

*Media History Monographs 11:1 (2008-2009)*

ISSN 1940-8862

The First Common Market:  
The British Press on Nineteenth-Century  
European Journalism

*E.M. Palmegiano*  
*St. Peter's College*

British magazines and reviews printed volumes on European journalism in the nineteenth century. In so doing, they provided a record of the press in regions or states that kept none and, more crucial, created a common market of ideas about it across frontiers. While cross-cultural analysis is sorely lacking in books produced at the time and later, Victorian journals pictured their counterparts' development frequently and broadly. A study of forty-four periodicals selected because they represent different parties, religions and classes confirms that the Continental press intrigued contributors and presumably their audiences. Most articles prioritized journalism in France with Germany, Italy and Russia in its wake. The paramount themes that emerged in investigations of all areas were the tension between governments and journalists and the character of the press and its personnel, principally the burgeoning of newspapers and the transformation of journalism from a sideline to a career.

©2009 E.M. Palmegiano

## The First Common Market: The British Press on Nineteenth-Century European Journalism

British magazines and reviews printed volumes on European journalism in the nineteenth century. The reasons for this attention were political and cultural. In these years national industrialism and international preeminence crested. Events on the Continent that might adversely affect British interests sparked one genre of articles. Another sprang from curiosity about the press in foreign societies. Although powerbrokers may have been mindful of the first motive, the second was more important for the history of journalism. Seeing their own press evolve from a subsidiary to the chief medium of public communication, the British realized that in the process it had become a social institution. One way to evaluate it was to weigh it against journalism in other places. In this undertaking, British periodicals provided a record of the press in regions or states that kept none and, more crucial, created a common market of ideas about it across frontiers. The correlations between native and foreign journalism, even when prejudiced, are invaluable because they unmask nineteenth-century criteria for ranking the press. Hence this inquiry highlights these correlations.

Cross-cultural analysis is sorely lacking in books on journalism produced at the time and later.<sup>1</sup> Perusal of contemporary and later bibliographies reveals few entries of comparative narrative, much less of comparative assessment.<sup>2</sup> And while national histories of the press are proliferating, they naturally appear in national languages. Alternatively, Victorian journals pictured their

counterparts' development frequently and broadly, from the Channel to the Aegean, from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. While their examination was hardly complete, since it emanated from the need to suit a British audience, it showed a vibrant and varied press in many locales.

This study of forty-four titles selected because they represent different parties, religions and classes, verifies that Continental journalism intrigued writers and presumably their readers.<sup>3</sup> Editors adhered to the convention of anonymity until about the 1860s, but identification of many authors is possible through internal clues, the unpublished lists of publishers and the published ones of modern scholars. Contributors included lawyers, clerics, military men and travelers who submitted occasionally; social and literary critics who freelanced more often; correspondents assigned to European capitals or sent there for special events, and their European colleagues. The serials range from plain-spoken weeklies to erudite quarterlies.

The paramount themes were not unusual: power manifested itself in the tension between governments and journalism; money, in the characterizations of the press and its personnel, principally with the burgeoning of newspapers and the transformation of journalism from sideline to career.<sup>4</sup> Press goals and press clients underlay these motifs. Formal and informal controls were the main topic, which gave the British a chance to gloat about their relative freedom. Living in an age of

---

E.M. Palmegiano is a professor of history at Saint Peter's College, New Jersey. She has written five books and over forty articles and papers on the nineteenth-century British press as well as numerous reviews in scholarly journals. She serves on the editorial boards of several academic journals. At present, she is working on a book-length study of press perceptions of journalism and journalists in the Victorian era.

inventions, they likewise tied the character of the press to technology or its absence. Machinery, particularly telegraphy and faster presses, meant progress because it permitted more efficient and less costly news gathering and distribution. That it homogenized news and expanded audiences led to consideration of reader education and owner regard for advertising, other factors linked to press character. Journalists were also part of the equation. The British, treated foreigners like nationals, categorizing them as professionals when they were good writers, logical editorialists and upright reporters but exposing hacks and frauds. These themes resonate in the following pages – in the context where the British found them.

Most prioritized by investigators was the journalism in France with Germany, Italy and Russia in its wake. The dominance of France is overwhelming. The British watched the ebb and flow of journalism in other countries but not with the same intensity. Why they were spellbound by the French is a question very easy and very hard to answer. A superficial but legitimate gauge is numbers. British papers had more correspondents in Paris than elsewhere; British citizens regularly sojourned in France; French journalists-cum-politicians resided and published in Britain; French papers were available in aristocratic clubs and inexpensive reading rooms. Beyond these circumstances, the British were perhaps mystified by the contradictions of the French press. It was on a tight tether but bred revolutions; it exemplified magnificent writing but mired it in ugly partisanship and dubious ethics; it interpreted news but neglected specifics. Finally, British scrutiny may have sprung early from discomfort about the liaison between their unstamped press and workers and later from awareness that the French were their only rivals for European journalistic supremacy.

### *France from the Gazette de France to the Gazettes of Napoleon I*

Essays on the Gallic press focused on its past as well as its present. Judgments about nineteenth-century French journalism were extreme: the British generally admired its flair and despised its content. This polarity was not evident in sagas about its origins. From the 1850s chroniclers backtracked to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They invariably began with Théophraste Renaudot, the physician who had Armand de Richelieu's blessing to launch the *Gazette de France*.<sup>5</sup> Some Britons thought that Renaudot's aims were to nip sedition and gossip with Richelieu as his informer.<sup>6</sup> Other scribes conjectured that the serious literary criticism in the *Journal des Savants* established French as the international language, while the "social literary" columns of the *Mercure Gallant* delighted audiences.<sup>7</sup> The first Paris magazine of light literature, the *Mercure* purportedly symbolized the "little journalism" of underground satirical papers.<sup>8</sup> However, as the *Westminster Review* declared, censorship reached even the *Journal des Savants* in the reign of Louis XIV.<sup>9</sup> Thereafter, private salons were a fountain of royal news, literary information and social chitchat, but *salonières* were careful to separate fact and rumor in two registers.<sup>10</sup> Public scandal sheets defied censors who, *Fraser's Magazine* bared, committed female managers to convents for their sins.<sup>11</sup>

The British logged the *Journal de Paris*, arriving on the eve of the French Revolution, as a pioneer and soon-shuttered daily.<sup>12</sup> They asserted that the Revolutionary era cut the pattern for government-press relations in the nineteenth century, a pattern of alternating control and liberty, because every French regime recognized journalism's might.<sup>13</sup> The *British and Foreign Review* summarized the situation this way.

If the influence of the public journals is greater in France than elsewhere, it is also more contested; from its very birth, as it displayed a tendency to absorb

everything, nothing was granted to it without a struggle. No power has ever excited more alarm, has had more enemies, has survived severer trials, or has undergone more singular revolutions.<sup>14</sup>

Estimating that from the days of the Estates-General to the National Convention about 1000 new gazettes surfaced, outsiders distinguished the able and moderate, as the *Moniteur*, from more extremist brothers, notably during the Reign of Terror.<sup>15</sup>

The Terror dominated British pages about the Revolution. People marveled at the explosion of newspapers and the resourceful journalists who rode them to office or to the guillotine.<sup>16</sup> Execution, some British insisted, was appropriate for those selling or posting papers of “brutality and blasphemy” so vehement that opposition mobs assailed publishers.<sup>17</sup> This school concluded that the worst of the eighteenth-century press was nothing against the “breathless, bloody, and illiterate” attacks in Revolution tribunes.<sup>18</sup> One exception, some postulated, was Jean-Paul Marat’s “inflammatory” but never coarse *Ami du Peuple*.<sup>19</sup> Amid the bombast, the *Monthly Chronicle* discovered a neutral daily, the *Journal des Guillotines* with its deadly statistics.<sup>20</sup>

The *Dublin University Magazine* reckoned that the Directory, which succeeded the Terror, was as intolerant as its predecessor.<sup>21</sup> Directors allowed little expression, transporting for life about forty owners and editors and jailing many more critics.<sup>22</sup> Among those who escaped was Jacques Mallet du Pan, editor of the *Mercure de France* and *Mercure Britannique*, whom the British praised for defying the Terrorists.<sup>23</sup>

The bleak vision of the French press did not vanish with the accession of Napoleon I. Observers accused him of guile, sanctioning “a little venom” to prove his press was free and licensing a handful to echo his ideas.<sup>24</sup> He allegedly ignored the prestigious *Journal des*

*Débats* until 1811 when he divided the shares of the Bertin family between his supporters and the police and then ordered other opponents delivered to “military commissions.”<sup>25</sup> Commentators rejoiced that, within a decade of the Bertins’ return in 1814, they converted the *Débats* into a significant journal of “learning” and “independence.”<sup>26</sup>

### *Restoration to July Revolution, 1815-1830*

During the Bourbon Restoration after Napoleon, French journalists supposedly did not initially object to the regulations of Louis XVIII because they were less stringent than Bonapartist ones.<sup>27</sup> Libel theoretically concerned the French as much as the British in 1819, but practically, the years of censorship had apparently left few with the technical and literary skills essential for newspapers.<sup>28</sup> They were, the Paris agent for *Harper’s New Monthly* recalled, more like reviews but with an inconsequential audience measured against Britain.<sup>29</sup> Among genuine reviews, Stendhal told British readers, the *Revue Britannique* had an “extensive” circulation by the 1820s, when every literary group had an organ.<sup>30</sup> French criticism could be as flattering as British, but the French had the decency not to critique books of their publisher-sponsors, a practice more common in England.<sup>31</sup>

By the coronation of Charles X in 1824, newspapers were flourishing. The king was manifestly nervous because he acknowledged that readers feared him less than journalist-politicians.<sup>32</sup> J.D. Acton remembered that Charles tried to ruin his adversaries, such as the *Courrier Française* and *Quotidienne*, with “vexatious litigation,” and when that failed, to close them.<sup>33</sup> Surveys of this reign noted that the “independent,” well-run *Courrier* had, like the *Constitutionnel*, about 24,000 readers, both far outdistancing the *Débats*.<sup>34</sup> The dagger of suppression hung over journalistic jobs and profits and annoyed audiences who took their

opinion from newspapers of accuracy and style.<sup>35</sup> Among this cadre were the *Constitutionnel* and the new *Globe*. Habitual social analyst W.R. Greg described both as the offspring of educated, talented and decent men but equated the *Globe* to British quality reviews.<sup>36</sup> This trailblazing literary newspaper was ostensibly impartial and dignified in its original, spirited criticism.<sup>37</sup> Under François Guizot, a future premier, the *Globe* carried the torch for the rising generation.<sup>38</sup> Meanwhile, the well-paid Adolphe Thiers, another future premier, was scribbling pithy editorials for the *Constitutionnel*, which the British designated as the paper of the Parisian bourgeoisie.<sup>39</sup> Guizot's wife, Pauline de Meulan, editor of the *Publiciste*, might be a prominent critic, but it was Thiers and his associates who shaped journalism's future in July 1830 remarked A.V. Kirwan, longtime student of French culture.<sup>40</sup>

The July Revolution garnered legions of lines in British serials as it happened, during the 1848 Revolution and even late in the century. Authors spotlighted the role of newspapers, mainly the *National*.<sup>41</sup> Thiers and Armand Carrel, a man of talent and integrity universally rated as a foremost French journalist, started the *National* after Thiers decided that the *Constitutionnel* was "somewhat antiquated."<sup>42</sup> British writers featured Thiers as the "life and soul" of the paper and editor Carrel as the brain of this "most influential" political herald, one which demonstrated the potential of the daily.<sup>43</sup> Temperate in tone until royal policy threatened it, the *National* mobilized Paris editors to resist outside intervention and their actions mobilized the French public to depose Charles.<sup>44</sup>

### ***The "Golden Age" of the July Monarchy***

Most onlookers concurred that this result confirmed the sway of French journalists but divided about whether they put it to good or evil. Edward Bulwer-Lytton, novelist, MP and

*New Monthly Magazine* editor, claimed that appraisal was not easy because in crises French journalism roused rather than subdued anxiety, but in ordinary times it endured persecution.<sup>45</sup> Retrospectives labeled Louis Philippe's July Monarchy press "brilliant" and "provocative," a "Golden Age" when petulant journalists boosted their notoriety but not necessarily fortune.<sup>46</sup> Cynics at the time pointed out that newspapers might be multiplying, but many were not worthwhile.<sup>47</sup> The neonates may have improved the 1830 ratio of papers to readers (1:437), but it was not close to the British (1:184).<sup>48</sup> Moreover, most prints belonged to politicians or aspirants to political, not journalistic careers.<sup>49</sup> *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* contrasted this arrangement and the British one.

Everyone knows by what class in society the daily press is conducted in England: it is in the hands of persons of great ability, but in general of inferior grade in society. If the leading political characters do occasionally contribute an article, it is done under the veil of secrecy, and is seldom admitted by the author, with whatever fame it may have been attended. But in France the case is quite the reverse. There the leading political characters, the highest of the nobles, the first men of the State, not only contribute to the daily press but avow and glory in their doing so... So far from being considered a discredit, or a thing to be concealed, these eminent men pride themselves on the influence they thus have on public opinion.<sup>50</sup>

The ongoing interchange between press and politics was but one of the peculiarities of French journalism on which the British dwelled. Another was the position of Paris. If the press was the "intellectual instrument" of the French, Paris, the British testified, was the sharpest tool because its papers were more cerebral than London's and were more persuasive in the country.<sup>51</sup> Dailies, though not comparable in news or advertising to London

but cheaper in price, averaged about twenty-six in 1847, and the French could scan Sunday offerings, magazines and niche and fringe publications.<sup>52</sup>

Fans raved that Paris could “direct” national opinion because well-paid journalists had time to craft sound and stylistic editorials.<sup>53</sup> French columns might not be as well-reasoned as British but had more clout because the newspaper was the public forum in a nation unaccustomed to public meetings.<sup>54</sup> French readers adopted the opinions of newspapers, whereas the British assumedly extrapolated information in order to form their own opinions.<sup>55</sup>

Enemies targeted Paris editors. The “riff-raff,” seduced by Thiers to collude in rebellion, tarnished the reputations of honorable and smart men and, left unfettered, undermined orthodox values.<sup>56</sup> From the era of Louis XIV, they had been pivotal in political swings, deluding or riling readers by concealing or altering the facts.<sup>57</sup> After 1830 they destabilized society by propagating inconsistent programs.<sup>58</sup> Liberty sired sedition that ministers were reluctant to check lest another confrontation with journalists ensue.<sup>59</sup> To most but not all British solons, French journalists, selfishly searching for prestige and reward, sustained a press of revolution, not of public service.<sup>60</sup>

For Victorians dedicated to anonymity, the foulest French crime was signature, by which “every fifth-rate contributor to a sixth-rate journal” got a name.<sup>61</sup> Paltry pay, below the British average, guaranteed an untalented, probably immoral cohort.<sup>62</sup> W.M. Thackeray, for years a Paris correspondent, painted the ambitious as perennial liars and the ousted as perennially acerbic.<sup>63</sup> Either group was amenable to bribes – like those that English newspaper proprietors once took – but historian H. Longueville Jones sermonized that the French had turned a “public, political press” into the “worst” in the “literary world.”<sup>64</sup>

The Orleanist compromise, with its security money and fines or jail, was unsatisfactory to those who wanted censorship and those who wanted to eliminate it. Liberals argued that the excesses of Paris did not justify the ordinances of a king who had promised a free press. Instead of opening his own paper, he chose to interfere with others.<sup>65</sup> The British abhorred the rising prosecutions and royal diversion of “secret service money” to the “ablest and most conscientious” journalists paid to reply to anti-monarchist editorials.<sup>66</sup> Essayists deemed the big Paris dailies bothersome but not dangerous to Louis Philippe. Burdened by antiquated organizational structures and disinclined to emulate British and American emphases on news and advertising, some Parisians did compress partisan wrangling as competition deepened.<sup>67</sup> The papers of the July Monarchy, finding their audiences among subscribers or in reading rooms and cafés, broadcast as much on the arts and literature as on government.<sup>68</sup>

The first *Temps*, which helped Louis Philippe gain the throne, was “noble and independent” until it was closed, and the *Débats* was a “semi-official organ.”<sup>69</sup> Staffed by lettered “gentlemen,” this “conservative, constitutional, and moral” newspaper was the best in British eyes.<sup>70</sup> Then there was the *Presse* of Emile Girardin. Some hailed him as a “clever,” innovative and enterprising entrepreneur.<sup>71</sup> Skeptics doubted that shifting journalism from “political instruction” to “financial speculation,” from profession to trade that banked on sales, from partisanship to greed was an improvement.<sup>72</sup> The *North British Review* disparaged his price-cutting.

[The price] obliged him, first, to lower the rate of remuneration to his contributors, and of course to be contented with an inferior set; and secondly, to write down to a lower audience... Political articles were not always stimulating enough for appetites that had long fed on garbage and on poison, so the *feuilletons* of Eugene

Sue's stamp were introduced, and completed the degradation and denaturalization of the public taste.<sup>73</sup>

Others joined the attack on *Presse* feuilletons intended to lure women and advertisers. The British raged that Girardin transmogrified feuilletons from literary or philosophical pieces to “enervating and demoralizing effusions” of novelists pressured to pen them.<sup>74</sup> What had once been “clear, correct, candid, and learned criticism” was a “vulgar” tale that arrived at the same moment *Charivari* was popularizing caricature.<sup>75</sup> The “manly” *Gazette de France* headed by the “learned” Abbé Eugene de Genoude might be more admirable, but the “great vogue and sales” of feuilletons did not escape Girardin's competitors.<sup>76</sup> According to the British, the *Constitutionnel* owed its higher circulation to the feuilletons of Eugene Sue but in the transaction exchanged “urbanity” for “sensuality.”<sup>77</sup> The *Siècle* benefited even more from feuilletons, having the most subscribers of Paris dailies in the 1840s, and *Figaro* grew circulation by addressing the undiscerning middle-class lovers of the format.<sup>78</sup>

*Figaro* had other advantages, a “free, fanciful tone” and “brilliant independence of ideas,” due principally to Léon Gozlan and Jules Janin.<sup>79</sup> Janin, who went from the “popular” *Figaro* to the “aristocratic” *Débats*, was later memorialized as a man content to be a journalist.<sup>80</sup> Dubbed by Thackeray “the critic of France” in 1842, Janin was to others witty, even impudent, but pleasant – so different from ignorant and cruel compatriots who traded raves for the favors of actresses or dueled rivals to the death.<sup>81</sup> Janin's behavior, the British presumed, made him a quarry of small theatrical papers, “untrustworthy” feeders on gossip.<sup>82</sup> These “nuisances” generally acclaimed subscriber-actors, but the dull *Revue* was “respectable” and the *Coureur de Spectacles* was honest.<sup>83</sup>

The British understandably heeded any Gallic publication that resembled their own.

The *Revue Comique* was the French *Punch*, albeit Habsburg Foreign Minister Clemens von Metternich preferred *Charivari* to relax, and the *Litterature Pittoresque* was “a sort of *Penny Magazine*.”<sup>84</sup> Thus, the space allotted to the Catholic *Avenir*, a title of short tenure, small audience and fathers – Charles de Montalembert, Jean-Baptiste Lacordaire and Félicité de Lamennais – scarcely known outside France, was unusual.<sup>85</sup> The *Avenir*, full of invective, was a modest literary success, but its campaign for civil liberties and its subsequent papal censure was what intrigued Protestant Britons.<sup>86</sup>

Lamennais later moved to the socialist press, but in the 1830s the British considered the *Globe* the chief representative of that wing. Previously well-funded and ably run by Michael Chevalier, the quality *Globe* of the Restoration morphed into a socialist journal in the 1830s and captured much more British attention than others on the doctrines of Charles Fourier and C.-H. Saint-Simon.<sup>87</sup> Columnists marginalized even further provincial sheets, which approximated British weeklies in amount of local advertising but not local news.<sup>88</sup>

At the other extreme the British situated the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the apex of French journalism.<sup>89</sup> They rhapsodized that its astuteness surpassed their elite quarterlies and its writing was merely equal because the *Revue* lost authors to better-paying feuilleton commissions.<sup>90</sup> Its precursor, the *Revue de Paris*, never received such high marks, but the British esteemed both for excluding critics who were blackmailers.<sup>91</sup> Like their own editors, the French counted on famous penmen to introduce their protégés.<sup>92</sup> Conversely, French almanacs were more specialized than Britain's amusing but not utilitarian annuals.<sup>93</sup> For their work in these and all periodicals, French contributors earned less than their cross-Channel comrades but held the copyright on their material, a right denied at home.<sup>94</sup>

### ***A French Revolution Again***

Any British complacency about French journalism ceased abruptly during the 1848 Revolution. Press activities were the subject of numerous articles.<sup>95</sup> They concentrated on the senior *National* and the nascent *Réforme*, although the *Moniteur*, *Universal* and *Revue Rétrospective* also celebrated Louis Philippe's departure.<sup>96</sup> Even if *Réforme* editor Armand Marrast was "insufferably arrogant," he was the "ablest journalist of France," and his writing and the paper's 20,000 subscribers, some surmised, underpinned the new republic.<sup>97</sup> Alternatively, Girardin's *Presse*, which ran "scraps of news" during February, was in jeopardy as republican journalists flooded into office.<sup>98</sup> Several older papers reportedly fell to functionaries and mobs or drowned in the deluge of new gazettes.<sup>99</sup> Cancellation of the stamp and briefly caution money spawned the small and the cheap, 1200 in February alone.<sup>100</sup> *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* tallied that Paris went from 26 to 150 dailies overnight.<sup>101</sup> Most died quickly, but recent news stalls generated "immense" sales for survivors.<sup>102</sup> Playwright-author J.P. Simpson vividly sketched the scene.

One of the most striking features...of the newly-acquired liberty may be found in the public criers and newspaper vendors, who have poured down upon the streets of Paris, like the savage hordes of Attila. What a screaming fills the air, from the earliest hour of the day to the latest hour of the night!<sup>103</sup>

The British denigrated tyros' layouts, uninformed stories and savage language.<sup>104</sup> Particularly distasteful was that women penned or backed such papers.<sup>105</sup> The arch demon was George Sand, whose "incendiary doctrines" were in the *Bulletin de la République* and *Cause du Peuple*.<sup>106</sup>

Before the June Days, sages outlined a scenario in which journalists struck down foes; after, a story in which government shut "ten of the most disaffected journals," jailed Girardin,

and revived caution money, possibly a ploy to secure capitalist control.<sup>107</sup> The British defended action against an "incendiary press" of "assassins" and "panderers" but singled out men of "courage and ability," even "eloquence," among them Louis Blanc and Alphonse de Lamartine who were not "anarchical."<sup>108</sup>

### ***Another Bonaparte Era, 1849-1870***

By 1850, when Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was president of the Second Republic, a press that had seesawed between restraint and license since 1815 seemed to be everywhere and everywhere revived.<sup>109</sup> Subscription forms for the established chronicles were available in post offices, and individual issues, in coffee-shops, "cheap newspaper clubs" and well-supplied reading rooms.<sup>110</sup> In this decade, the apogee of their own fourth estate, the British engaged in extensive analysis.

Assayers were sure that their newspapers were an insight into British life, whereas the French journals, while more illuminating than before, were hardly ideal.<sup>111</sup> They had less crime and better writing, but they exaggerated even when the "Various Facts" on accidents and disasters needed no embellishment, and their owners employed newspapers as personal weapons instead of investment opportunities.<sup>112</sup> Paris dailies, about the size of but greater in number than London's evening tribunes, were not a "safety-valve" but were the progeny of editors whose tidy quarters testified to their under-work.<sup>113</sup> Their signed editorials were "far more tastefully and spiritedly written" than London columns, but their papers were devoid of hard news.<sup>114</sup> The British despaired that French audiences savored a „billiant' editorial or an „exciting' feuilleton, what one pundit later summarized as "milk for babes," not "meat for men."<sup>115</sup> Truly bizarre to essayists was that the French read more about foreign policy and cared less about advertising, locating it on the last rather than the first page.<sup>116</sup> The provincials were still



dull if more timely. News gathered in Paris and supplemented by local announcements – of goods and services, rites of passage and rumors – avoided politics, the centerpiece of British locals, because once the Second Empire replaced the Second Republic, the emperor limited press liberty.<sup>117</sup>

Gurus had much to say about the policies of Napoleon III, whose hostility to the press resembled that of his uncle. Opponents tracked the new emperor's switch from blunt repression to subtle manipulation.<sup>118</sup> They thundered that requiring permission to publish, banning street sales, releasing his decisions selectively, and imposing severe penalties for violations amounted to overkill even if the press had been wanton in 1848.<sup>119</sup> Libertarians labeled the outcome catastrophic, shuttering or pressuring the “leading organs of democracy” and ruining controversial pigmies.<sup>120</sup> Many journalists went to jail; some committed suicide.<sup>121</sup> Confiscation of English and other foreign papers and indulgence of pro-imperial ones verified Bonaparte capriciousness by which the press was in chains at best and “entirely extinct” at worst.<sup>122</sup> By contrast, advocates of gagging contended that regulation would reduce licentiousness and might induce replication of the British model of reasoned criticism of officials and political education of readers.<sup>123</sup> Moreover, French readers endorsed silencing of journalists who had fed unrest.<sup>124</sup>

Bonapartism perplexed savants in the 1860s. They resented ongoing seizure of British journals at the border just as the easing of restrictions on French journalism sired 150 new heralds, the majority “fiery” or smutty and all fiercely competitive.<sup>125</sup> Bickering among editors of these halfpennies sold in news-shops shattered any semblance of influence.<sup>126</sup> Yet, because French audiences were “more impressionable” than British, paragraphs spewed out by the arrogant might kindle another rebellion.<sup>127</sup> The compromise, according to spectators, was to retain rules and

taxes but to mete out lighter fines and prison terms.<sup>128</sup> As a retrospective disclosed, the imperial strategy of sending money and news to favored papers was as effective.<sup>129</sup>

The British detailed how the principal papers reacted to this Napoleon's program. Originally, the *Presse* and the *Constitutionnel* tried to undermine his “pretensions.”<sup>130</sup> Bureaucrats retaliated by curbing the “effrontery” of the *Presse* before 1856 but not its “superior and exciting” feuilletons; the *Constitutionnel*, “less respectable” than during the July Monarchy, reorganized as a paper for merchants but with topflight feuilletons.<sup>131</sup> The dull but honest *Siècle*, with a large circulation in 1867, was fine for the cafés.<sup>132</sup> The *Moniteur* had superb literary critics, and *Charivari*, excellent illustrations.<sup>133</sup> The *National* had less sway, discredited in the early 1850s by its actions in 1848, leaving the *Débats* preeminent thanks to intelligent composers of significant editorials.<sup>134</sup> *Figaro* after 1854 was paying well for spicy small talk and fiction but faced the new *Gaulois* in the 1860s when the *Petit Journal* commenced.<sup>135</sup> The sensuality of this very cheap paper disturbed British moralists but not profiteers who saw that it would beguile buyers and then advertisers.<sup>136</sup>

The British separated the strands of French journalism in other ways so as to underscore Anglo-Saxon superiority. For example, the complaints that Gallic distaste for advertising impeded “lucrative” journalism implied that journalism at home was successful business; and the mutterings that a taste for cliques thwarted the maturation of a “leading journal” was a paean to *The Times*.<sup>137</sup> Paris journals that copied American technology printed more copies but had neither newsboys nor distribution companies, instead relying on women to bundle mailings.<sup>138</sup> Evening “gray little papers,” with bits of news, “lively criticism” of opera and theatre, finance data and romances, were better than Italian offerings but too “florid” and too mudslinging

for serious, i.e., British readers.<sup>139</sup>

Bystanders did not overlook reviews in the Second Empire. The *Deux Mondes* continued as the classic, an erudite, tranquil and therefore compelling voice.<sup>140</sup> By the 1860s Matthew Arnold put it ahead of British reviews, except the short-lived *Home and Foreign*, for breadth of knowledge and “play of mind.”<sup>141</sup> The *Revue* was the “ablest organ of French criticism,” “calm and unbiased” about both literature and politics.<sup>142</sup> Penned by the “first minds of France,” it was perennially “learned.”<sup>143</sup> Of other reviews, primarily the religious tempted the British. The Catholic *Correspondant*, perused by “the gentry and better intellects,” won plaudits from British Protestant and Catholic journals for its willingness to speak about the Empire “in a spirit of free, legitimate, and religious criticism.”<sup>144</sup> The French Protestant press, from the intellectual to the practical, for juveniles and for sophisticates, had much broader coverage.<sup>145</sup>

Small, topical magazines, as in Britain, dealt with science and fashion, the arts and humor.<sup>146</sup> Inexpensive serials did not thrive except titles akin to the *London Journal* – with light fiction for the barely literate and with gifts for women who subscribed.<sup>147</sup> The *Journal pour Tous* and the *Journal du Dimanche*, which pirated American and British novels, prospered.<sup>148</sup> Almanacs, once imaginative and funny, were derivative and tedious, especially those dedicated to the emperor.<sup>149</sup> Whatever their price, periodicals had too much Gallic-English to suit Charles Dickens’ *Household Words*.<sup>150</sup>

Even in the heyday of supervision, the British agreed that French journalists had residual power from the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 but disagreed about how the mandate for signature impacted that power.<sup>151</sup> To one camp, it stripped out the stupid and prejudiced and bestowed fame on pedestrian if courteous persons.<sup>152</sup> The known Gallic man displayed “elegant impertinence” that shamed

anonymous Britons’ “trenchant aggressiveness.”<sup>153</sup> To another coterie, signature eradicated journalists’ eminence, sapped their spirit, and multiplied duels.<sup>154</sup>

In the Second Empire, narrators avowed, men but not women with average qualifications earned a steady income from parliamentary and other reporting, but the bigwigs were the commentators.<sup>155</sup> Lucien Prévost-Paradol, an eloquent columnist for the *Débats* and the *Courrier du Dimanche*, was a notorious enemy of Napoleon III.<sup>156</sup> Of a different stamp but no less renowned for his critiques and feuilletons was Janin.<sup>157</sup> James Hogg’s *Titan* saluted Théophile Gautier and Charles Sainte-Beuve for their efforts.<sup>158</sup> The thorough and punctual Gautier apparently lived on his press wages while he penned poetry.<sup>159</sup> His sixty articles on theatre, music and art for the *Presse* never showed the “baser side of journalism.”<sup>160</sup> Sainte-Beuve was an outstanding literary reviewer for the *Globe* and the *Deux Mondes*.<sup>161</sup>

Alongside these paragons were Henri Rochefort, a prototype of upward mobility who went from penny-a-liner at *Charivari* to satirist at *Figaro* to editor-in-exile of the anti-imperial *Lanterne*, and the Jews, whom the British segregated in France and elsewhere.<sup>162</sup> They envisioned Paris Jews as “news-writers, editors and contributors” in the afternoon who spent their mornings managing railroads and trading on the Bourse or as conductors “with great ability” of the fine literary *Universe Israélite* and *Archives Israélites*.<sup>163</sup>

### ***The Second Empire Goes, The Third Republic Comes***

Group biography was more extensive during and after the Franco-Prussian War that killed the Second Empire. The British complimented the “ablest” journalists for their attempts to “allay agitation” in the run-up to the conflict and war correspondents for their ingenuity, sending dispatches by balloon and pigeon when telegraphy failed.<sup>164</sup> Assessors

condemned Paris Communards for crushing their enemies' press and permitting their friends to disseminate falsehood and vice hawked by a flock of newsboys.<sup>165</sup> Foes equated Communard and Irish nationalist sheets because both "print lies and promote incendiarism" and blamed French journals for German constraints during the occupation, whose onset Paris newspapers omitted or announced on black-bordered pages.<sup>166</sup>

In the 1870s the British nodded to the provinces, touching on the metamorphosis of the *Bulletin des Communes* from informative to "scurrilous" and on the habit of reporters to depart routinely for Paris where they mingled with those not devoted to authenticity or objectivity.<sup>167</sup> The Parisian epitomized the emotional, unskilled, dogmatic or unscrupulous scribbler with no cachet.<sup>168</sup> Even though signature in a competitive market enriched the top men, French readers did not revere journalists.<sup>169</sup> And why should they, asked British free lancer and Paris resident E.C. Grenville-Murray in 1873.

Your ordinary Paris editor prints a few foreign telegrams, without a word of comment, and, as it is costly to keep a staff of reporters employed in collecting genuine intelligence on home subjects, he finds it simpler to fill his columns with inventions or vague rumours, garnished with spurious embellishments. Nobody puts any faith in the parliamentary anecdotes, startling scientific discoveries, murders, diplomatic intrigues, and horrible catastrophes that abound in Parisian newspapers. For the most part, such news appears without any specification of date, place, or authority.<sup>170</sup>

In light of this negative stereotype, it is odd that British periodicals were even-handed about late-century Paris journalism. As the Third Republic's press blossomed, they debated the degree of liberty that the French did or should have. Some thought that abuse of public men was improper; others, that a

multitude of papers deterred "ugly dictatorship."<sup>171</sup> Pollyannas articulated reasons for hope. Post-Commune papers had more national news and less malice than their forebears and polished editorials that could mold sound opinion.<sup>172</sup> Yet, positivist Fredric Harrison acknowledged, partisanship prevailed in humor and rumor.<sup>173</sup> Killjoys retorted that Paris newspapers distributed news of neither veracity nor variety, and capital heralds, as in Britain, no longer published solid book reviews.<sup>174</sup> This circumstance propelled London literary weeklies but in France strengthened the hand of the scholarly offerings.<sup>175</sup> The *Deux Mondes* remained the bellwether, but new Protestant reviews were promising.<sup>176</sup>

Emblematic of the audience yen for trifles, a yen too of the British, was *Figaro*, selling in the streets and "places of amusement" to those who appreciated its banter but did not "esteem" it.<sup>177</sup> The younger *Cigarette* likewise had a sizable circulation due to innovative advertising, plenty of chatter and news of theatre and commerce.<sup>178</sup> The British identified *Corsaire*, a "lively little journal," as a way-station between *Figaro* and the deliberative and incorruptible *Débats*.<sup>179</sup>

Another landmark in the history of French journalism was the Press Law in 1881. As journalist Joseph Reinach trumpeted, it conferred the broadest liberty in Europe on a contemptuous press.<sup>180</sup> His confrere Theodore Child chimed in that the Parisians mixed "loyalty and deceit, sincerity and roguery."<sup>181</sup> Nonetheless, what preoccupied analysts in France, as in Britain, was not legislation but the business of journalism.

The feuilleton was a financial anchor for large papers but not for most of the fifty Paris dailies by the 1880s.<sup>182</sup> The majority were ostensibly tiny, wedging a handful of advertisements and telegrams between propaganda that could "demoralize" or "degrade" the masses.<sup>183</sup> Even when they shared printing and advertising agency costs,

they had deficits because, recorders pontificated, they advanced a cause rather than chased profits.<sup>184</sup>

Dailies owned by businessmen added more news but preserved style in signed editorials more sparkling than anonymous British ones and fairer than the German.<sup>185</sup> But Gallic reporters were less precise, even in the six or so papers that were “conscientiously edited.”<sup>186</sup> Sages rated the *Débats* “one of the most judicious” in Europe, and the *Moniteur*, still authoritative.<sup>187</sup> The second *Temps*, with the “widest circulation” of the “political journals” in 1885, was capable but perhaps too “earnest” and “heavy” because of its penchants for foreign policy and “unadulterated facts.”<sup>188</sup> The *Matin* operated more like American dailies, employing special wires, expressing many opinions, and handling its own printing.<sup>189</sup> *Figaro* was “exciting” because this entrenched “literary and society paper” of the “boulevard” now noticed politics.<sup>190</sup> The gigantic circulation of the neophyte *Petit Journal* was potentially dangerous, but the *Lanterne*, *Intransigent* and *France* were already disreputable.<sup>191</sup>

On the sidelines, essayists espied a mélange of journals. The socialist organs clearly conveyed an ideology but depended on feuilletons and scandal for income.<sup>192</sup> The anarchist *Révolution* was lucky to have Jean Grave who gave it “literary merit” in contrast to the more emotional *Père Peinard*.<sup>193</sup> The provincials, plagued by piracy, were resolving their disputes in the Société des Gens de Lettres.<sup>194</sup> Literary reviews were withering because critics were open to bribery of the worst kind, taking money for opposing views under two names, an offense easier perpetrated in Britain wherever anonymity endured.<sup>195</sup> Even the *Deux Mondes*, though always the acme, was slipping as its tyros diverged in ability.<sup>196</sup>

The British detected too a talent spectrum among senior journalists. Critics of the *Artiste* and *Revue de Paris* might be superlative, but

the clagues of theatre reviewers demeaned them.<sup>197</sup> Writers at the *Débats* went on to books and politics, but the *chroniquer*, like the British interviewer, was destined to repeat gossip cavalierly because of a growing audience for it.<sup>198</sup>

If the *chroniquer* irritated some observers, Jews angered others. The chief charges were secretly financing journalism, using money in Europe the way the Irish used pens in New York, and hiding behind Christian names in order to dominate newspapers and agencies.<sup>199</sup> Anti-Semitic tirades in the Catholic *Dublin Review* accused Jews of monopolizing the French press as proprietors and editors in Paris and the countryside and manipulating international news agencies in order to spread stories that could tip financial markets and diplomatic negotiations.<sup>200</sup>

French anti-Semitism heightened in the 1890s because of the publicity on the Dreyfus case. To most Britons, French coverage exposed the flaws of French journalism. The *National Review* carried myriad items, but all serials castigated anti-Dreyfus gazettes for their foul and hysterical prose.<sup>201</sup> Outsiders pointed out that the “widely read” *Libre Parole* exemplified heretofore inconsequential and unprofitable newspapers, which raised revenue by inferring that the Republican press defense of a Jew was unpatriotic.<sup>202</sup>

The British drew from Dreyfus journalism evidence of their longstanding objections to the French media. Paying generals for columns was the embodiment of blatant venality.<sup>203</sup> But signature had not eliminated corruption among regulars, inspiring them instead to focus on stardom and its commensurate remuneration.<sup>204</sup> In this “paradise of journalists,” the best newspapers were happy to pay the qualified to condense politics, discreetly handle wrongdoing, and politely review books.<sup>205</sup>

Newspapers burgeoned in the 1890s, according to spectators, less from Dreyfus inserts than from financier-owners’

prioritization of sales above decency.<sup>206</sup> The French version of “New Journalism” replicated British stress on personalities, scandals and prizes but seasoned everything with polemic except for the deadly editorials in the *Temps* and “well-informed” *Débats*.<sup>207</sup> Editors could intimidate any minister since they had better information than the legislature and their shrill though occasionally amusing rants shaped more and more voters.<sup>208</sup> Paris scattered a smattering of news between political libels so “gross” that politicians resigned rather than brave the abuse.<sup>209</sup> Irresponsible rhetoric, raconteurs mused, was natural for a press unaccustomed to liberty, embedded in a culture with a plethora of papers, and oblivious to improving minds or gathering news, the two fabled pillars of British journalism.<sup>210</sup>

The upshot, to British dismay, was that the French perused fourth-rate tribunes created by those who took money for their words or their silence.<sup>211</sup>

How, then, do the newspapers of Paris reward their avaricious staffs and discharge their printers’ bills? By a system of modified blackmail, which is less offensive by its very cynicism. The city [financial] paper, as we call it, is let out to the highest bidder... A lady, greedy for notice, gives a dinner party and pays the paper to applaud her entertainment.<sup>212</sup>

Somewhere between these publications and the *Débats* in the 1890s lay the “light, smart” *Figaro* that balanced fiction and telegraphic tidbits and the entertaining *Echo de Paris*, both of which enthralled the semi-informed middle class.<sup>213</sup> The *Petit Journal*, which one million purchased and three million read, also sold to the bourgeoisie.<sup>214</sup> Although it had correspondents in all the provinces, whether it or any Paris paper reflected the French peasant mind was unclear to the British.<sup>215</sup> They were sure that the *Petit Journal*, denoting the triumph of the

unprincipled and the reward of the corrupt, was but a step above the wretched *Gil Blas*.<sup>216</sup>

By century’s end, reviews represented the polar opposites of a *Gil Blas*.<sup>217</sup> The British spotted all sorts of periodicals in between, from the “high-class scientific” *Médecine Moderne* to women’s magazines and comic serials.<sup>218</sup> Circa 1900 only the output of the Roman Church was suspect, partly by association with the Dreyfus case. Victorians spotlighted the reach of the *Croix* among parishioners and the monetary schemes of it and its ilk.<sup>219</sup> These solicitations were, to the British, what ultimately and uncompromisingly divided French journalism from their own.

#### ***North of France: Belgium and Holland***

To the British, the country with the closest journalistic bond to France was Belgium. In the 1830s they credited the July Revolution for triggering a call by the Brussels press for independence from the Netherlands.<sup>220</sup> The fact that the judiciary mandated in 1814 to protect journalists was never appointed was another motive for them to spearhead the national movement whose victory ended prosecutions.<sup>221</sup> By the 1840s authors deplored this liberty because former “third and fourth rate contributors” coming north from Paris spit up “vomit” about the new Belgian bureaucracy.<sup>222</sup> Insults in the 1850s were so vile that even the once-zesty *Fraser’s* sanctioned censure.<sup>223</sup>

About mid-century penmen decided that Belgium had no national press. It housed newspapers of French, German and Russian refugees, members of “fallen dynasties” and “Jewish bankers.”<sup>224</sup> Brussels’ *Indépendance Belge*, the offspring of Jewish backers, was really a European paper with some local readers.<sup>225</sup> French-language heralds, relying on French buyers, had little regional news except for the *Journal de Bruxelles*, said to have the largest foreign audience of Belgium’s Catholic papers.<sup>226</sup> France had another, and to the

British more irritating effect on Belgian journalism, the prompting of gossip sheets.<sup>227</sup>

From the 1870s onward, onlookers skipped over Belgian newspapers except for remarking that, unlike the British, they did not have enough telegrams and letters.<sup>228</sup> Still newsboys reputedly had no trouble selling the *Indépendance Belge*, by then the “leading paper,” on Sunday afternoons.<sup>229</sup> Conversely, the *Diable du Corps* was sarcastic and “indecent.”<sup>230</sup> The *Lanterne* unsurprisingly had a Gallic flavor under editor Rochefort and the *Nord*, a Russian tinge under another émigré, while the *Tribune du Peuple* was the brainchild of the International Working Men’s Association.<sup>231</sup>

Long before the Belgians left the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Holland had a press. Histories of British journalism frequently cited the precedence of the Dutch yet merely glanced at their journals between 1810 and 1850 before neglecting them altogether.<sup>232</sup> To the British, the *Haarlem Chronicle* was a pioneer in the seventeenth century, but after 1815 press freedom diminished because Dutch functionaries translated opposition as sedition.<sup>233</sup> Perhaps this idea stemmed from the fact that newspapers, about 1 per 100 people in 1830 compared to 1 per 184 in Britain, were primarily for politics rather than gain. But, the *Foreign Quarterly Review* cautioned, suppressing the work of gifted youths elevated the threat of rebellion.<sup>234</sup>

As the Dutch stopped leashing in the 1840s, reviews and magazines, previously all imported, flowered.<sup>235</sup> Though well written, the domestic offerings averaged 400 subscribers because dailies allocated more space to “personal attacks” in a Church-State war than to politics and commerce.<sup>236</sup>

### ***South of France: Spain and Portugal***

A different sort of combat but not different conduct characterized Spanish journalism, which ultra-conservative Archibald Alison held partly responsible for upheavals

commencing in the 1830s.<sup>237</sup> This indictment was not without merit. The British reported from the 1820s that Madrid’s budding newspapers were “unsophisticated,” with the cheap *Télégrafo* rousing the “lower ranks.”<sup>238</sup> Ironically, after the first wave of unrest, bystanders bemoaned the fines, imprisonments, deportations and destruction of presses belonging to those of every class.<sup>239</sup> The Spanish might justify their actions on the ground that journalists were blackmailers, but the British believed that the clampdown on Barcelona’s *Constitucional* and others was a blow to honest men, most seasoned reporters similar to British penny-a-liners and similarly underpaid.<sup>240</sup>

Morning and evening dailies that hung on had few readers and advertisers. Agents neither of party like the French nor of proprietors and editors like the British, the dailies supposedly lacked a soul and lived on borrowed feuilletons and native but raw humor.<sup>241</sup> The ubiquitous journalist Kirwan disdained the lot.

A newspaper in Spain is too often the speculation of a handful of needy and unprincipled individuals to promote their own political and personal views, in which speculation they embark equally without money or without character.<sup>242</sup>

The weekly *Pensamiento de la Nacion* under the direction of Jaime Balmez was an exception, sixteen pages of news, politics and literature penned moderately and elegantly.<sup>243</sup> He earlier started the “interesting” magazine, *Sociedad*, and later the daily *Conciliador* as a vehicle for novices.<sup>244</sup>

From the 1850s paragraphs on Spain alternated remonstrations against content and controls of content. As the number of newspapers actually rose and the “license” of journalism hypothetically expanded, some investigators were uneasy about harsh punishments for journalists.<sup>245</sup> This wing pictured the truthful publication as a “muffled

desperado” next to mendacious but affluent official ones.<sup>246</sup> To other pundits, the bulk of Spain’s newspapers were worthless. Editors of “intelligence and ability,” such as Emilio Castelar of *Democracia* and Juan Mañé y Flaquer of the “old-established” *Diario de Barcelona*, were unusual.<sup>247</sup> Madrid’s halfpennies dispensed a feeble partisan editorial, the requisite feuilleton and trivia.<sup>248</sup> No wonder to visitor John Scoffern, country audiences got their news in barber shops and other information in magazines.<sup>249</sup>

After overlooking Spain for thirty years, the British in the 1890s reiterated their abhorrence of royal rigidity that begat illegal newspapers replete with polemic swallowed by “passionate” readers in the streets.<sup>250</sup> Things appeared more tranquil in the Balearics, which had a Saturday organ, and in Portugal.<sup>251</sup>

Commentators tied Portuguese journalism to British as they had Belgian journalism to French. During the Peninsula War, Lisbon bureaucrats allegedly modeled the *Investigador Português* on the British *Gazette* published by generals but open to all locals and to their criticism of their London allies.<sup>252</sup> Things went downhill thereafter, the British theorized, because they could locate “no literary journals” in the 1820s, the government’s *Lisbon Gazette* was “a half-sheet of blotting paper” in the 1840s, and “flimsy, trivial,” urban bulletins catered to the mob in the 1890s.<sup>253</sup> Between these summary dismissals, the first editor of the *New Quarterly Magazine* in the 1870s enlightened that the Portuguese had a meager press because rustics, as in Spain, passed news orally.<sup>254</sup> Papers in pompous language that printed foreign abstracts and emotional stories but not much on law, society, science, religion and literature were unappealing.<sup>255</sup> Even townspeople deserted this tripe for British and French periodicals.<sup>256</sup>

### *Italy and Its Neighbors: San Marino and Switzerland*

Across the Tyrrhenian Sea, Italian journalism at first captivated the British more for its past than its present. Articles on the history of the British press rooted it in the Roman *acta diurna* or the Venetian *notizie scritte*.<sup>257</sup> Otherwise, peninsula journalism went unnoticed but for a random word on seventeenth-century reviews until opening shots on nineteenth-century Habsburg and papal censorship that discouraged or suffocated recent attempts, such as Florence’s *Antologia*.<sup>258</sup> The fine editing of this purported hybrid of the *Edinburgh Review* and Joseph Mazzini’s *Apostolato Popolare* supported its reputation until its liberalism irked the powerful.<sup>259</sup> The British recalled that Mazzini, a scribe for English magazines in the 1830s and 1840s, suffered before, when Piedmont stifled the Genoese *Indicatore* for which he wrote.<sup>260</sup>

By the 1830s Mazzini himself proclaimed that there were no important newspapers because the Italian states, notwithstanding their patchwork of governance, superintended the press.<sup>261</sup> Italians could issue non-political weeklies, such as Turin’s *Letture Popolari*, a penny instructor for the poor, but significant Italian serials came from outside, *Giovine Italia* from Marseilles and the *Italiano* from Paris.<sup>262</sup> Carlo Pepoli, the Italian expatriate professor living in London, opined that the *Italiano*, the voice of Young Italy in Paris, was beautifully written and ideologically original, unlike the Austrian-sponsored gazette in Venetia.<sup>263</sup>

Entries of the 1840s were more nuanced. Antonio Gallenga, an editorialist for *The Times*, commended the freer discussion in Naples’ *Progresso* and Milan’s *Rivista Europea*, the prosperous in the south and the north, and the translations of the *Penny Magazine* in Piedmont and Lombardy.<sup>264</sup> Others carped that widely disseminated literary criticism was substandard, except in

the “higher periodicals” in the Austrian territories, and scores of penny magazines were inane or immoral except for the *Guida dell’Educatore*.<sup>265</sup>

Gallenga especially detested Austrian and papal restrictions.<sup>266</sup> When the Habsburgs and the papacy briefly relaxed them in the revolutionary years, 1848-49, the Italians aped the French. Evaluating the free press, the British faulted Italian journalists, as they had French, for sowing linguistic seeds of “exaggeration and vehemence” that yielded “extreme democracy.”<sup>267</sup> Penmen divided, however, about whether the “fresh boldness” of the *Alba* in Florence motivated copycats, such as the *Indipendenza* in Milan and *Contemporaneo* in Rome.<sup>268</sup> Worse to the jittery had been the return home of journalist – and republican – Mazzini.<sup>269</sup>

The British slighted another Italian journalist-politician, Camillo Benso di Cavour, until his death in 1861, the same year as Italy’s unification. Then eulogies of modern Italy’s father delved into his press career, notably at the *Risorgimento*.<sup>270</sup> As its “chief writer and responsible editor,” Cavour comprehended that the press was the “mistress of intelligence and intelligence...of the world.”<sup>271</sup> Apologists downplayed his obvious limitation of liberty in 1850s Piedmont, when he was premier, by arguing that his rules were less severe than papal overreaction to 1848.<sup>272</sup> Intriguing to the British was another papal weapon, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the brainchild of the Jesuits born in Naples but ensconced in Rome.<sup>273</sup> The *North British* branded it the preeminent papal production even though its editors were a “clique of old ladies.”<sup>274</sup>

Attention to Cavour catalyzed British pieces on journalism in the young kingdom. Authors were relieved that laws were not strict although they could interrupt news distribution.<sup>275</sup> Nonetheless, as in the United States, a mania for news spurred the launch of many locals.<sup>276</sup> The British categorized early efforts as bad. Italian heralds, unlike British,

had weak editorials, insufficient news and letters, excessive bias and insults and, unlike French, no polish.<sup>277</sup> Neophytes and hacks would dominate until journalism was a “profession,” a notion the British were advancing about their own press.<sup>278</sup>

Grades for papers went from high to low. Florence’s *Nazione* was exemplary, with ample telegraphic and regional news, a feuilleton and local advertising.<sup>279</sup> By 1863 this “country town” had eleven other dailies ranging in price and politics and three illustrated humor magazines.<sup>280</sup> In proportion to population, Milan’s dailies were similar in number and in sales to London’s.<sup>281</sup> The “influential and moderate” *Perseveranza* could “rank in the first class of Continental journals.”<sup>282</sup> The British blasted or slighted the press in other cities. Turin had a surfeit of publications but one morning daily and that edited by a Jew.<sup>283</sup> Rome’s press lied.<sup>284</sup> The *Giornali di Roma* was unrefined, the *Osservatore Romano* was overly protective of the papal court, and the knowledgeable *Civiltà Cattolica* was too strong.<sup>285</sup> The *Nazionale* in Naples got a mere mention.<sup>286</sup>

Besides newspapers, the British detected Italians reading a profusion of “literary and scientific” as well as religious captions.<sup>287</sup> Journalist Frances Power Cobbe profiled the Protestant, such as the inexpensive but “moral and literary” inexpensive *Letture di Famiglia*, an Italian version of *Leisure Hour*, and the estimable if polemical *Eco della Verità*.<sup>288</sup>

The journalism of the 1870s and 1880s generally did not engross observers. They did register that magazines, some of “high literary merit,” were booming and that Sunday newspaper supplements contained some matter of quality.<sup>289</sup> Talk of imprisoned editors and suppressed newspapers subsided after the capital shifted in 1870.<sup>290</sup> Rome’s journalism was suddenly front-and-center. *Leisure Hour* surveyed the “grave *Opinione*,” the “racy *Fanfulla*” and the “ranting *Capitale*.”<sup>291</sup> If editor Carlo M. Curci once guarded the stature



of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, now Florence's *Rassegna Settimanale* had more prestige because of its dispassion about politics and society.<sup>292</sup> But there was no Italian equivalent of the French *Figaro* and *Gaulois*, which Italians skimmed in cafés.<sup>293</sup>

Columnists in the 1890s silhouetted a constrained and corrupt press. Owners paid fines, and editors and reporters went to jail.<sup>294</sup> Rome impounded foreign journals that questioned its policies.<sup>295</sup> Newspapers that government did not manipulate were in the hands of patrons.<sup>296</sup> Their funding was indispensable, economist Antonio De Viti de Marco swore, since politically uneducated Italians were not buyers.<sup>297</sup> There were exceptions: the *Moniteur de Rome* was “very respectable,” and the *Secolo* (Milan) was “a courageous and well-written daily” but soon closed.<sup>298</sup> Among periodicals, the *Sole*, “an agricultural and commercial journal,” was the “widest-read specialist paper,” and the *Revista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali* was a title of “vigour and competence.”<sup>299</sup> But, according to oracles, arbitrary enforcement of outdated laws would push a venal press to sedition.<sup>300</sup>

Italy's nearest neighbor, San Marino, perhaps overwhelmed by the controversy surrounding Italian journalism, published only the *Philatelist* to advertise its stamps.<sup>301</sup> Another neighbor, Switzerland, had more organs but almost as little British scrutiny except when a foreigner temporarily brought a journal there.<sup>302</sup> The British did salute the *Swiss Messenger* on its fortieth anniversary (1844) and did laugh at the matrimonial advertising in Thun's younger *Intelligenzblatt*.<sup>303</sup> In the 1870s, when sentences on the country peaked, Matthew Arnold lauded the “seriously conducted and trustworthy” *Revue Suisse*.<sup>304</sup> The *Fortnightly Review* finished the ruminations on Switzerland by sighing that its newspapers needed more telegrams and foreign correspondence, i.e., needed to be British in format.<sup>305</sup>

### **The German States and Germany**

Germany, like Italy, united in the nineteenth century, but the British treated their journalism differently. The British did not venerate the Germans for the part they played in press history, possibly because princely interference by the eighteenth century was habitual. Prussia's Frederick II eased penalties to make newspapers “interesting,” but his reviews were already bright because, polymath J.S Blackie related, Berlin was in the forefront of Continental literary criticism.<sup>306</sup> Royal subscribers in the German states, as well as in Sweden, Poland and Russia, also had the services of Melchior Grimm, a special correspondent of sorts with his manuscript *Correspondance Litteraire*.<sup>307</sup>

Habsburg privileging in 1814, and the republican papers that followed, evaporated in 1819, the same year the French and British were reinforcing their handle on journalism.<sup>308</sup> In the interlude liberty was not a priority of German princes, so the press was “pitiful” but for Louis Börne's *Wage* and its confreres.<sup>309</sup> The British suspected that the chilling effect of the Carlsbad Decrees accounted for the emphasis on science and foreign rather than domestic news in Augsburg's *Allgemeine Zeitung* but not for the absence of a newspaper in Dresden, a “respectable capital” where citizens without “political appetite” opted for French and English magazines and reviews.<sup>310</sup>

Outsiders identified two German reactions to the July Revolution in France. Based on the activities of Thiers and his friends, German journalists founded the short-lived Society for the Promotion of a Free Press.<sup>311</sup> The Diet of the German Confederation, though certain that “an unbridled press” accelerated political opposition and moral decay, was painfully aware of French events so loosened the reins.<sup>312</sup> The British, not startled when the Diet retightened them in the 1840s, balanced German journalistic excesses in the interim against the greater good of liberty that tempered the police and opened the courts.<sup>313</sup>

Bystanders in the 1830s and 1840s applauded most German periodicals. Those with “profound and instructive criticism” were impartial if not always candid because of signature.<sup>314</sup> The *Historisch-Politische Blätter* drew the educated until the Bavarians prosecuted its staff, and the German edition of the *Penny Magazine*, printed in Paris with English stereotypes, attracted the middling classes.<sup>315</sup> Annuals, whether gracefully or incoherently penned, had engravings that were below British standards.<sup>316</sup>

In the wake of the 1848 revolutions, when Karl Marx epitomized journalist as socialist, people exulted that freedom again existed momentarily, proved by Berliners reading voraciously in “confectioners’ shops” that stocked sixty to seventy newspapers and serials.<sup>317</sup> The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, now seen as one of the most prominent in Europe because of its news depth, separation of fact and rumor, and solid writing by a well-compensated staff, was the choice of diplomats and cultivated readers.<sup>318</sup>

When the Germans in the 1850s revived restraints, the British reckoned that many people turned to almanacs. Scribes avouched that in some areas they had as much clout as London dailies.<sup>319</sup> Yet, as *Bentley’s Miscellany* bemoaned in its annual appraisal of German almanacs, editors were oblivious to their potential.

When we remember the enormous influence the German almanacks could legitimately exert over millions of peasants, whose staple literature they form in conjunction with the Bible, we are amazed to find how slightly the editors begin to comprehend their illustrious mission.<sup>320</sup>

Conversely, even if a cluster was as urbane as anything French, “amusing” or “instructive,” “remote districts” received the mediocre.<sup>321</sup> Still, frequent free lancer Jane Sinnett preached, almanacs and new magazines were ethically healthier for the

masses than the fare of Britain and France.<sup>322</sup>

Censorship persisted as a motif in the 1860s when articles specified its implementation.<sup>323</sup> The “degrading regulations” forced newspapers to print material that “demoralized” rather than taught readers, the imagined aim of British tribunes.<sup>324</sup> Orders that editors sign columns, diffusion of money and talent as journalists migrated from state to state, and governments “terrified” by the audacity of foreign correspondents or bound to ideology likewise inhibited the growth of potent heralds.<sup>325</sup> To survive, Bavarian publications eschewed politics while Cologne’s *Zeitung* and the ever-present *Allgemeine Zeitung*, with the biggest audience, treaded water.<sup>326</sup>

Survival was problematic for another reason. Except for matrimonial listings, as in Berlin’s *Intelligenz-blatt*, most Germans did not recognize the value of advertising.<sup>327</sup> As *Temple Bar* warranted, personal inserts in Munich’s *Neueste Nachrichten* made the daily far more popular than its scissored news because classifieds were analogous to letters in British newspapers.<sup>328</sup>

Since newspapers were chancy, the best men went to serials, chiefly “more national” almanacs, such as *Kladderadatsch*, the Prussian *Punch*, whose large subscriptions bankrolled high salaries.<sup>329</sup> Regional almanacs had old news and irrelevant jokes from London’s *Punch*, but even fresher ones, the British confessed, were never as droll as the French.<sup>330</sup>

On the edge of the German press, the British memorialized Jewish journals, such as *Hameliz* and *Hausfreund*. Although *Hausfreund* was supposedly the first literary magazine “in Judeo-German,” Jewish housewives were said to prefer *Kladderadatsch*.<sup>331</sup>

Despite this uneven past, German journalism from 1815 to 1866, was, according to politician Ludwig Bamberger, better than its successors.

In the quiet times between the wars of

the first Empire and the year 1866 (the short episode of 1848 excepted), a certain kind of learned journalism was a much more satisfying career than it is at present, because a widely extended and superior class of readers was then as much attracted by learning in the columns of the daily papers as by politics, perhaps even more so... The tumult of party politics has drowned all this, and forced all literary work of a higher kind into the net of Regionalism. It is no longer permitted to journalists to satisfy either their literary ambition or their desire for a widely extended sphere of influence.<sup>332</sup>

What explains this shift? Unification and universal manhood suffrage are two answers. But there is another. For the last thirty years of the century, the dominant figure in German journalism was not a journalist. Otto von Bismarck, Prussian and then German chancellor, was the bugbear of the British because of his interventions in the press. The *Westminster* impugned him for penning letters and columns covertly, subsidizing adherents, and prosecuting adversaries.<sup>333</sup> The *Edinburgh* chastised him for providing news and editorials to provincial as well as foreign papers.<sup>334</sup> Stuffed with these communications, the locals lacked taste, form and even common sense, but, the *Fortnightly* guessed, they suited a “hum-drum” middle class.<sup>335</sup>

Regardless of Bismarck’s maneuvers during his tenure in the Second Reich, the “unimpeachably respectable” *Allgemeine Zeitung* endured, the younger *Gartenlaube* was a paradigm for family magazines, and the *Tagblatt* was an archetype for all-advertising papers.<sup>336</sup> Cologne’s *Zeitung* was “an authoritative journal” that had a fine staff and special wires, and Frankfurt’s *Zeitung* was famous for its interviews.<sup>337</sup> Berlin had a “legion” of newspapers and magazines, but, some lamented, Bismarck secretly floated Berlin’s *Janus* while its police shut the *Deutsche Rundschau*, a “leading literary

review.”<sup>338</sup>

Bismarck’s departure in the 1890s did not slow intrusion. Narrators cited legislation on „subversion” and artful press releases for the “mendacity” in the papers.<sup>339</sup> Savants muttered that statutes gave ministers latitude to muzzle personnel, and custom enabled them to benefit allies, dispersing money and secrets to papers without access to the wires of the quasi-official Wolff agency.<sup>340</sup> As journalist-author Charles Lowe synopsisized:

patronage... assumes the shape of special information... revelations, denials, rectifications, feelers, „booms,” and the like. [P]rivileges include the right of priority in despatch and receipt of his [Wolff’s] telegrams, an immense advantage over his newspaper rivals. In return for these valuable prerogatives, the „Wolff” News Company binds itself to circulate nothing to the detriment of government or its repute, to submit questionable matter to the Foreign Office before disseminating it at home or dispatching it abroad, and generally to couch the language of its telegrams in accordance with the principles of „cooking” as understood and practised in the Imperial *cuisine*.<sup>341</sup>

The unblessed without telegraphy clipped filler and rejected whisperings to stay clear of the police.<sup>342</sup>

Assayers generalized that the manacled German newspaper was biased about domestic politics and selective about foreign news.<sup>343</sup> Iterations about particular prints were more diverse. For example, Cologne’s *Zeitung* was either a “high-class” well-written or an “irresponsible daily.”<sup>344</sup> Berlin’s papers were petty, driving many to Vienna’s *Neue Freie Presse*, or were vigorous, if less so than London dailies.<sup>345</sup>

Spectators were more positive about niche organs, from the domestic *Hausfrauen-Zeitung* to the worldly *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, directed by Arnold Juge, emblematic of “young Hegelianism in a democratic sense.”<sup>346</sup>

The reference to Juge was singular because the British rarely dedicated space to individuals. For instance, even Heinrich Heine's journalism was often an aside.<sup>347</sup> But in Germany as elsewhere, the Jews were subjects. People denied that they commanded the press or affirmed that they subsidized a host of journals and painted Jews as outstanding writers or unscrupulous reporters.<sup>348</sup>

### *Austria and Its Empire*

The British, from the 1830s, complemented their discussion of Vienna's impact on German and Italian journalism with items on the press of Austria and other Habsburg territories. Abraham Hayward, a lawyer and reviewer distressed that domestic news hinged on imperial dispatches, welcomed Vienna's excellent neutral review, the *Jahrbücher*.<sup>349</sup> The city had six papers by the 1840s, but editors there and everywhere excerpted the *Amsblatt* on German affairs.<sup>350</sup> Austrians got their foreign news from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.<sup>351</sup> If the capital reduced surveillance, the *British and Foreign* counseled, a freer press would be a venue for citizens to air grievances and would validate the sway of journalism.<sup>352</sup> Instead, in reaction to the 1848 revolutions challenging their dominion, the Habsburgs strangled liberty as the French would soon do.<sup>353</sup> Newspapers thereafter were grim, relieved only by "ridiculous" personal advertisements.<sup>354</sup>

For thirty years grumbling went on about everything, from the Official Press Bureau to supervision of telegraphy, from suppression of International Working Men's Association papers and "independent news" to bullying domestic critics and foreign reporters.<sup>355</sup> British army officer Robert R. Noel was succinct.

As regards liberty of the press, that important element of progress and corollary of popular legislative institutions, Austria is now in a miserable plight. Although newspaper editors have been relieved of the

editorship, prosecutions for articles unfavourable to Government are the order of the day.<sup>356</sup>

The British thus rejoiced when Vienna's heralds waxed intellectually, the *Presse* allegedly on a par with *The Times*, and financially, thanks to Jewish publishers.<sup>357</sup> Although Noel scolded Jewish editors for printing "claptrap" to foment discontent, *Blackwood's* extolled the talented and honorable men at the leading dailies.<sup>358</sup>

A pivotal territory within the Habsburg realm was Hungary, whose press the British dated from Matthias Ráth in 1781.<sup>359</sup> Initially they explored periodicals, the *Foreign Quarterly* averring in the 1820s that Magyar reviews of 200-800 subscribers had no worthwhile criticism because reviewers were unwilling to offend or dispirit novelists.<sup>360</sup> A decade after, one tourist discovered Pest magnates reading British, French and German reviews as well as magazines and newspapers.<sup>361</sup> The local press, such as the daily *Pesti Napolo* and the "ladies" *Hölgy Futár*, tried to counter prejudice and prize law but was hamstrung by Vienna's policies on censorship and signature, policies that pushed editors to subterfuge or subservience.<sup>362</sup> However, as the Habsburgs increasingly needed Magyar money and troops, barriers dropped.<sup>363</sup> Hence, Louis Kossuth's *Pesti Hirlap* articulated his liberal ideals.<sup>364</sup> Whether journalists could hold this course did not concern the British, who sidestepped the Magyars after mid-century.

Concurrent with this disinterest was a sudden interest in Czech journalism. After an 1848 nationalist upheaval in Prague, Vienna prohibited political papers. Those edgy about seditious Pan-Slavic sheets held editors to strict ordinances, with fines and prison terms for violations.<sup>365</sup> Still, Czech serials multiplied so that by 1869 there were two or three dailies and three illustrated weeklies in Prague, four provincial papers and a plethora of publications on topics from education to

“pomology.”<sup>366</sup> Scribes singled out in the 1860s the popular *Národní Listy* and *Pozor*, whose editors were tried for criticizing Austria, and in the 1880s the “literary” *Lumir* and the quarterly *Casopis*, “a thesaurus for the Slavonic student.”<sup>367</sup>

Croatia and Serbia garnered even fewer paragraphs. The British in the 1840s reported the birth of the *Serbian Messenger* – but in Pest – and toasted Croatian journalists for their “dignity” and “self-control” in the face of Magyar “arrows.”<sup>368</sup> In the 1870s a lone commentator denounced the incarceration of *Zastava*’s proprietor for disparaging functionaries, which stimulated the move of *Zatocnik* to the frontier.<sup>369</sup>

### ***Russia and Its Satellites***

British penmen ignored Russian journalism until the 1830s except for a notice of women’s work in periodicals.<sup>370</sup> Retrospectives did catalog the early ones, such as Nicholas Karasin’s comprehensive *European Messenger*; the “perfectly harmless” *Child of the Land*, “a small sheet with a large circulation,” and the venal *Russian Bee*.<sup>371</sup> Contemporaries in the 1830s graded publishers and editors of Russian art journals superior to their British counterparts and Russian annuals, whose numbers were about the same as at home, better literature.<sup>372</sup> At the moment and after, the British realized that censorship intensified under Nicolas I.<sup>373</sup>

In the 1840s Christian Johnstone, editor of *Tait’s*, stressed the stringency of rules decreed by a tsar who read France’s *Débats* but banned most European papers.<sup>374</sup> Others noted that, apart from the *Imperial Gazette* and monthly ministerial bulletins, only *Viedomoski*, the “celebrated newspaper of Moscow,” seemed to thrive – with 12,000 subscribers in 1842 against 2,000 in 1812.<sup>375</sup>

To elude the policing, the anti-Romanov Alexander Herzen launched *Kolokol* in 1850s London. Britons limned him as capable and clever, an icon of free political journalism.<sup>376</sup>

*Kolokol*, first in manuscript, was the trailblazer for a secret press that haunted Russian rulers.<sup>377</sup> *Macmillan’s Magazine* delineated how it aggravated others.

This terrible journal is the dread of all the Russian functionaries. It is more feared by the ministers and courtiers at the present day than was ever the formidable „dubina’ (cudgel) of Peter the Great... Freed from the operation of the censorship, it exposes all official shortcomings, corruption, and tyranny with remorseless vigour; and it is well know that many a contemplated act of wickedness has been abandoned, through fear of the immortal infamy certain to be conferred in its pages.<sup>378</sup>

The British crowed that, though forbidden, the “audacious radical” tribune had a huge Russian audience, including the tsar, with intellectuals and enemies of serfdom in the forefront.<sup>379</sup> Its sponsors, journalist Sutherland Edwards intimated, were tsarists visiting England who were pro-reform or anti-their bosses.<sup>380</sup> After Michael Bakunin injected the “democratic” *Kolokol* with his “lust for destruction,” it concentrated on “broadcasting revolution” from its new Geneva base in the company of other rebel papers.<sup>381</sup>

Magazines bloomed from the 1840s, but many of the 300 hatched by the uninformed purportedly died immediately.<sup>382</sup> The best accrued standing by commissioning renowned authors.<sup>383</sup> Michael Katkoff successfully copied this practice when he edited the *Russian Messenger* in the 1850s.<sup>384</sup> Although his British compatriots and their descendants lionized Katkoff, they knew he was no saint. In the 1850s he was jealous of the popular *Kolokol* and in the 1860s pushed bureaucrats to kill the daily *Golos* and the monthly *Memoirs of the Fatherland*, and to cut a wide berth for his *Moscow Gazette*.<sup>385</sup>

Estimates of Katkoff’s editing of the *Gazette* were mixed. The *North British* opined that its “intellectual supremacy” was irreproachable.<sup>386</sup> Detractors, led by the

peripatetic foreign correspondent E.J. Dillon, deplored Katkoff's neglect of facts and fairness.<sup>387</sup> The *Gazette's* monopoly on political news, shared by the official *St. Petersburg Gazette*, hardly squared with independence.<sup>388</sup> Nevertheless, everyone acknowledged that Katkoff was the most acclaimed journalist in Russia, more imposing than any journalist in any free country.<sup>389</sup> The *Fortnightly* eulogized him thusly:

Mr. Katkoff will in any case be remembered as a powerful and independent journalist who, living and working in Russia, attained such a position of influence as would be impossible in any country possessing a parliament and independent politicians. It was thought until Mt. Katkoff's time that the profession of journalism was one that could not be conveniently exercised within the Russian dominions: the newspaper writer having to choose between abject servility on the one hand and Siberia or successful flight on the other.<sup>390</sup>

With the accession of Alexander II in 1855, censors who alerted editors about acceptable stories replaced rigid gatekeepers. Russians could find personalities in the *Invalide* and crime in the *Police News*.<sup>391</sup> Foreigners could scan the *Journal of St. Petersburg* and provincials, the *Odessa Messenger*.<sup>392</sup> The once-dominant *Kolokol* remained in vogue, but the radical *Northern Bee* and the nascent secret revolutionary press were competitors.<sup>393</sup> Without newsboys, all Russian newspapers relied on subscriptions, already the mainstay of old and new serials.<sup>394</sup> But, the British groaned, in a country of limited literacy, the modest subscription lists of the *Russian Messenger*, the *Contemporary* and their brothers were greater than those of most newspapers.<sup>395</sup>

After a short interlude of latitude, stringency again impacted Russian and foreign journalism in the 1870s and 1880s.<sup>396</sup> Russians and Britons alike reasoned that the tsars

worried more about journalists' liberty than anarchists' dynamite, unfortunate because restraints harvested a conspiracy press ingested by a public starved for a public forum.<sup>397</sup> The Nihilist *Will of the People* and the rest of its "clandestine" tribe were much more dangerous, onlookers alerted, though they conceded that *Zemlia i Volia* was stylish and newsy.<sup>398</sup>

Judges were of two minds about journalists. On the one hand, Major-General Frederick Chenevix Trench saluted them.

Within a very recent period – that is... 1860-80 – the Russian journalistic press was conducted by an able band of editors, who, more or less regardless of the consequences, made it their business to denounce abuses, to attack Ministers, and to expose the corruption in all the departments of the State. In spite of the censorship and all its machinery... the newspaper press in Russia during the period just mentioned exercised a very great influence.<sup>399</sup>

Other people, though exponents of freedom for Russian journalists, were not blind to their colleagues' expressions of anti-Semitism.<sup>400</sup> One contributor, for example, charged "Jewish correspondents of foreign journals" with misrepresenting the motherland.<sup>401</sup>

Another problem for emancipists was that, even though restricted, magazines and newspapers reflecting Russian life persisted.<sup>402</sup> Moreover, if price and illiteracy abetted censorship to contain mass access to the press, political prisoners could subscribe to newspapers and occasionally to domestic magazines.<sup>403</sup>

Late-century papers headed by *Golos* and *Novoe Vremia* gained ground, *Macmillan's* enlightened, by stealing the audiences of thoughtful periodicals.<sup>404</sup> *Blackwood's* considered *Golos* the "most influential and best conducted paper ever published in Russia."<sup>405</sup> Others added that the semi-official *Novoe Vremia* and the recent *Novosti* had

editorials as incisive as British but fewer telegrams.<sup>406</sup> Both papers were “authorized” to cover the Dreyfus case, but the *St. Petersburg Gazette* ordinarily had more foreign news because of its profusion of correspondents.<sup>407</sup> Illustrated weeklies were adequate but not cheap, whereas *Sviet* was “beneath contempt” because it and its confederates were casual about truth.<sup>408</sup>

No surprise to the British that the autocratic Alexander III, who perused the *Moscow Gazette* daily but deemed the press a “pernicious force,” leashed it.<sup>409</sup> In his reign, foreign journals, composed by those who appeared to race through the country and then prescribe solutions to its big problems in small paragraphs, had to register before importation; and censors snipped crucial pages or ordered costly reprints of Russian papers.<sup>410</sup>

Ethnic minorities, as the British elucidated, were also victims of press rules. One case was the Armenians during the 1890s. Russian scissors ravaged their two dailies and three monthlies, and émigrés in London could manage one “little newspaper,” the *Anglo-Armenian Gazette*.<sup>411</sup>

In Poland, partly a Russian enclave, writer-soldier André Vieusseux recollected a brief spell of journalistic liberty, 1815-1819, that coincided with similar intervals in France and the German states.<sup>412</sup> *Saint Pauls* unearthed two monthlies and a quarterly from the 1830s but did not assess them.<sup>413</sup> In the 1860s Foreign Officer Adam Gielgud glanced at anti-Prussian journalists, mainly in Galicia, who wanted to substitute Russian, not Polish, for German in the press.<sup>414</sup>

The British had more sympathy for their brethren in Wallachia and Moldavia. The regions, though part of the Ottoman Empire, were often under the Russian thumb. In 1839 political economist Thomas C. Banfield grieved that pressmen who breached censorship suffered torture.<sup>415</sup> After the Russian occupation in 1848, when the authorities confined newspapers to

disseminating Russian extracts, the *London Quarterly Review* disclosed that merchants funded a press in exile in Paris and Brussels.<sup>416</sup> Notwithstanding harassment, by the 1880s Bucharest boasted twelve Sunday offerings, seven in Romanian, two in French, and one each in German, Hebrew and Greek.<sup>417</sup>

Another Russian satellite, Finland did not materialize in entries until the 1880s. Peter Kropotkin narrated that the Romanovs closed the local press in the eighteenth century, but softening of proscriptions in 1863 spawned a low-priced, widely-circulating horde.<sup>418</sup> Newspapers were free as long as they not did criticize government, a situation fine with Finnish journalists said to fear Swedish competition more than Russian regulation.<sup>419</sup> In 1900 the *National Review* conjectured that Russian “preventive censorship” would eventually destroy Finland’s press, constituting in 1899 some 227 captions with many peasant readers.<sup>420</sup>

### *The Nordic and Baltic States*

A significant cohort of journalists in Finland was Swedish, but the British devoted as few pages to journalism in Sweden as in Finland. Scribes noticed a “war of periodical writers” about 1800 and a policy of royal intervention in the 1830s, ridiculing censors who halted the first twenty-four attempts to publish the *Aftonblad*.<sup>421</sup> In a brief intermission of liberty in 1839, over eighty, mostly apolitical newspapers with local advertising and entertaining tales surfaced.<sup>422</sup> By the 1840s curbs on newspapers seemed stronger than ever.<sup>423</sup> The upshot was that in rural locales the pulpit was far more effective for advertising goods.<sup>424</sup> In 1871 *Fraser’s* hailed the restoration of freedom generally and the *Handels Tidningen* specifically because its owner/editor, S.A. Hedlund, understood his job.<sup>425</sup> As the Religious Tract Society’s *Leisure Hour* attested:

Mr. Hedlund, as proprietor and chief editor of the Gothenburg journal of commerce, *Handels Tidning* [sic],

recognizes his responsibility as an influential leader of public opinion. In this important work...the journal has attained a foreign as well as a Swedish reputation for the varied excellence of its articles and communications. It is not only a first-class commercial newspaper, but is also distinguished by its high literary and aesthetic standard, and by its comprehensive attention to cosmopolitan as well as Scandinavian objects of interest.<sup>426</sup>

The proximity of Norway and Denmark to Sweden did not cause the British to connect journalistic endeavors or to assign much space to Norwegians and Danes. A commemorative in 1874 tagged Norway's *Morgenbladet* the first major newspaper. Begun in 1819, it dwelled on the arts and gossip until 1831, when its editor and his stable of good, young wordsmiths transformed it into a political player.<sup>427</sup> In the 1830s no taxes accounted for the sprouting of about twenty newspapers, from official to advertising tribunes.<sup>428</sup> The *Skilling Magazin*, another clone of the *Penny Magazine*, was reputedly as utilitarian and unoriginal as its British progenitor.<sup>429</sup>

After some thirty years, when the *Folktidende* had a sizable circulation, the examination of the Norwegian press resumed.<sup>430</sup> In 1874 novelist and free lancer Edmund Gosse counted seventy-two newspapers, twelve in Oslo and three north of the Arctic Circle, and reprimanded editors for abbreviating their columns and subeditors for mishandling literary criticism.<sup>431</sup> Thereafter, journalist William Archer blared that Norway had no outstanding political editorialist, merely impotent and virulent editors.<sup>432</sup>

Denmark was a sidebar from the 1830s when the *Dublin Review* declared that the country had 180 newspapers but few matched Copenhagen's "merit."<sup>433</sup> The *Westminster* praised the largest, the *Morgenblatt*, for its sound editorials, domestic and foreign news and advertisements on paper and in type better

than those of France and the German states.<sup>434</sup> The *New Monthly* starred the *Corsair*, "a clever weekly between *Punch* and the *Athenaeum*," that featured literary, art and theatre reviews, humor and humdrum illustrations.<sup>435</sup> Because Copenhagen's monthly *North and South* was the sole literary magazine, Danes supplemented it with British and French reviews.<sup>436</sup> At mid-century *Tait's* documented that Denmark had 70-100 costly newspapers. Copenhagen's ten dailies and four weeklies set news, political columns and feuilletons in big type.<sup>437</sup>

Across the Gulf of Finland, the Baltic states rated even fewer sentences than the Scandinavians. Only one entry, in the 1840s, catalogued the area press: six newspapers, sixty-seven light literary journals and one scientific periodical.<sup>438</sup>

### *The Ottoman Empire in Europe*

Probes of the journalism of the Ottoman Empire in Europe varied in length, with the Greeks getting more attention than the Porte itself and with Bulgaria in the margins. In 1876 *Fraser's* unveiled fourteen Bulgarian newspapers, four from Constantinople.<sup>439</sup> Except for this allusion and an 1891 assertion that *Periodichesko* was the "leading Bulgarian Review," the British forgot Bulgaria's press before and after its independence.<sup>440</sup>

Greek journalism grabbed more headlines, no doubt because of British fascination with Classical Greece. Eyewitnesses were proud that their Committee for Greek Independence sent presses and type to hasten the success of newspapers, hopefully to tutor and unite the populace.<sup>441</sup> Pieces underscored that independence introduced momentary autonomy, soon narrowed by the new king's Bavarian team who superseded the Ottomans.<sup>442</sup> The *Ionian Anthology*, intended for scholarly inquiry, seemed immune, but the *Foreign Quarterly* advised it to reprint essays from quality British and French reviews rather than ancient Greek or recent light literature, at



least until civil society matured.<sup>443</sup>

Because the British acquired dominion over the Ionian Islands in 1815, they monitored the independent Greek press. George Finlay, the Victorian classicist, cheered the 1838 return to liberty in principle but not the throng of anti-government papers in Athens that followed.<sup>444</sup> Proponents of constraint were furious, but their opposites speculated that good pay would smother sedition faster than circumscription.<sup>445</sup>

After mid-century, narrators were calmer. They skimmed *Elipsis*, “the “court newspaper,” in the 1860s, and the Sunday organs of Patras in the 1870s, halting briefly to commend most of the country’s 129 newspapers and magazines for avoiding scurrility and for schooling opinion of an increasingly literate population.<sup>446</sup> By the 1890s chroniclers were again hostile. They decried newspaper “diatribes” and caricature of political rivals because this material misled readers who interpreted antagonism between individuals as a sign of official ineptitude, and they denounced telegraphic tampering that bordered on fraud.<sup>447</sup> Coverage of Greek journalism, born in optimism, was deeply pessimistic by 1900.

### ***Conclusion***

The doubts about journalism spread beyond the Peloponnesus at precisely the moment when the mass market press was hitting its stride in Europe. Tempering the enthusiasm about the spread of cheap newspapers was the fear that they would reduce journalism’s stature. No one knew if rampant capitalism would cost the press its mythic high ground.

Irrespective of journalism’s future, the British survey of its past revealed some commonalities, themes that articles had unwittingly stressed over ten decades. The overarching though not always overt motif was the purpose of the press. Concern about whether it was primarily for public service or

for private enterprise catalyzed scrutiny of audience, which in turn catalyzed discussion of content and style and who controlled them. By 1900 it was clear that censorship was waning across the Continent. This trend did not mean that journalism was free because pressure to sell and pressure to propagandize could be as intrusive. The British might ponder why others failed to appreciate advertising revenue, but they were certain that the growth of nationalism eroded editorial liberty. Informal coercion looked deadlier than formal at the end of the nineteenth century.

A second thread writers emphasized about European journalism was that elegant writing continued in reviews, but newspapers prevailed among buyers. As endnote titles confirm, both treatises on the press and other stories talked about this circumstance and its nexus to the presence or absence of technology and education.

A third British subject was the emergence of journalists, an emergence that occurred in two ways. One was centering instead of sidelining their work in their lives; another was crossing borders long before the foreign correspondent formally existed. In this latter incarnation, they linked journalism at the personal level as restrictions linked it at the governmental level.

Highlighting this cross-fertilization might be the best example of the ultimate benefit of the British overview. The historian may ruminate about whether France’s journalistic model would have triumphed over others but for the interruptions of revolutions, how Germany’s would have differed without Bismarck, how Italy’s would have fared with Cavour at the helm, or how Russia’s would have evolved without the tsars. But the historian cannot say with any certitude more than the record permits. Here, one conclusion is obvious from the abundance of evidence. By aligning developments across the Continent, the sources show congruity that no study of a single society can capture and prove that

journalism history belongs in both intellectual and public history.

**APPENDIX: Abbreviations and Descriptions of Sources Cited**

- AM* *Ainsworth's Magazine*, 1842-1854 (3)\*: upper middle/middle classes – light reading
- AYR* *All the Year Round*, 1859-1895 (2): middle/lower middle classes – light/serious reading
- BM* *Bentley's Miscellany*, 1837-1868 (26): upper middle/middle classes – light/serious reading
- BR* *Bentley's Quarterly Review*, 1859-1860 (1): educated – serious essays
- BEM* *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 1824-1900 (35): Tory upper/upper middle classes – essays
- BFR* *British and Foreign Review*, 1835-1844 (10): educated – essays with international outlook
- BQR* *British Quarterly Review*, 1845-1886 (20): Nonconformist upper middle/middle classes – serious essays
- CJ* *Chambers's Journal*, 1832-1900 (9): lower middle/working classes – miscellany
- CR* *Contemporary Review*, 1866-1900 (28): educated – serious essays
- CM* *Cornhill Magazine*, 1860-1900 (10): upper middle/middle classes – light/serious reading
- DB* *Dark Blue*, 1871-1873 (1): Oxonian upper/upper middle classes - essays
- DR* *Dublin Review*, 1836-1900 (18): Catholic upper middle/middle classes – essays
- DUM* *Dublin University Magazine*, 1833-1880 (16): Anglo-Irish upper middle/middle classes – essays
- ER* *Edinburgh Review*, 1802-1900 (20): Whig upper/upper middle classes – serious essays
- FQR* *Foreign Quarterly Review*, 1827-1846 (33): educated – essays with international outlook
- FR* *Fortnightly Review*, 1865-1900 (42): educated – serious essays
- FM* *Fraser's Magazine*, 1830-1882 (40): upper middle/middle classes – essays
- GW* *Good Words*, 1860-1900 (8): middle/lower middle classes – essays with religious outlook
- HI* *Hogg's Instructor*, 1845-1856 (4): lower middle/working classes – miscellany
- HW* *Household Words*, 1850-1859 (8): forerunner of *AYR*
- HJ* *Howitt's Journal*, 1847-1848 (1): lower middle/working classes – essays
- LH* *Leisure Hour*, 1852-1900 (9): Religious Tract Society middle/lower middle classes – essays
- LQR* *London Quarterly Review*, 1853-1900 (16): Methodist upper middle/middle classes – serious essays
- LM* *Longman's Magazine*, 1882-1900 (2): middle/lower middle classes – light/serious reading
- MM* *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1859-1900 (14): upper middle/middle classes – essays
- MR* *Modern Review*, 1880-1884 (1): Unitarian upper/upper middle classes – serious essays
- MC* *Monthly Chronicle*, 1838-1841 (5): middle class - essays
- NA* *National Review*, 1855-1864 (5): Unitarian upper/upper middle classes – serious essays
- NR* *National Review*, 1883-1900 (24): Tory upper middle/middle class – serious essays
- NMM* *New Monthly Magazine*, 1821-1854 (38): upper/upper middle classes – light/serious reading
- NQM* *New Quarterly Magazine*, 1873-1880 (5): upper middle/middle classes – essays
- NE* *New Review*, 1889-1897 (5): upper middle/middle classes – essays
- NC* *Nineteenth Century*, 1877-1900 (22): educated – serious essays

- NBR* *North British Review*, 1844-1871 (15): Scottish Free Church upper middle/middle classes – serious essays
- PR* *Prospective Review*, 1845-1855 (1): forerunner of the *National Review* (*NA*)
- QR* *Quarterly Review*, 1824-1900 (27): Tory upper/upper middle classes – serious essays
- RA* *The Rambler*, 1848-1862 (10): Catholic upper/upper middle classes – serious essays
- SP* *Saint Pauls*, 1867-1874 (4): upper middle/middle classes – light/serious reading
- SR* *Scottish Review*, 1882-1900 (2): upper middle/middle classes – essays
- TEM* *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, 1832-1855 (16): middle/lower middle classes – essays
- TB* *Temple Bar*, 1860-1900 (15): upper middle/middle classes – light/serious reading
- TR* *Theological Review*, 1864-1879 (7): forerunner of the *Modern Review*
- TI* *Titan*, 1856-1859 (1): successor of *Hogg's Instructor*
- WR* *Westminster Review*, 1824-1900 (52): Benthamite upper/upper middle classes – serious essays

\* Number of articles

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The only books in English to parallel developments in several countries are *The Rise of Western Journalism, 1815-1914: Essays on the Press in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States* eds. Ross F. Collins and E.M. Palmegiano (Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland, 2007) and Jane Chapman, *Comparative Media History: An Introduction, 1789 to the Present* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005),

<sup>2</sup> One exception is Lenore O'Boyle, "The Image of the Journalist in France, Germany, and England, 1815-1848," *Studies in Society and History* 10 (1968): 290-317, but its focus is narrow and its timeframe is short.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix for a profile of the serials cited and the number of articles each published.

<sup>4</sup> See "Introduction" in *Rise of Western Journalism*, 3-9, for a fuller discussion of these themes.

<sup>5</sup> [E.C. Grenville-Murray], "The French Press," *CM* 27 (1873): 703, 715; "The French Press," *AYR* 19 (1867-68): 127.

<sup>6</sup> Edith Sellers, "Théophraste Renaudot: A Seventeenth Century Social Reformer," *TB* 101 (1894): 221; Grenville-Murray, 715.

<sup>7</sup> "The French Press," *WR* 74 (1860): 198, 209; [W.B. Jerrold], "The Father of the French Press," *TB* 1 (1860-61): 39.

<sup>8</sup> K[eningale and] M[abel] C[ook], "Journalism and Poetry of Mortimer Collins," *DUM* 90 (1897): 565; Jerrold, 39.

<sup>9</sup> "French Press," *WR*, 211.

<sup>10</sup> [W.]B. J[errold], "Madame Doublet's News-Saloon," *TB* 1 (1860-61): 473.

<sup>11</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], "History of French Journals and Biography of French Journalists," *FM* 43 (1851): 350.

<sup>12</sup> "French Press," *WR*, 219; C.J. Wallis, "French Political Journalism," *DUM* 89 (1877): 290; Rev. William Burnett, M.A., "The Early Days of French Newspapers," *GW* 33 (1892): 268.

<sup>13</sup> "French Press," *AYR*, 130-31; Grenville-Murray, 29 (1874): 164, 552.

<sup>14</sup> "The Political Press in France," *BFR* 4 (1837): 411.

- <sup>15</sup> “The Newspaper Press: The French Journals,” *HI* 3 (1846): 412; [J.W. Croker], “The Guillotine,” *QR* 73 (1843-44): 236; Wallis, 292.
- <sup>16</sup> [?E.E. Crowe], “The Press of the Revolution,” *MC* 3 (1839): 279; [Robert Southey], “French Revolution – *Conspiration de Babeuf*,” *QR* 45 (1831): 181.
- <sup>17</sup> “Chateaubriand,” *NMM* 83 (1848): 465; Jerrold, “Doublet,” 482.
- <sup>18</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “Journalism in France,” *BQR* 3 (1846): 474; H.G. Keene, “The Age of Reason: Some Literary Aspects of the French Revolution of 1789,” *NR* 14 (1889-90): 118.
- <sup>19</sup> [Archibald Alison], “On the Late French Revolution,” *BEM* 29 (1831): 40; The Author of “Robespierre” [H.B. Baker], “Marat: The Delirium of Revolution,” *TB* 32 (1871): 359; Francis Bowen-Graves, “Marat,” *FR* n.s., 15 (1874): 49.
- <sup>20</sup> “Inedited Facts Respecting the French Revolution of 1789,” *MC* 7 (1841): 108-09.
- <sup>21</sup> Wallis, 295.
- <sup>22</sup> “The Newspaper in France,” *BM* 40 (1856): 462; [J.W. Croker], “Correspondence of the Committee of Public Safety,” *QR* 67 (1840-41): 482; Croker, “Guillotine,” 235.
- <sup>23</sup> “*The Memoirs of Mallet du Pan*,” *BM* 31 (1852): 553-57; [Herman Merivale], “Mallet du Pan,” *ER* 95 (1852): 481-517; [R.C.E. Abbot, 3<sup>d</sup> Baron] Colchester, “Mallet du Pan,” *NR* 7 (1886): 668-77.
- <sup>24</sup> [James Macintosh], “France,” *ER* 24 (1814-15): 534; [Abraham Hayward], “Lanfrey’s *Napoleon*,” *QR* 128 (1870): 381; “Thibaudeau’s *Memoirs of Napoleon*,” *FQR* 17 (1836): 337.
- <sup>25</sup> “Reminiscences of Paris,” *NMM* 98 (1853): 309-10; [Archibald Alison], “*Memoirs of the Duchess of Abrantes*,” *BEM* 32 (1832): 54.
- <sup>26</sup> “Reminiscences,” *NMM*, 311; Kirwan, “History,” 352-53.
- <sup>27</sup> “Present State of France,” *WR* 17 (1832): 216; “Lamartine’s *History of the Revolution*,” *NMM* 93 (1851): 52.
- <sup>28</sup> “French Law of Libel,” *ER* 32 (1819): 207; “Political Press,” *BFR*, 414.
- <sup>29</sup> [Theodore Child], “The French Newspaper Press,” *CM* n.s., 1 (1883): 214.
- <sup>30</sup> Stendhal, “Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, and Literature,” *NMM* 16 (1826): 510-11.
- <sup>31</sup> Stendhal, 17 (1826): 199.
- <sup>32</sup> Stendhal, 17 (1826): 287.
- <sup>33</sup> J.D. A[cton], “The Abbé de Lamennais,” *RA* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 1 (1859): 71.
- <sup>34</sup> Stendhal, 16 (1826): 98; [J.W. Croker], “Thiers’ *Histories*,” *QR* 76 (1845): 528.
- <sup>35</sup> Stendhal, 19 (1827): 375; 16 (1826): 99.
- <sup>36</sup> [W.R. Greg], “The Prospects of France and the Dangers of England,” *NBR* 18 (1852-53): 329.
- <sup>37</sup> [William Maginn], “French Literature of the Day,” *BEM* 18 (1825): 717.
- <sup>38</sup> James Ward, “The Career of M. Guizot,” *BM* 23 (1848): 440.
- <sup>39</sup> Emily J. Crawford, “M. Thiers: A Sketch from Life,” *MM* 37 (1877-78): 14; “M. Thiers,” *LH* 19 (1870): 503; Croker, “Thiers,” 528.
- <sup>40</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “Public Men in France,” *BQR* 7 (1848): 127.
- <sup>41</sup> [?A.V. Kirwan], “The Revolution in France,” *NMM* 29 (1830): 284-93; [Edouard Colmache], “The Late Prince Tallyrand,” *NMM* 70 (1844): 185-86; “Narratives of the Late French Revolution,” *FM* 2(1830-31): 674; S., “A Sketch of Thiers,” *FM* n.s., 7 (1873): 96; [Abraham Hayward], “Journalism in France,” *QR* 65 (1839-40): 428; [William Barry], “Lamennais,” *QR* 185 (1897): 467.

- <sup>42</sup> Gertrude Layard, “Armand Carrel,” *LM* 5 (1884-85): 48-53; A. [J.S. Mill], “Armand Carrel,” *WR* 6/28 (1837-38): 66-111; Hayward, “Journalism,” 432; “Newspaper Press,” *HI*, 412; “Biographical Sketches,” *CJ* 9 (1840-41): 292.
- <sup>43</sup> [Abraham Hayward], “M. Thiers: His Life and Character,” *QR* 146 (1878): 452; Layard, 51.
- <sup>44</sup> Kirwan, “History,” 461; [?Louis P.E.A. Sedillot], “Events of the Three Days in Paris,” *WR* 13 (1830): 478-80; Crawford, 20; “French Presidents,” *LH* 48 (1898-99): 398.
- <sup>45</sup> [E.G. Bulwer-Lytton], “The Reign of Terror: Its Causes and Results,” *FQR* 29 (1842): 307.
- <sup>46</sup> [E.R. Bulwer Lytton], “The French Constitutional Monarchy of 1830: An Enquiry into the Causes of Its Failure,” *CR* 24 (1874): 867-68; Burnett, 268.
- <sup>47</sup> “Present State of France,” *WR* 17 (1832): 239; [Jane Sinnett], “*Literary Statistics for Fifteen Years*,” *BM* 23 (1848):458.
- <sup>48</sup> [John Ward], “Present State of the Netherlands,” *FQR* 5 (1829-30): 396.
- <sup>49</sup> “School for Journalists,” *FQR* 25 (1840): 115-16; Percy B. St. John, “General View of the Revolutions in Europe,” *TEM* n.s., 15 (1848): 466.
- <sup>50</sup> [Archibald Alison], “France in 1833,” *BEM* 34 (1833): 654-55.
- <sup>51</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “France – The Press, Literature, and Society,” *BQR* 38 (1863): 128; “Paris in 1846,” *DUM* 28 (1846): 184.
- <sup>52</sup> “Paris,” *DUM*, 183-84; “The French Press,” *NMM* 61 (1841): 372; “Newspapers in France,” *CJ* n.s., 8 (1847): 367; Sinnett, 458; Ward, 435-36.
- <sup>53</sup> [Basil Hall], “Political Conditions and Prospects of France,” *QR* 43 (1830):203; Kirwan, “Journalism,” 523.
- <sup>54</sup> [Miles T. Stapleton], “Montémont’s *London*,” *DR* 3 (1837): 126.
- <sup>55</sup> [John Wilkes], “Thiers,” *BEM* 43 (1838): 316; [George Moir], “Present State and Prospects of French Literature,” *FQR* 11 (1833): 198.
- <sup>56</sup> Benjamin Blunt [A.V. Kirwan], “A Letter to Oliver Yorke on French Newspapers and Newspaper; Writers, Farceurs and Feuilletonists, French Duellists, French Actresses, Etc.,” *FM* 33 (1846): 674; [J.F. Corkran], “The Newspaper Press in France,” *FQR* 30 (1842-43): 476; [Archibald Alison], “The French Revolution of 1830,” *BEM* 32 (1830): 940-41.
- <sup>57</sup> [Robert Southey], “Prince Polignac – Revolutionary of Three Days,” *QR* 48 (1832): 256-57, 270.
- <sup>58</sup> [Henry Southern], “The Revolution of 1830: Government of Louis Philip,” *FQR* 10 (1832): 525.
- <sup>59</sup> Alison, “France in 1833,” 647.
- <sup>60</sup> Hayward, “Journalism,” 430-31; [A.V. Kirwan], “Recent French Memoirs,” *FM* 57 (1858): 679; Henry Pelham [E.G. Bulwer-Lytton], “Letter from Paris,” *NMM* 35 (1832): 298.
- <sup>61</sup> [John Bowring], “French and English Authorship,” *TEM* 3 (1833): 727.
- <sup>62</sup> [G.H. Lewes], “The Condition of Authors in England, Germany, and France,” *FM* 35 (1847): 288; Wilkes, 317; “The Newspaper Press of Paris,” *FM* 17 (1838): 223.
- <sup>63</sup> [W.M. Thackeray], “The Last Fifteen Years of the Bourbons,” *FQR* 29 (1842): 420.
- <sup>64</sup> [H. Longueville Jones], “France,” *BEM* 48 (1840): 524.
- <sup>65</sup> [Henry Brougham], “French Parties and Politics,” *ER* 61 (1835): 219-20; “France,” *BFR* 1 (1835): 512; Southern, 539.
- <sup>66</sup> [John Bowring], “Louis Philippe of France,” *TEM* 1 (1832): 612; [John Wilks], “Letters from O.P.Q.,” *TEM* n.s., 1 (1834): 452-53; [A.V. Kirwan], “Chronique de Paris; or, the Restoration

and Revolution Compared,” *FM* 35 (1847): 419; “A Soirée at Monsieur Guizot’s,” *NMM* 60 (1840): 447.

<sup>67</sup> “Political Press,” *BFR*, 438-39.

<sup>68</sup> “Newspaper Press,” *FM* 52, 55.

<sup>69</sup> Sedillot, 480; “The American Envoy and the King of France,” *FQR* 29 (1842): 486; Wallis, 296.

<sup>70</sup> Kirwan, “Letter,” 675; Corkran, 471; [G.H. Lewes], “Eugene Sue: *Les Mystères de Paris*,” *BFR* 18 (1845): 226.

<sup>71</sup> “An Hour or Two with Berryer,” *NMM* 62 (1841): 236; Albert [D.] Vandam, “The King of Journalists,” *FR* n.s., 62 (1897): 266.

<sup>72</sup> Layard, 53; Greg, 330; Hayward, “Journalism,” 442; Kirwan, “Journalism,” 507.

<sup>73</sup> Greg, 330.

<sup>74</sup> Wallis, 297-98; [W.H. Ainsworth], “Alexandre Dumas and His Romances,” *AM* 11 (1847): 241.

<sup>75</sup> Kirwan, “Letter,” 681; “Engraving,” *NBR* 6 (1846-47): 168.

<sup>76</sup> “An Hour,” *NMM*, 236; “Newspaper Press,” *HI*, 413; St. John, 465.

<sup>77</sup> Kirwan, “History,” 359; “Paris Journals and Journalists,” *TI* 2 (1857): 4.

<sup>78</sup> “Paris Journals,” *TI*, 11; Kirwan, “Letter,” 677; Child, 127.

<sup>79</sup> Evelyn Jerrold, “Léon Gozlan,” *TB* 79 (1887): 436.

<sup>80</sup> [Christian Johnstone], “Bulwer’s Work on France,” *TEM* n.s., 3 (1836): 221; [H.B. Baker], “How Jules Janin Became a Journalist,” *TB* 45 (1875): 74; [Frederick Hardman], “Letters and Impressions from Paris,” *BEM* 60 (1846): 423.

<sup>81</sup> [W.M. Thackeray], “Dickens in France,” *FM* 25 (1842): 349; [Charles Hervey], “Some Reminiscences of Literary Paris,” *TB* 68 (1883): 432; [G.H. Lewes], “State of Criticism in France,” *BFR* 16 (1844): 328; Hardman, 420.

<sup>82</sup> Kirwan, “Chronique,” 426; A Travelling Satellite of Queen Victoria, “Glimpses of Germany with a Glance at France,” *AM* 8 (1845): 318.

<sup>83</sup> Charles Hervey, “The Drama in Paris,” *NMM* 81 (1847): 486.

<sup>84</sup> “*La Revue Comique*,” *WR* 51 (1849): 524; M[orris] B[arnett], “Passages in the Lives of Celebrated Statesmen of Europe. No. IV: Metternich,” *NMM* 74 (1845): 4; “Gossip on Parisian Authors,” *NMM* 81 (1847): 330.

<sup>85</sup> [Abraham Hayward], “Charles, Comte de Montalembert,” *QR* 134 (1873): 432; [C.W. Russell], “Montalembert’s *Monks of the West*,” *NBR* n.s., 9 (1868): 168; “Lacordaire,” *HI* n.s., 5 (1850): 306-07; “Félicité de Lamennais,” *HJ* 2 (1847): 20; “*The Abbé de Lamennais*,” *LH* 48 (1898-99): 704; [C. Prentice], “DeLamennais: His Life and Writings,” *WR* 71 (1859): 523-24.

<sup>86</sup> Charles Beard, “A Group of French Friends,” *TR* 10 (1873): 358-63; Russell, 169.

<sup>87</sup> [Charles de Coux], “Saint-Simonism,” *DR* 4 (1838): 158-61; Kirwan, “History,” 354; Edward S. House, “Saint-Simon and Enfantin,” *TR* 9 (1872): 53-56; “Ste. Beuve,” *WR* 95 (1871): 442; “Recent French Social Philosophy – Organization of Labour,” *NBR* 9 (1848): 228-29; Arthur J. Booth, “Fourier,” *FR* n.s., 12 (1872): 679-88.

<sup>88</sup> “Political Press,” *BFR*, 426-28; “Newspaper Press,” *FM*, 54; “French Press,” *NMM*, 376.

<sup>89</sup> Corkran, 479; [G.H. Lewes], “French Literary Journals,” *FQR* 36 (1845-46): 70.

<sup>90</sup> Lewes, “French Literary,” 72; “Periodical Literature of France: *Review of the Two Worlds*,” *CJ* 11 (1842-43): 383-84.

- <sup>91</sup> “*An Englishman in Paris*,” *LQR* n.s., 19 (1892-93): 84; [A.V. Kirwan], “De Véron’s *Memoirs*,” *FM* 49 (1854): 23; Hayward, “Journalism,” 447, 450.
- <sup>92</sup> “Gossip,” *NMM*, 331.
- <sup>93</sup> “French Almanacs,” *NMM* 81 (1847): 458; “French Almanacks,” *AM* 14 (1848): 461.
- <sup>94</sup> Lewes, “Condition,” 286, 288.
- <sup>95</sup> See, for example, Percy B. St. John, “France – The Revolution of June and July,” *TEM* n.s., 15 (1848): 536; [G.S. Venables], “Revolutionary Revolutions,” *TEM* n.s., 17 (1850): 416-17; [Archibald Alison], “Lamartine’s *Revolution of 1848*,” *BEM* 66 (1849): 219-34.
- <sup>96</sup> “Lamartine’s *History of the Revolution of 1848*,” *NMM* 86 (1849): 484-99; [James B. Robertson], “France since the Revolution of February,” *DR* 27 (1849): 102; [William Paul], “The French Revolution of 1848,” *NBR* 9 (1848): 1-42; [J.W. Croker], “Political Prospects of France and England,” *QR* 83 (1848): 251.
- <sup>97</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “Lord Normanby and *A Year of Revolution*,” *FM* 56 (1857): 734; [W.E. Hickson], “The French Revolution of February, 1848,” *WR* 49 (1848): 170; Venables, 417; Kappa [A.V. Kirwan], “France: A Retrospect of the Year 1848,” *DUM* 33 (1849): 136-37.
- <sup>98</sup> An American Lady [Elizabeth Wormeley], “The Eventful Days of February 1848 in Paris,” *BM* 23 (1848): 415; “The French Moral Republic,” *NMM* 82 (1848): 510; “The Downfall of the Republic,” *NMM* 85 (1849): 122-23.
- <sup>99</sup> [J.P. Simpson], “Republican Paris: March, April 1848,” *BEM* 63 (1848): 578.
- <sup>100</sup> The Flâneur of Paris [J.P. Simpson], “The Republican Newspapers of Paris,” *BM* 24 (1848): 147; Mrs. Percy [Jane] Sinnett, “Gossip from Paris,” *BM* 23 (1848): 637; [James Lorimer], “The Socialist Party in France,” *NBR* 10 (1848-49): 281; [W.E. Hickson], “Louis Napoleon: The French Elections,” *WR* 51 (1849): 467; [J.B. O’Meagher], “A Few Words about France,” *BEM* 73 (1853): 721.
- <sup>101</sup> St. John, “General View,” 465.
- <sup>102</sup> St. John, “General View,” 467; Hickson, “Louis Napoleon,” 466-67.
- <sup>103</sup> Simpson, “Republican Newspapers,” 149.
- <sup>104</sup> Kirwan, “France,” 129; St. John, “General View,” 467; O’Meagher, 721.
- <sup>105</sup> Kirwan, “France,” 129.
- <sup>106</sup> “Lamartine and the Provisional Government,” *NMM* 87 (1849): 74; Sinnett, “Gossip,” 637; Evelyn Jerrold, “On George Sand,” *TB* 75 (1885): 196.
- <sup>107</sup> Kappa [A.V. Kirwan], “The Inauguration of 1849,” *DUM* 33 (1849): 270; [W.E. Hickson], “The French Republic,” *WR* 50 (1848-49): 233, 235.
- <sup>108</sup> [James B. Robertson], “Political State of Germany,” *DR* 26 (1849): 516; Greg, “Prospects,” 330; “*An Englishman in Paris*,” *LQR* n.s., 19 (1892-93): 86; “Europe in 1848,” *BQR* 8 (1848): 537; “The French Revolution of 1848,” *DUM* 31 (1848): 531; [J.F. Corkran], “Lamartine, *Homme de Lettres*,” *DUM* 48 (1856): 414.
- <sup>109</sup> [T.W. Allies], “The Catholic University,” *DR* 31 (1851): 556; [A.V. Kirwan], “Chronique de Paris,” *FM* 43 (1851): 684.
- <sup>110</sup> Hickson, “Louis Napoleon,” 466-67; [Joseph Archer Cowe], “A Paris Newspaper,” *HW* 1 (1850): 164-65; [George Dodd and Henry Morley], “Accommodation for Quidnuncs,” *HW* 8 (1853-54): 90.
- <sup>111</sup> C.A. B[risted], “The Political Press of America,” *FM* 52 (1855): 678; [J.F. Corkran], “*A Year of Revolution*,” *DUM* 51 (1858): 50.



- <sup>112</sup> “Crime and Criminal Law in France,” *LQR* 8 (1857): 92; “The Age of Veneer,” *FM* 44 (1851): 333; [William Moy Thomas], “Sentimental Journalism,” *HW* 4 (1851-52): 551; “The French Press,” *CJ* n.s., 16 (1851): 169.
- <sup>113</sup> “French Press,” *WR*, 224; “A Parisian Newspaper Office,” *LH* 8 (1859): 784.
- <sup>114</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “Guizot’s *Memoirs*,” *BQR* 28 (1858): 156; [A.V. Kirwan], “Paris Gossip,” *FM* 49 (1854): 197.
- <sup>115</sup> [W.R. Greg], “France in January 1852,” *NBR* 16 (1851-52): 597; Kirwan, “France,” 134.
- <sup>116</sup> Kirwan, “History,” 366; Cowe, 165.
- <sup>117</sup> Cowe, 166; [Edmund Saul Dixon], “French Provincial News,” *HW* 5 (1852): 441-43; [Sidney L. Blanchard], “Dining with the Million,” *HW* 5 (1852): 489.
- <sup>118</sup> [W.R. Greg], “Louis Napoleon at Home and Abroad,” *NA* 6 (1858): 486; “France under Louis Napoleon,” *WR* 70 (1858): 311.
- <sup>119</sup> “France under Louis Napoleon,” *WR*, 312; [Matilda Betham-Edwards], “A Recent History of the Second Empire,” *TB* 63 (1881): 74-75; [A.V. Kirwan], “State and Prospects of France and the Continent of Europe,” *FM* 45 (1852): 357; [A.V. Kirwan], “Portraits of French Celebrities,” *BQR* 20 (1854): 221.
- <sup>120</sup> “Paris in June,” *NMM* 89 (1850): 330; “French War Pamphlets,” *BM* 37 (1855): 452.
- <sup>121</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “Napoleonism – Its Present and Its Prospects,” *BQR* 15 (1852): 558.
- <sup>122</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “France and England,” *BQR* 29 (1859): 225; [J.W. Croker], “The French Autocrat,” *QR* 90 (1851-52): 280; [A.V. Kirwan], “A Few Words about France and French Affairs,” *FM* 56 (1857): 161; [Sarah Austin], “France,” *BR* 1 (1859): 520; Kirwan, “State,” 354.
- <sup>123</sup> “War Pamphlets,” *BM*, 451; O’Meagher, 720; Greg, “Prospects,” 331.
- <sup>124</sup> [E.E. Crowe], “Paris in 1852,” *BM* 31 (1852): 694; Greg, “Prospects,” 328.
- <sup>125</sup> Kirwan, “France,” 168; “Between London and Paris,” *CJ* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 17 (1862): 177; [Rev.] Archer Guerne, “France as It Is,” *FR* 1 (1865): 723; Karl Blind, “The Condition of France,” *FR* n.s., 6 (1869): 662; [J.F. Corkran], “On Advances Towards Liberty for France,” *DUM* 55 (1860): 138; “The French Almanacks for 1865,” *BM* 56 (1864): 585; “The French Almanacks for 1867,” *BM* 60 (1866): 612.
- <sup>126</sup> Atom [H.W. Jerningham], “Paris Gossip,” *TB* 25 (1868-69): 140; One Who Knew It Well [J.M. Ludlow], “Paris Revisited,” *MM* 5 (1861-62): 68.
- <sup>127</sup> [J.H. Hippisley], “The Realities of Paris,” *WR* 73 (1860): 56; [Abraham Hayward], “New Paris,” *QR* 123 (1867): 26.
- <sup>128</sup> “French Press,” *AYR*, 131-32; “New Paris,” *LQR* 29 (1867-68): 351.
- <sup>129</sup> [Francis R. Conder], “Secret Papers of the Second Empire,” *ER* 161 (1885): 261-62.
- <sup>130</sup> Crowe, “Paris,” 695.
- <sup>131</sup> [W.R. Greg], “The Present State of France,” *NA* 2 (1856): 147-48; “Paris Journals,” *TI*, 4.
- <sup>132</sup> “Paris Journals,” *TI*, 12; “New Paris,” *LQR*, 351.
- <sup>133</sup> “Paris Journals,” *TI*, 10, 12.
- <sup>134</sup> Kirwan, “History,” 361, 366; Greg, “Present State,” 148; [Marie Blaze de Bury], “The Political Press – French, British, German,” *NBR* 34 (1861): 191; John Wilson, “M. Guizot’s *Own Time*,” *FR* n.s., 2 (1867): 268.
- <sup>135</sup> Ludlow, 68; “New Paris,” *LQR*, 352; Jerningham, 140.
- <sup>136</sup> Rev. Archer Guerne, “Reminiscences of Vienna,” *MM* 14 (1866): 417; Burnett, 268.
- <sup>137</sup> “New Paris,” *LQR*, 350; Blaze de Bury, 184; “French Press,” *WR*, 224.

- <sup>138</sup> “A French Newspaper Office,” *LH* 12 (1863): 677.
- <sup>139</sup> “Father,” *TB*, 38; Author of *John Halifax, Gentleman* [Dinah M. Mulock], “A City at Play,” *MM* 18 (1868): 43; [Charles Lever], “Cornelius O’Dowd,” *BEM* 100 (1866): 383; “*The Foul Smells of Paris*,” *FM* 75 (1867): 372.
- <sup>140</sup> Greg, “Present State,” 142, 144; [W.R. Greg], “French Judgments of England: Montalembert and Rémusat,” *ER* 103 (1856): 560.
- <sup>141</sup> Matthew Arnold, “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time,” *NA* 19 (1864): 244.
- <sup>142</sup> [G.A. Simcox], “French Criticism – M. Renan,” *NBR* n.s., 9 (1868): 64; “French Press,” *WR*, 224; Blaze de Bury, 190.
- <sup>143</sup> [J.S. Mill], “Centralisation,” *ER* 115 (1862): 326; [Margaret Oliphant], “French Periodical Literature,” *BEM* 98 (1865): 605.
- <sup>144</sup> Kirwan, “France and England,” 221; [J.M. Capes], “The French Emperor,” *RA* 2<sup>d</sup> ser., 8 (1857): 91.
- <sup>145</sup> “French Protestantism,” *BQR* 36 (1862): 364; [Edmond de Pressensé], “The Ecclesiastical Crisis in the Reformed Church of France,” *BQR* 43 (1866): 495-523; Un Pasteur de l’Eglise Réformée de Paris [Athanasie Coquerel], “Protestantism in France, 1789-1864,” *TR* 1 (1864): 369, 377; “Protestantism in France,” *GW* 1 (1860): 42.
- <sup>146</sup> [Edmund Saul Dixon], “Literary Small Change,” *HW* 18 (1858): 405-08.
- <sup>147</sup> Oliphant, 621; “French Almanacks for 1853, and Parisian Literary and Political Chit-Chat,” *NMM* 96 (1852): 328.
- <sup>148</sup> Dixon, “Literary,” 408.
- <sup>149</sup> “French Almanacks,” *NMM* 90 (1850): 298; “French Almanacks for 1852,” *NMM* 93 (1851): 330; “The French Almanacks for 1854,” *NMM* 99 (1853): 312; “The French Almanacks for 1860,” *BM* 46 (1859): 460-69; “The French Almanacks for 1862,” *BM* 50 (1861): 480-90; “The French Almanacks for 1864,” *BM* 54 (1863): 577-92.
- <sup>150</sup> [W.B. Jerrold], “Broken Language,” *HW* 9 (1854): 332.
- <sup>151</sup> [W.R. Greg], “Modern French Literature,” *ER* 101 (1855): 107; Cowe, 165.
- <sup>152</sup> “French Newspaper,” *LH*, 676; [Frederick Hallard], “M. Prévost-Paradol,” *NBR* n.s., 7 (1867): 497; Dixon, “French Provincial,” 442.
- <sup>153</sup> [Coke Richardson], “The Sharpshooters of the Press in England, France, and Germany,” *CM* 7 (1863): 238-39.
- <sup>154</sup> “Letters from Paris. No. 4,” *HI* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 4 (1855): 40; Crowe, “Paris,” 695; “Parisian Newspaper,” *LH*, 784; [Horatio Mansfield], “A Little ‘Difficulty’ in French Literature,” *TEM* n.s., 18 (1851): 152.
- <sup>155</sup> “*Histoire Morale des Femmes*,” *WR* 53 (1850): 521-22; Cowe, 165.
- <sup>156</sup> Hallard, 490-91; [John Wilson], “Prévost-Paradol and Napoleon III,” *QR* 129 (1870): 372, 375.
- <sup>157</sup> “French Almanacks, 1853,” *NMM*, 323.
- <sup>158</sup> “Paris Journals,” *TI*, 10.
- <sup>159</sup> Walter Herries Pollock, “Théophile Gautier,” *LM* 16 (1890): 396.
- <sup>160</sup> [Cecilia Meetkerke], “Théophile Gautier,” *TB* 99 (1893): 544.
- <sup>161</sup> [J.B. Paton], “Sainte-Beuve and Renan,” *LQR* 33 (1869-70): 458; “Ste. Beuve,” *WR* 95 (1871): 442, 448.
- <sup>162</sup> “Henri Rochefort’s *Adventures*,” *LQR* n.s., 28 (1897): 72-75.

- <sup>163</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], “A Fortnight in Paris in the May of 1863,” *FM* 67 (1863): 818; William Gilbert, “The Jews in Paris,” *GW* 8 (1867): 460.
- <sup>164</sup> [Edward Spender], “Fall of the Second Empire,” *LQR* 35 (1870-71): 24; “The Balloon and Pigeon Posts,” *CJ* 4<sup>th</sup> ser., 8 (1871): 131, 154-55; [Andrew Wynter], “Applications of Photography,” *ER* 133 (1871): 352.
- <sup>165</sup> Editor [John Morley], “France and Germany,” *FR* n.s., 8 (1870): 374; [William Stigand], “The Commune of Paris,” *ER* 134 (1871): 547; H.S. F[agan], A Vicar of the Church of England, “At Paris, Just Before the End,” *FM* n.s., 4 (1871): 244.
- <sup>166</sup> W.R. G[reg], “The Cost of a Napoleon,” *FM* n.s., 1 (1870): 483; “The American Republic – Its Strengths and Weaknesses,” *WR* 95 (1871): 331; [Otto Corvin-Wiersbitski], “Aspects of Paris after the War,” *TB* 32 (1871): 104.
- <sup>167</sup> Frederic Harrison, “The Republic and the Marshall,” *FR* n.s., 22 (1877): 760; [Frances Hoey], “Paris,” *DR* n.s., 26 (1876): 62.
- <sup>168</sup> [E.C. Grenville-Murray], “Jacques Girard’s Newspaper; or, the Trials of a French Journalist,” *CM* 32 (1875): 700; Frederic Harrison, “First Impressions of the Republic,” *FR* n.s., 25 (1869): 369.
- <sup>169</sup> Wallis, 300.
- <sup>170</sup> Grenville-Murray, “French Press,” 28 (1873): 412.
- <sup>171</sup> [James Scott Henderson], “France: Her Position and Prospects,” *WR* 98 (1872): 424; “Parisiana,” *FM* n.s., 5 (1872): 480.
- <sup>172</sup> Edward Dicey, “Paris after Peace,” *FR* n.s., 9 (1871): 493; Karl Hillebrand, “The Prospects of Liberalism in Germany,” *FR* n.s., 10 (1871): 410; [John Wilson], “The Third French Republic and the Second German Empire,” *QR* 130 (1871): 357.
- <sup>173</sup> Frederic Harrison, “The Fall of the Commune,” *FR* n.s., 10 (1871): 132.
- <sup>174</sup> Grenville-Murray, “French Press,” 28 (1873): 412; Gabriel Monod, “Contemporary Life and Thought in France,” *CR* 31 (1877-78): 195.
- <sup>175</sup> Monod, 399.
- <sup>176</sup> Monod, 399; 35 (1879): 349.
- <sup>177</sup> Albert Reveille, “The Religious Situation in France Subsequent to the War of 1870-71,” *TR* 10 (1873): 116.
- <sup>178</sup> “Jovial Journalism,” *AYR* n.s., 3 (1869-70): 514-16.
- <sup>179</sup> [Henry Curwen], “Henry Murger, the Bohemian,” *WR* 99 (1873): 435; Frederic Harrison, “The Revolution of the Commune,” *FR* n.s., 9 (1871): 559.
- <sup>180</sup> Joseph Reinach, “Parisian Newspapers,” *NC* 12 (1882): 347.
- <sup>181</sup> Theodore Child, “The Paris Newspaper Press,” *FR* n.s., 38 (1885): 153.
- <sup>182</sup> [W.C. Miller], “Some Mistranslations,” *CM* n.s., 10 (1888): 416; Child, “Paris Newspaper,” 149.
- <sup>183</sup> Reinach, 349; R[ichard] Heath, “Two Years in Paris,” *GW* 26 (1885): 735.
- <sup>184</sup> Child, “Paris Newspaper,” 150.
- <sup>185</sup> Child, “Paris Newspaper,” 151; Monod, 54 (1888): 898.
- <sup>186</sup> Arthur Otway, “Fallacies of the French Press,” *NC* 21 (1887): 725; Joseph Reinach, “The True Position of French Politics,” *NC* 21 (1887): 341.
- <sup>187</sup> [Laurence Oliphant], “The Unloaded Revolver – The Diplomacy of Fanaticism,” *BEM* 128 (1880): 652; “India and Our Colonial Empire,” *WR* 113 (1880): 527.

- <sup>188</sup> Otway, 721; Monod, 46 (1884): 134; Child, "Paris Newspaper," 157.
- <sup>189</sup> Child, "Paris Newspaper," 159.
- <sup>190</sup> Reinach, "True Position," 341; Monod, 48 (1885): 895.
- <sup>191</sup> Child, "Paris Newspaper," 158; Monod, 53 (1888): 908.
- <sup>192</sup> M[oritz] Kaufmann, "French Socialism," *NR* 10 (1887-88): 373.
- <sup>193</sup> C.B. Roylance-Kent, "The Literature of Anarchism," *NE* 17 (1897): 285-86.
- <sup>194</sup> Edmund Gosse, "The French Society of Authors," *NC* 22 (1887): 848.
- <sup>195</sup> L[ouis] E[ngel], "Meyerbeer," *TB* 66 (1882): 67; Hervey, "Reminiscences," 435.
- <sup>196</sup> Ferdinand Rothschild, "Century for Century," *NC* 23 (1888): 589; Frank T. Marzials, "M. Zola as a Critic," *CR* 51 (1887): 68.
- <sup>197</sup> Hervey, "Reminiscences," 434; "The Paris Clique," *AYR* n.s., 36 (1885): 444.
- <sup>198</sup> Theodore Child, "Society in Paris," *FR* n.s., 39 (1886): 496; Robert Louis Stevenson, "The Morality of the Profession of Letters," *FR* n.s., 29 (1881): 515.
- <sup>199</sup> [Alexander Innes Shand], "Fortunes of Paris: for the Last Fifty Years," *BEM* 160 (1896): 338; G[eorge] W. Smalley, "Notes on New York," *NC* 21 (1887): 217; Goldwin Smith, "The Jews: A Deferred Rejoinder," *NC* 12 (1882): 798.
- <sup>200</sup> [F.] Jeffrée, "The Jews in France," *DR* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 18 (1887): 336-37; 19 (1888): 34.
- <sup>201</sup> Frederick C. Conybeare ("Huguenot"), "Side-Lights on the Dreyfus Case," *NR* 32 (1898-99): 250, and the *National Review* published nine more articles by several authors within eighteen months; [J.H.A. Macdonald], "France To-Day," *BEM* 166 (1899): 546-47; "The Dreyfus Case and the Future of France," *WR* 152 (1899): 368; Spencer Broadhurst, "The Outlook in France," *MM* 81 (1899-1900): 49.
- <sup>202</sup> Lucien Wolf, "Anti-Semitism and the Dreyfus Case," *FR* n.s., 63 (1898): 139; [Charles Whibley], "The Catholic Reaction in France," *QR* 189 (1899): 462; Paul Bettelheim, "The Jews in France," *NC* 47 (1900): 118.
- <sup>203</sup> Albert D. Vandam, "The Spy Mania and the Revanche Idea," *FR* n.s., 64 (1898): 407.
- <sup>204</sup> Frederic Carrel, "English and French Manners," *FR* n.s., 55 (1894): 686; Shand, 338; Charles Hervey, "Notes of a Book-Collector," *TB* 92 (1891): 127; James Macintyre, "Théophraste Renaudot: Old Journalism and New," *NC* 34 (1893): 603.
- <sup>205</sup> A Leader-Writer, "The Lament of a Leader-Writer," *WR* 152 (1890): 663; Carrel, 686.
- <sup>206</sup> Burnett, 268; Gabriel Monod, "The Political Situation in France," *CR* 64 (1893): 627.
- <sup>207</sup> Macintyre, 601; Frederick Maxse, "Fraternal France," *NR* 25 (1895): 861; [Charles Whibley], "The Press of Paris," *MM* 79 (1898-99): 290.
- <sup>208</sup> Maxse, 862; C.C.P. Fitzgerald, Rear-Admiral, "„Fraternal France’, ” *NR* 26 (1895-96): 263; An Anglo-American Journalist [Emily J. Crawford], "Bonapartism," *FR* n.s., 65 (1899): 693.
- <sup>209</sup> "France as It Is Today," *LQR* n.s., 30 (1898): 112.
- <sup>210</sup> [Edward Delille], "The French Newspaper Press," *NC* 31 (1892): 477; Whibley, "Press," 287.
- <sup>211</sup> "The People of Europe: How They Live, Think, and Labour – France," *LH* 42 (1893): 551; Maxse, 860; A Resident in Paris, "French Journalism," *NR* 26 (1895-96): 78.
- <sup>212</sup> Whibley, "Press," 287.
- <sup>213</sup> Delille, 474; Whibley, "Press," 288, 290.
- <sup>214</sup> Delille, 477; Conybeare, 253, 258.
- <sup>215</sup> Whibley, "Press," 294; [William Wallace], "The Agony in French Politics and Literature," *SR* 33 (1899): 271-72.

- <sup>216</sup> Macdonald, 545-46; Richard Davey, "A Few French Facts," *FR* n.s., 68 (1900): 282.
- <sup>217</sup> Andrew Lang, "The Science of Criticism," *NE* 4 (1891): 403.
- <sup>218</sup> Frederick C. Conybeare, "French Military Justice," *NR* 32 (1898-99): 348; Evelyn March Phillipps, "Women's Magazines," *FR* n.s., 56 (1894): 669; "People of Europe," *LH*, 551.
- <sup>219</sup> Conybeare, "French Military," 356; Frederick C. Conybeare, "The Dreyfus Case. No. III: A Clerical Crusade," *NR* 32 (1898-99): 794, "Popular Catholicism in France," *NR* 34 (1899-1900): 767-68, and "The Conspiracy Against the French Republic," *NR* 35 (1900): 730; Robert Horton, "The Roman Danger," *NR* 34 (1899-1900): 933.
- <sup>220</sup> [Henry Southern], "Belgium – By an Eye-Witness," *FM* 2 (1830-31): 605; [Henry Southern], "The Belgian Revolution," *FQR* 6 (1830): 502; [George Moir], "The German Ultra-Liberal Press," *FQR* 10 (1832): 152.
- <sup>221</sup> [W.H.L. Bulwer], "Belgian Insurrection," *WR* 14 (1830): 165, 173; [Thomas Grattan Colley], "The Political, Social, and Commercial State of Belgium," *BFR* 3 (1836): 12.
- <sup>222</sup> [Charles Lever], "Continental Countries. No. I: Belgium," *DUM* 20 (1842): 414; [John Steinmetz], "Civil and Religious Education in Belgium," *DR* 8 (1840): 376.
- <sup>223</sup> [M.E. Grant Duff], "Belgium," *FM* 73 (1866): 802.
- <sup>224</sup> [Myles O'Reilly], "The Duty of the State, Its Rules and Limits," *DR* 52 (1862-63): 268; "Paris Journals," *TI*, 1; [A.V. Kirwan], "A Fortnight in Belgium in the June and July of 1863," *FM* 68 (1863): 351.
- <sup>225</sup> Kirwan, "Fortnight in Belgium," 351.
- <sup>226</sup> [Richard Simpson], "Belgium," *RA* 2<sup>d</sup> ser., 10 (1858): 393; Y.Z. [Victor de Buck], "Belgian Politics," *RA* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 2 (1859-60): 392.
- <sup>227</sup> "Material and Intellectual Life in Belgium," *CJ* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 5 (1856): 316; "Foul Smells," *FM*, 372.
- <sup>228</sup> Hillebrand, 411.
- <sup>229</sup> "Newspapers and the War," *LH* 19 (1870): 775.
- <sup>230</sup> Luis de Lorac, "The Situation in Belgium," *NR* 24 (1894-95): 345.
- <sup>231</sup> "Rochefort's *Adventures*," *LQR*, 75; Frederick Geffcken, "Contemporary Life and Thought in Germany," *CR* 52 (1887): 881; [Matilda Betham-Edwards], "The International Working Men's Association," *FM* n.s., 12 (1875): 79.
- <sup>232</sup> See, for example of historical treatment, "The London Daily Press," *WR* 64 (1855): 495.
- <sup>233</sup> [Charles Lever], "Continental Countries. No. II: Holland," *DUM* 21 (1843): 231; [James Mill], "Liberty of the Continental Press," *ER* 25 (1815): 127; Southern, "Belgian Revolution," 503.
- <sup>234</sup> Ward, "Present State," 396.
- <sup>235</sup> Lever, "Holland," 231.
- <sup>236</sup> M.P. L[indo], "Researches in Dutch Literature," *FM* 50 (1854): 676.
- <sup>237</sup> [Archibald Alison], "The Spanish Revolution," *BEM* 32 (1832): 328, 339.
- <sup>238</sup> [Henry Brougham], "Quin's *Visit to Spain*," *ER* 40 (1824): 54; [A.V. Kirwan], "Newspaper Press and Political Literature of Spain," *BQR* 6 (1847): 320.
- <sup>239</sup> [A.V. Kirwan], "Modern Spain," *BQR* 4 (1846): 178; An Old Contributor [Samuel Warren], "Things in General," *BEM* 60 (1846): 629; [Abraham Hayward], "Ford and Hughes on Spain and the Spaniards," *ER* 84 (1846): 190.

- <sup>240</sup> Hayward, "Ford," 190; [Frederick Hardman], "What Is Spain About?" *BEM* 64 (1848): 631; Kirwan, "Newspaper Press," 331-32.
- <sup>241</sup> Kirwan, "Newspaper Press," 332.
- <sup>242</sup> Kirwan, "Newspaper Press," 330.
- <sup>243</sup> [Nicholas Wiseman], "Spain," *DR* 18 (1845): 382.
- <sup>244</sup> "Balmez," *RA* 6 (1850): 130, 133.
- <sup>245</sup> [M.E. Grant Duff], "Spain," *NBR* n.s., 3 (1865): 96; [Abraham Hayward], "Politics and Prospects of Spain," *FM* 72 (1865): 683; [Frederick Hardman], "Spain under the Last Bourbon Sovereign," *SP* 3 (1868-69): 287.
- <sup>246</sup> "French Press," *CJ*, 169; *Vedette* [Frederick Hardman], "The Insurrection in Spain," *BEM* 76 (1854): 162.
- <sup>247</sup> Grant Duff, "Spain," 95-96.
- <sup>248</sup> *Vedette* [Frederick Hardman], "Memoranda from Manzanares," *BEM* 82 (1857): 360.
- <sup>249</sup> Dr. [John] Scoffern, "The Paradise of Spain," *NMM* 98 (1853): 68.
- <sup>250</sup> Franklyn G. Smith, "Spain after the War," *LQR* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 1 (1899): 293, 301; John Foreman, "Europe's New Invalid," *NR* 29 (1897): 726; [Charles Edwardes], "Barcelona," *CM* n.s., 19 (1892): 294.
- <sup>251</sup> [Charles Edwardes], "The Balearics," *CM* n.s., 18 (1892): 432.
- <sup>252</sup> [Robert Southey], "Political and Moral State of Portugal," *QR* 41 (1829): 203.
- <sup>253</sup> [Robert Southey], "Lisbon," *QR* 31 (1824-25): 386; "Romance of Portuguese Revolution," *FM* 37 (1848): 275; Oswald Crawford, "The Future of Portugal," *FR* n.s., 50 (1891): 153.
- <sup>254</sup> John Latouche [Oswald Crawford], "Country Life in Portugal," *NQM* 10 (1878): 297.
- <sup>255</sup> John Latouche [Oswald Crawford], "Notes of Travels in Portugal," *NQM* 2 (1874): 670-74.
- <sup>256</sup> John Latouche [Oswald Crawford], "The Tourist in Portugal," *NQM* 6 (1876): 409.
- <sup>257</sup> See, for example, [F. Bayford Harrison], "Our Small Ignorances," *CM* n.s., 10 (1888): 65; Thomas Gibson Bowles, "Newspapers," *FR* n.s., 36 (1884): 18; W.F. Nelson, "Early Newspaper Sketches," *LM* 8 (1886): 500.
- <sup>258</sup> [André Vieusseux], "Italian Literature of the Eighteenth Century," *FQR* 2 (1828): 645; "Italy," *ER* 40 (1824): 211.
- <sup>259</sup> Bolton King, "England and Italy," *MM* 82 (1900): 211; [T.A. Trollope], "Giampietro Vieusseux, the Florentine Bookseller," *SP* 2 (1868): 731, 733.
- <sup>260</sup> "Mazzini and the New Italy," *BQR* 58 (1873): 112; W.[E. Hickson], "Mazzini and the Ethics of Politicians," *WR* 42 (1844): 244.
- <sup>261</sup> Joseph Mazzini, "Letters on the State and Prospects of Italy," *MC* 3 (1839): 404; 4 (1839): 232.
- <sup>262</sup> A[ngelo] U[nglio] and Joseph Mazzini, "Italian Literature since 1830," *WR* 6/28 (1837-38): 166-67; Mazzini, 4: 231.
- <sup>263</sup> [?Carlo Pepoli], "Austria and Its Liberals," *MC* 3 (1839): 156; Mazzini, 4:131.
- <sup>264</sup> [Antonio Gallenga], "Copyright in Italy," *FQR* 26 (1840-41): 309; L. Mariotti [Antonio Gallenga], "Present State and Prospects of Italy," *NMM* 79 (1847): 255.
- <sup>265</sup> Lewes, "State of Criticism," 339; [Robert J. Graves], "Wilde's *Austria*," *DUM* 22 (1843): 100; "Austria in Italy: *Memoirs of a Prisoner of State*," *BFR* 10 (1840): 671; [Antonio Gallenga], "Education in Italy," *FQR* 27 (1844): 325, 327.

- <sup>266</sup> [Antonio Gallenga], "Italy, the Pope, and the Jesuits," *PR* 3 (1847): 40; L. Mariotti [Antonio Gallenga], "The Italian Programme," *NMM* 81 (1847): 257; Gallenga, "Present State," 255.
- <sup>267</sup> [Edward Cheney], "Revolution in Italy," *QR* 83 (1848): 227-28; [R.M. Hanna], "Rome and Its Revolution," *NBR* 14 (1850-51): 319-20.
- <sup>268</sup> L. Mariotti [Antonio Gallenga], "The Italian Crisis," *NMM* 81 (1847): 243; Our Own Correspondent [J.S. Northcote], "Roman Intelligence," *RA* 3 (1848-49): 40.
- <sup>269</sup> [J.S. Northcote], "The Roman Revolution," *RA* 9 (1852): 60, 64.
- <sup>270</sup> "Count Cavour," *BM* 50 (1861): 90; "Camillo Benso di Cavour," *BQR* 34 (1861): 239-40; "Count Cavour," *LH* 10 (1861): 519; [J.D. Acton], "Cavour," *RA* 3<sup>d</sup> ser., 5 (1861): 142-43; [A.H. Layard], "Cavour," *QR* 110 (1861): 217.
- <sup>271</sup> [Jane F. Teleki von Szek], "Count Cavour," *WR* 76 (1861): 421; [Abraham Hayward], "Count Cavour," *QR* 148 (1879): 109.
- <sup>272</sup> [W.F. Finalson], "The Massacre of Perugia," *DR* 47 (1859-60): 204; [Charles Lever], "How Must Sardinia Fight Austria?" *DUM* 48 (1856): 509; [W.E. Gladstone], "Sardinia and Rome," *QR* 97 (1855): 46; [Francis Mahony], "Young England's Onslaught on *Young Italy*," *BM* 28 (1850): 303.
- <sup>273</sup> [William Harris Rule], "Jesuitism: Its Political Relations," *LQR* 5 (1855-56): 401; [J.M. Capes], "Theological Science: Protestant Preaching," *RA* 6 (1850): 239.
- <sup>274</sup> [R.M. Hanna], "The Five Wounds of the Holy Church," *NBR* 15 (1851): 524.
- <sup>275</sup> [E.A. Seymour], "The Peripatetic Politician in Florence," *BEM* 93 (1863): 324-25; [Henry Yule], "The Week's Republic in Palermo, 1866" *QR* 122 (1867): 103-04.
- <sup>276</sup> The Editor [Norman Macleod], "Rambling Notes on a Ramble to North Italy," *GW* 3 (1862): 454; Edward Dicey, "The Italy of To-Day," *MM* 20 (1869): 122-23.
- <sup>277</sup> [Frances Power Cobbe], "What Annexation Has Done for Italy," *NA* 18 (1864): 37; Dicey, "Italy," 122; Lever, "Cornelius O'Dowd," 383.
- <sup>278</sup> Dicey, "Italy," 122.
- <sup>279</sup> [Edward Dicey], "Provincial Journalism," *SP* 3 (1868-69): 62; Dicey, "Italy," 122; Cobbe, 37.
- <sup>280</sup> Seymour, 324; Cobbe, 37.
- <sup>281</sup> Dicey, "Italy," 122.
- <sup>282</sup> J.W. P[robyn], "Italy and the War of 1866," *WR* 87 (1867): 279; Dicey, "Italy," 122; Dicey, "Provincial," 62.
- <sup>283</sup> [Frederick Hardman], "Notes and Notions from Italy," *BEM* 97 (1865): 660.
- <sup>284</sup> [C.E. Maurice], "Rome at the Close of 1867," *CR* 7 (1868): 22, 34.
- <sup>285</sup> [M.E. Grant Duff], "Italy in 1867," *NBR* n.s., 8 (1867): 492; Dean of Canterbury [Henry Alford], "Letters from Rome," *GW* 5 (1864): 478; [W.G. Ward], "Pius IX and the *Civiltà Cattolica*," *DR* n.s., 7 (1866): 417; "The Court of Rome – Its Parties and Its Men," *FM* 71 (1865): 413.
- <sup>286</sup> Dicey, "Provincial," 62.
- <sup>287</sup> Cobbe, 37.
- <sup>288</sup> [Frances Power Cobbe], "Religion in Italy," *TR* 1 (1864): 211.
- <sup>289</sup> James Picciotto, "United Italy," *DUM* 78 (1871): 247; Roberto Stuart, "Contemporary Life and Thought in Italy," *CR* 37 (1880): 175.
- <sup>290</sup> A. E[milie] V[enturi], "Joseph Mazzini: What Has He Done for Italy?" *CR* 15 (1870): 400; "Modern Ideals and the Liberty of the Press," *DR* n.s., 29 (1877): 193.

- <sup>291</sup> “Rome in 1878,” *LH* 27 (1878): 542.
- <sup>292</sup> “Father Curci,” *LQR* 57 (1881-82): 290-91; “Italian Affairs,” *NQM* n.s., 3 (1880): 77.
- <sup>293</sup> A[ntonio] Gallenga, “France and Italy,” *CR* 54 (1888): 595.
- <sup>294</sup> Ouida [Marie de la Ramée], “Postscript,” *FR* n.s., 65 (1899): 484.
- <sup>295</sup> Ouida [Marie de la Ramée], “The Crispi Dictatorship,” *CR* 68 (1895): 246.
- <sup>296</sup> [Helen Zimmern], “Italian Journalism as Seen in Fiction,” *BEM* 162 (1897): 207.
- <sup>297</sup> [Antonio] De Viti de Marco, “The Political Situation in Italy,” *NC* 38 (1895): 554.
- <sup>298</sup> W.S. Lilly, “The Temporal Power of the Pope,” *NE* 6 (1892): 486; An Observer [Marie de la Ramée], “L’Uomo Fatale,” *FR* n.s., 55 (1894): 357.
- <sup>299</sup> “The Italian Ministry,” *WR* 136 (1891): 238; Charles S. Devas, “Catholic Socialism,” *DR* 4<sup>th</sup> ser., 9 (1896): 120.
- <sup>300</sup> Ouida [Marie de la Ramée], “Italy: The Marquis di Rudini and Italian Politics,” *FR* n.s., 60 (1896): 351; [Antonio] De Viti de Marco, “The Recent Insurrections in Italy,” *NR* 31 (1898): 911.
- <sup>301</sup> W[illiam] Miller, “The Smallest Republic in the World: A Visit to San Marino,” *WR* 144 (1895): 291.
- <sup>302</sup> See p. 40.
- <sup>303</sup> “The Novels of Zschokke,” *TEM* n.s., 12 (1845): 435; “Sketches of Sunny Scenes and Social Science in Switzerland,” *BM* 60 (1866): 319.
- <sup>304</sup> Matthew Arnold, “A Speech at Westminster,” *MM* 29 (1873-74): 361.
- <sup>305</sup> Hillebrand, 411.
- <sup>306</sup> [A.H. Jaff], “Lessing: His Life and Writings,” *WR* 109 (1878): 100; [J.S. Blackie], “Lessing’s Life and Writings,” *FQR* 25 (1840): 241.
- <sup>307</sup> Paul Sylvester [Pauline Schletter], “The First Special Correspondent,” *NR* 13 (1889): 222.
- <sup>308</sup> “Germany,” *WR* 22 (1835): 155-56; Leonard A. Montefiore, “Liberty in Germany,” *NC* 4 (1878): 226.
- <sup>309</sup> James Mill, 127; [Kate V.] J[ennings], “Louis Börne,” *FM* n.s., 17 (1878): 623.
- <sup>310</sup> “Political Rights of the German People,” *FQR* 36 (1845-46): 176; [J.J. Blunt], “Tour in Germany,” *QR* 31 (1824-25): 185-86.
- <sup>311</sup> Montefiore, 743.
- <sup>312</sup> “The German Confederation: Its Political Character and Influence,” *BFR* 4 (1837): 210; Moir, “German Ultra-Liberal,” *FQR*, 152.
- <sup>313</sup> “The Political Opinions of the Germans,” *BFR* 10 (1840): 31; “The German Newspaper Press,” *FQR* 33 (1844): 377; [James B. Robertson], “Moral and Intellectual Condition of Catholic Germany,” *DR* 10 (1841): 88; [R.M. Milnes], “Political State of Prussia,” *ER* 83 (1846): 236.
- <sup>314</sup> [W.H. Leeds], “Present State of Art in Russia,” *FQR* 20 (1837-38): 329; [Abraham Hayward], “Germany and the Germans,” *QR* 58 (1837): 302.
- <sup>315</sup> [James B. Robertson], “German Catholic Literature,” *DR* 7 (1839): 263; [J.D. Acton], “The Count de Montalembert,” *RA* 2<sup>d</sup> ser., 10 (1858): 428; “My Note-Book,” *WR* 24 (1836): 238.
- <sup>316</sup> [George Moir], “German Pocket Books for 1831,” *FQR* 7 (1831): 234, 236; [George Moir], “A Glance at the German Annuals for 1835,” *BEM* 37 (1835): 387.
- <sup>317</sup> “Prince Metternich,” *NMM* 82 (1848): 501; “The New Order of Politics,” *NMM* 83 (1848): 109; Arthur Arnold, “Socialism,” *NQM* 10 (1878): 417; Alice Oldham, “The History of



- Socialism,” *NR* 16 (1890-91): 630; [Moritz Kaufmann], “Socialism,” *LQR* n.s., 5 (1885-86): 211; “*Popular Life in Berlin*,” *WR* 51 (1849): 217.
- <sup>318</sup> “Political Opinions,” *BFR*, 35; “German Newspaper,” *FQR*, 378-79; “Diplomatic Doings,” *NMM* 73 (1845): 162.
- <sup>319</sup> “German Almanacks for 1854,” *NMM* 100 (1854): 90; “The German Almanacks for 1855,” *BM* 37 (1855): 177.
- <sup>320</sup> “German Almanacks for 1858,” *BM* 43 (1858): 38.
- <sup>321</sup> “Almanacks for 1858,” *BM*, 38; “German Almanacks for 1860,” *BM* 46 (1859): 567.
- <sup>322</sup> [Jane Sinnett], “Contemporary Literature of Germany,” *WR* 58 (1852): 612.
- <sup>323</sup> [Friedrich Geffcken], “Count Bismarck,” *ER* 130 (1869): 435; Max Schlesinger, “Count Bismarck,” *FR* 5 (1866): 604.
- <sup>324</sup> [Albert Eubule Evans], “Constitutional Germany,” *CR* 20 (1872): 855.
- <sup>325</sup> [Edward Wilberforce], “Newspaper Writers in Germany,” *CM* 7 (1863): 750, 754-55; “Heinrich Heine,” *FM* 74 (1866): 601; Blaze de Bury, “Political Press,” 184.
- <sup>326</sup> [L.J. Trotter], “Life in Munich,” *DUM* 63 (1864): 700; Dicey, “Provincial,” 62; Wilberforce, 748.
- <sup>327</sup> [F.W. Johnston], “London to West Prussia,” *BEM* 75 (1854): 587; “A German in London,” *BM* 47 (1860): 59.
- <sup>328</sup> [?Edward Wilberforce], “A Popular Paper in Munich,” *TB* 6 (1862): 34, 36.
- <sup>329</sup> “The German Almanacks for 1862,” *BM* 50 (1861): 591; “Specimens of German Humour,” *BM* 57 (1865): 310.
- <sup>330</sup> “The German Almanacks for 1861,” *BM* 48 (1860): 615 and “for 1867,” 61 (1867): 94.
- <sup>331</sup> [W.M. Metcalfe], “Yiddish Literature,” *SR* 36 (1900): 61; “The Duel of the Nations,” *MM* 22 (1870): 326.
- <sup>332</sup> [Ludwig] Bamberger, “The German Daily Press,” *NC* 27 (1890): 28-29.
- <sup>333</sup> “Prince Bismarck,” *WR* 112 (1878): 472.
- <sup>334</sup> “Germany since the Peace of Frankfort,” *ER* 150 (1879): 314-15.
- <sup>335</sup> Hillebrand, 411.
- <sup>336</sup> Henry G. Hewlett, “Heinrich Heine’s Life and Work,” *FM* n.s., 14 (1876): 612; Albert Stutzer, “Some Remarks Respecting the Purchase of Books in Germany,” *FM* n.s., 13 (1876): 571; “German Advertisements,” *CJ* 4<sup>th</sup> ser., 8 (1871): 219.
- <sup>337</sup> L.W.E. Rauwenhoff, “France and the Jesuits,” *MR* 1 (1880): 569; [Rudolph Lindau], “Berlin in 1884,” *BEM* 136 (1884): 9; Geffcken, “Contemporary Life,” 883.
- <sup>338</sup> Lindau, 9; Rev. M[oritz] Kaufmann, “Christian Socialists,” *GW* 23 (1882): 788; Poultney Bigelow, “The German Emperor,” *NE* 1 (1889): 254.
- <sup>339</sup> “The Late German Crisis,” *CR* 66 (1894): 830; Rowland Blennerhassett, “Great Britain and the European Powers,” *NR* 35 (1900): 33.
- <sup>340</sup> [Friedrich Geffcken], “The Change of Government in Germany,” *FR* n.s., 48 (1890): 290-92, 294; Charles Lowe, “The German Newspaper Press,” *NC* 30 (1891): 864.
- <sup>341</sup> Lowe, 863.
- <sup>342</sup> Bamberger, 22; Lowe, 859.
- <sup>343</sup> Bamberger, 31; George W. Smalley, “A Visit to Prince Bismarck,” *FR* n.s., 54 (1893): 13.
- <sup>344</sup> W[illiam] Miller, “Prince Bismarck’s Position,” *WR* 133 (1890): 342; Lowe, 855; “Late German,” *CR* 833.

- <sup>345</sup> Bamberger, 27-28; Lowe, 857.
- <sup>346</sup> Jessie Margaret King, "An International Women's Congress," *GW* 38 (1897): 636; Karl Blind, "The Rise and Development of Anarchism," *CR* 65 (1894): 142.
- <sup>347</sup> See, for example, "Heinrich Heine's *Germany*," *WR* 23 (1835): 293; E.B. Sheridan, "Heine's Life and Writings," *TB* 29 (1870): 222; Charles Beard, "Heinrich Heine," *TR* 13 (1876): 182, 184; Hewlett, 612-13; "Life and Works of Heinrich Heine," *LQR* 58 (1882): 428, 431, 433.
- <sup>348</sup> Ernest Schuster, "The Anti-Jewish Agitation in Germany," *FR* n.s., 29 (1881): 382; Lowe, 867.
- <sup>349</sup> [Abraham Hayward], "Travellers in Austria and Hungary," *QR* 65 (1839-40): 252-53.
- <sup>350</sup> Graves, 100.
- <sup>351</sup> Robertson, "Moral and Intellectual," 89; Graves, 100.
- <sup>352</sup> [Thomas C. Banfield], "Austrian Statistics," *BFR* 14 (1843): 598-99.
- <sup>353</sup> Robertson, "Political State," 512; "The Siege of Vienna," *NMM* 84 (1848): 439; St. John, "General View," 477; "French Press," *CJ*, 169.
- <sup>354</sup> [E.C. Grenville-Murray and Henry Morley], "Advertisements," *HW* 4 (1851-52): 359.
- <sup>355</sup> [Robert R. Noel], "Dualism in Austria," *WR* 88 (1867): 455; Arthur J. Evans, "The Austrians in Bosnia," *MM* 38 (1878): 496, 502; Betham-Edwards, "International," 79; Arthur J. Evans, "The Austrian War Against Publicity," *CR* 42 (1882): 395.
- <sup>356</sup> [Robert R. Noel], "Austrian Constitutionalism," *WR* 79 (1863): 368.
- <sup>357</sup> [Charles H. Pearson], "Poland as It Is," *NA* 17 (1863): 382; Wilberforce, "Newspaper Writers," 751-52.
- <sup>358</sup> Noel, "Constitutionalism," 343, 369; [Alexander Innes Shand], "*Vienna and Viennese Life*," *BEM* 123 (1878): 624.
- <sup>359</sup> [Julia Pardoe], "On the Rise and Progress of Magyar Literature," *FQR* 29 (1842): 222-23.
- <sup>360</sup> [K.G. Romy], "Language and Literature of the Magyars," *FQR* 3 (1828-29): 71.
- <sup>361</sup> "Quin's *Steam Voyage down the Danube*," *WR* 23 (1835): 480.
- <sup>362</sup> "The Present State of Hungary," *HI* n.s., 7 (1851): 375.
- <sup>363</sup> "Revolution and Counter-Revolution," *WR* 55 (1851): 120.
- <sup>364</sup> [John] W[ard], "Hungary," *WR* 51 (1849): 448.
- <sup>365</sup> J.W. Tipping, "Russia and Panslavism [sic]," *DB* 4 (1872-73): 286; [Robert R. Noel], "The Nationality Question in Austria," *WR* 94 (1870): 42.
- <sup>366</sup> Noel, "Nationality," 42.
- <sup>367</sup> Noel, "Constitutionalism," 368; [W.R. Morfill], "The Latest Bohemian Literature," *WR* 116 (1881): 380, 391.
- <sup>368</sup> [Christian Johnstone], "*Servia, the Youngest Member of the European Family*," *TEM* n.s., 12 (1845): 516; "Jellachlich, Ban of Croatia," *NMM* 85 (1849): 34-35.
- <sup>369</sup> Edmond Fitzmaurice, "Hungary and Croatia," *MM* 36 (1877): 39.
- <sup>370</sup> [John Bowring], "Politics and Literature of Russia," *WR* 1 (1824): 101.
- <sup>371</sup> C.E. Turner, "Studies in Russian Literature. No. 7: Karansin," *FM* n.s., 16 (1877): 187; H. Sutherland Edwards, "Mr. Katkoff and the *Moscow Gazette*," *FR* n.s., 42 (1887): 380.
- <sup>372</sup> Leeds, 328; [W.H. Leeds], "Russian Annuals," *FQR* 16 (1835-36): 445.
- <sup>373</sup> [Frederick Chamier], "Anecdotes of Russia," *NMM* 29 (1830): 73; Reginald George Burton, "The Censorship of the Press in Russia," *WR* 144 (1895): 135.

- <sup>374</sup> [Christian Johnstone], “The Marquis de Custine’s *Empire of the Czar*,” *TEM* n.s., 10 (1843): 647; [Christian Johnstone], “Recent Travellers in Russia,” *TEM* n.s., 9 (1842): 127.
- <sup>375</sup> “Russia’s Internal Life,” *TEM* n.s., 14 (1847): 320; Banfield, 15 (1844): 555; “Kohl’s *Russia – Moscow*,” *CJ* 12 (1843): 19.
- <sup>376</sup> John Rae, “The Revolutionary Movement in Russia,” *BQR* 71 (1880): 404; W.R.S. Ralston, “Alexander Herzen [sic],” *TB* 29 (1870): 44-58; Edwards, 379.
- <sup>377</sup> W.R.S. Ralston, “Russian Revolutionary Literature,” *NC* 1 (1877): 405; Fritz Cunliffe-Owen, “Russian Nihilism,” *NC* 7 (1880): 24.
- <sup>378</sup> [Nicholas Rowe], “The Russian Political Press,” *MM* 7 (1862-63): 399.
- <sup>379</sup> “Serf-Emancipation in Russia,” *BQR* 29 (1859): 179; Rowe, 399; W.R.S. Ralston, “The Experiences of a Russian Exile,” *MM* 19 (1868-69): 107; Oldham, 466; D. Mackenzie Wallace, “Secret Societies in Russia,” *FR* n.s., 22 (1877): 159.
- <sup>380</sup> H. Sutherland Edwards, “The Reform Period in Russia,” *MM* 37 (1877-78): 168.
- <sup>381</sup> “Russia and Russian Reformers,” *WR* 113 (1880): 172; [W.R.S. Ralston], “Russia,” *BQR* 65 (1877): 472.
- <sup>382</sup> A.W. Benni, “Russian Society,” *FR* 6 (1866): 739.
- <sup>383</sup> “Kohl’s *Sketches of St. Petersburg*,” *FQR* 28 (1841-42): 432.
- <sup>384</sup> Edwards, “Katkoff,” 383.
- <sup>385</sup> An English Resident in Russia [E.J. Dillon], “Michael Katkoff,” *CR* 52 (1887): 516.
- <sup>386</sup> Aurelio Buddeus, “Parties and Politics of Modern Russia,” *NBR* n.s., 13 (1870): 161.
- <sup>387</sup> Dillon, 513-14.
- <sup>388</sup> Rowe, 395; Buddeus, 157; T.S. [Elizaveta Bezobrazova], “Contemporary Life and Thought in Russia,” *CR* 34 (1878-79): 603.
- <sup>389</sup> [M.E. Grant Duff], “Russia under Alexander II,” *NBR* n.s., 2 (1864): 166; [Adam Gielgud], “The Panslavist Revival in Eastern Europe,” *SP* 2 (1868): 25; A Russian Publicist, “The Secret Springs of Russian Policy,” *CR* 78 (1900): 497; F[rederick] C. Conybeare, “Armenia and the Armenians,” *NR* 14 (1889-90): 304; [J.T. Bealby], “The Downfall of Finland: An Object-lesson in Russian Aggression,” *BEM* 166 (1899): 6; Rowe, 396; Rae, 403.
- <sup>390</sup> Edwards, “Katkoff,” 394.
- <sup>391</sup> [W.R.S. Ralston], “The Progress of Reform in Russia,” *BQR* 63 (1876): 401; Rowe, 396.
- <sup>392</sup> Rowe, 395-96.
- <sup>393</sup> Rowe, 395, 399, 400.
- <sup>394</sup> Rowe, 396; Bezobrazova, 37 (1880): 162.
- <sup>395</sup> Rowe, 397; “The People of Europe: How They Live, Think, and Labour – Russia,” *LH* 43 (1894): 797.
- <sup>396</sup> Bezobrazova, 32 (1878): 603; Jesse Collins, “A Radical in Russia,” *FR* n.s., 33 (1883): 214; Stepiak [S.M. Kravchinsky], “The Mir and the Police,” *FR* n.s., 41 (1887): 244-45; [E.C. Whitehurst], “The Weakness of Russia,” *WR* 124 (1885): 158.
- <sup>397</sup> Sheridan Ford, “Tzar-Tyrant or Tzar-Tribune,” *WR* 132 (1889): 210; “Russia,” *NQM* n.s., 3 (1880): 404; [Malcolm MacColl], “Russia Revisited,” *FR* n.s., 35 (1884): 604.
- <sup>398</sup> “Russia,” *NQM*, 404; “The Russians in Turkey,” *WR* 111 (1879): 75; Bezobrazova, 34 (1878-79), 597.
- <sup>399</sup> Major-General F[rederick] Chenevix Trench, “The Russian Journalistic Press,” *BEM* 148 (1890): 124.

- <sup>400</sup> E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “The Jews in Russia,” *FR* n.s., 48 (1890): 505; Hermann Adler, “Recent Phases of Judaeophobia,” *NC* 10 (1881): 827; E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “Jewish Colonisation and Russian Persecution,” *NE* 5 (1891): 110.
- <sup>401</sup> A.P. Irby, “A Russian Lady’s Book,” *FM* n.s., 21 (1880): 617.
- <sup>402</sup> E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “Russian Characteristics,” *FR* n.s., 46 (1889): 858; William Rossiter, “The Continental Sunday,” *NC* 15 (1884): 937.
- <sup>403</sup> “People of Europe – Russia,” 797; Trench, 124; J.Y. Simpson, “The Political Prisoner in Siberia,” *BEM* 162 (1897): 331.
- <sup>404</sup> Edwards, “Reform,” 163-64.
- <sup>405</sup> Trench, 117.
- <sup>406</sup> E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “Finland,” *FR* n.s., 49 (1891): 66; Scythicus, “The Russian Press,” *NR* 35 (1900): 310-11.
- <sup>407</sup> L.J. Maxse, “Russia and Captain Dreyfus,” *NR* 32 (1898-99): 372; Scythicus, 316.
- <sup>408</sup> [R.W. Lowry], “The Russians at Home,” *CM* n.s., 19 (1892): 184; Scythicus, 316.
- <sup>409</sup> E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “The Tsar Alexander III,” *CR* 63 (1893): 9; Trench, 115.
- <sup>410</sup> E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “Constantine Pobedonostseff,” *CR* 63 (1893): 585; E.B. Lanin [E.J. Dillon], “The Russian Censure,” *FR* n.s., 49 (1891): 807; Lowry, 184.
- <sup>411</sup> Dillon, “Armenia and the Armenian People,” *FR* n.s., 48 (1890): 271; Richard Davey, “Turkey and Armenia,” *FR* n.s., 57 (1895): 204.
- <sup>412</sup> [André Vieusseux], “Poland in 1830,” *FQR* 7 (1831): 523.
- <sup>413</sup> “Foreign Policy and Internal Administration of the Austrian Empire,” *FQR* 18 (1836-37): 270-71.
- <sup>414</sup> Gielgud, 27.
- <sup>415</sup> [Thomas C. Banfield], “The Turkish Treaty,” *BFR* 9 (1839): 265.
- <sup>416</sup> [R.W. Monsell], “The Danubian Principalities,” *LQR* 10 (1858): 244.
- <sup>417</sup> Rossiter, 938.
- <sup>418</sup> P[eter] Kropotkin, “Finland: A Rising Nationality,” *NC* 17 (1885): 542-43.
- <sup>419</sup> Antonio Gallenga, “Finland,” *FR* n.s., 31 (1882): 608.
- <sup>420</sup> Finnicus, “Russian Officialdom and the Finnish Press,” *NR* 35 (1900): 521-23.
- <sup>421</sup> [R.P. Gillies], “Schubert’s *Travels in Sweden, Etc.*,” *FQR* 1 (1827): 195, 197; [Christian Johnstone], “Laing’s Sweden and Norway,” *TEM* n.s., 6 (1839): 324.
- <sup>422</sup> [H.S. Tremenheere], “Laing’s *Tour in Sweden*,” *ER* 69 (1839): 364; “Social, Moral, and Political State of Sweden,” *DUM* 13 (1839): 699.
- <sup>423</sup> [Patrick McMahon], “Laing’s *Travels*,” *DR* 14 (1843): 297; Samuel Laing, “Sweden and Norway: Mr. Laing’s Reply to a Pamphlet,” *MC* 6 (1840): 389-90.
- <sup>424</sup> “Religion in Sweden,” *TR* 2 (1865): 658.
- <sup>425</sup> T., “The Constitution of Sweden,” *FM* n.s., 4 (1871): 771.
- <sup>426</sup> W. Tallack, “Gothenburg,” *LH* 28 (1879): 795.
- <sup>427</sup> Edmund Gosse, “The Present Condition of Norway,” *FM* n.s., 9 (1874): 182.
- <sup>428</sup> J.C., “Norway,” *WR* 5/27 (1837): 189.
- <sup>429</sup> Gosse, “Norway,” 182.
- <sup>430</sup> Carl Siewers, “Will Norway Become a Republic?” *NR* 2 (1883-84): 381.
- <sup>431</sup> Gosse, “Norway,” 182.
- <sup>432</sup> William Archer, “Norway To-Day,” *FR* n.s., 38 (1885): 418.

<sup>433</sup> McMahon, 280.

<sup>434</sup> J.C., 189.

<sup>435</sup> Mrs. [Mary Anne S.] Bushby, "A Survey of Danish Literature from the Earliest Period to the Present Time," *NMM* 95 (1852): 296.

<sup>436</sup> William Hurton, "Winter Pictures from the North of Europe," *TEM* n.s., 17 (1850): 94.

<sup>437</sup> Hurton, 94.

<sup>438</sup> "The Baltic Provinces of Russia," *FQR* 29 (1842): 52.

<sup>439</sup> Dr. E.H. Kilian, "The Bulgarians," *FM* n.s., 14 (1876): 556.

<sup>440</sup> W.R. Morfill, "The Sufferings of a Bulgarian Patriot," *WR* 135 (1891): 524.

<sup>441</sup> [John Bowring], "Greek Committee," *WR* 6 (1826): 115; [George Croly], "Greece," *BEM* 20 (1826): 842.

<sup>442</sup> [Edward A. Freeman], "Mediaeval and Modern Greece," *NA* 18 (1864): 111; [George Finlay], "King Otho and His Classic Kingdom," *BEM* 76 (1854): 406.

<sup>443</sup> "*Ionian Anthology*," *FQR* 13 (1834): 443-44.

<sup>444</sup> [George Finlay], "The Bankruptcy of the Greek Kingdom," *BEM* 54 (1843): 349, 353; Finlay, "King Otho," 407.

<sup>445</sup> [Charles Brinsley Sheridan], "The Ionian Islands," *WR* 38 (1842): 419; [G.F. Bowen], "Ionian Administration – Lord Seaton and Sir Henry Ward," *QR* 91 (1852): 332; [John Colborne], "Jervis's *History of Corfu and the Ionian Islands*," *ER* 97 (1853): 69.

<sup>446</sup> "Greece and the Greeks," *LQR* 20 (1863): 146; Rossiter, 939; John Rae, "England and the Greek Question," *BQR* 70 (1879): 194.

<sup>447</sup> James D. Bouchiers, "A Glance at Contemporary Greece," *FR* n.s., 47 (1890): 868; W[illiam] Miller, "Impressions of Greece," *WR* 142 (1894): 307; Ernest M. Bennett, "Side-Lights on the Cretan Insurrection," *NC* 41 (1897): 687-88.