

4-2008

## Landscapes of Remembrance: Home and Memory in the Nineteenth-Century Bürgertum

Jason Tebbe  
*Grand Valley State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst\\_articles](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst_articles)



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

### ScholarWorks Citation

Tebbe, Jason, "Landscapes of Remembrance: Home and Memory in the Nineteenth-Century Bürgertum" (2008). *Peer Reviewed Articles*. 3.

[https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst\\_articles/3](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst_articles/3)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History Department at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peer Reviewed Articles by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gvsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gvsu.edu).

# LANDSCAPES OF REMEMBRANCE: HOME AND MEMORY IN THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY *BÜRGERTUM*

Jason Tebbe

*This article examines the ways in which the nineteenth-century German middle class turned their homes into sites of family memory as part of a vibrant vernacular memory. The highly segmented organization of middle-class homes contributed to and grew out of this memory culture. The divisions of domestic space ascribed heightened meaning to particular zones, especially festive spaces like the "Christmas room." Families filled domestic spaces with memory, putting family portraits and heirlooms on prominent display in the home. Middle-class Germans also filled the pages of personal memoirs with recollections of their childhood homes that almost always portrayed an idyllic environment. Ultimately, this article argues that family memory offers a window into the emotional universe of the nineteenth-century bourgeoisie and that the sanitizing narratives of family memory were used to impart a sense of stability and control.*

**Keywords:** Germany; family; memory; history; domesticity; middle class

The nineteenth-century German middle class, like the European bourgeoisie in general, constructed domestic interiors that most today find stuffy, cluttered, and stifling. Eric Hobsbawm expressed well the current distaste for this bygone mode of living:

The most immediate impression of the bourgeois interior of the mid-century is overcrowding and concealment, a mass of objects, more often than not disguised by drapes, cushions, cloths, and wallpapers, and always, whatever their nature, elaborated. No picture without a gilded, a fretted, a chased, even a velvet-covered frame, no seat without upholstery or cover, no piece of textile without tassel, no piece of wood without some touch of the lathe, no surface without some cloth or object on it.<sup>1</sup>

Although the bourgeoisie certainly used their homes for display, he and other historians often missed the genuine emotional attachments to the stereotypically cluttered

---

Jason Tebbe teaches at Grand Valley State University in Michigan. He received his PhD in 2006 from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign with the dissertation "Domesticating Time: Family and Memory in the German Middle Class, 1840-1939." He has published in *Central European History* and is currently working on a book manuscript entitled *Warding off Oblivion: German Family Memory from Biedermeier to the Nazis*.

*Journal of Family History*, Vol. 33 No. 2, April 2008 195-215

DOI: 10.1177/0363199007313672

© 2008 Sage Publications

objects and to their domestic interiors themselves.<sup>2</sup> The “gilded” picture frames housed treasured family portraits, dusty bookshelves contained books and family Bibles handed down through the generations, glass cases regularly displayed cherished heirlooms, and adults often wrote longingly about their childhood homes. Memory, which both sculpted domestic space and was generated by it, played a paramount role in shaping the meaning of “home.”

The nineteenth-century European middle classes and their cult of domesticity famously elevated the home’s symbolic meaning to unprecedented levels. In a move of symbolic importance, bourgeois families increasingly brought rituals and holidays into the home, with the newly domesticated family Christmas being the most prominent example.<sup>3</sup> In the popular mind, homes walled off the tumult of the outside world and promised refuge, security, and happiness. The obvious Victorian clichés come to mind, like “home sweet home” or “Keep the home fires burning,” but these sayings reflected a general obsession with domestic space with wide-ranging implications. Recent studies have even shown how the home took on a national meaning in the late nineteenth century, particularly in Germany, where women expressed their national identity through domesticity.<sup>4</sup>

Although Victorian notions of domesticity have become easy targets for ridicule, the home still carries significant meaning, making it “perhaps the most powerful source of identity in the modern era.”<sup>5</sup> Ideas about domesticity may have changed during the past century, but the meaning of home still resonates in contemporary society, mostly because home life practices are integral to the creation of selfhood. More than that, homes still self-consciously contain the past. Eugene Rochberg-Halton, observing contemporary home dwellers in Chicago, noted, “It is personal time embodied, a storehouse of signs of treasured people, events, and achievements that communicate one’s personal and cultural identity and serve as contexts for further cultivation.”<sup>6</sup> The ability of a home to become such a “storehouse” can be traced to particular times and places.

The German middle class molded their homes through memory and used their homes to preserve an idyllic version of the past. That idyll reinforced a sense of stability and continuity, the mainstays of the larger family memory culture and the cult of domesticity. Furthermore, families constructed memories of their homes as part of a general desire to fashion reassuring narratives of their past. The nineteenth century gave birth to and popularized the family Christmas, children’s birthdays, and wedding anniversaries, all emphasizing continuity and stability within the family. Innumerable amateur bourgeois authors commemorated their childhoods in unpublished memoirs that almost always presented a domestic paradise presided over by loving, all-powerful parents. Men and women both repeated this idyllic narrative, although women tended to invest themselves more personally in remembering the home.

The ubiquitous genre of family memory, as opposed to national or personal memory, demanded and still requires sanitizing narratives.<sup>7</sup> Whereas personal memory in the form of diaries and letters might register sadness, disappointment, or longing, families strove to remember themselves in a comedic rather than dramatic manner. Within this wider culture of family memory, home and conceptualizations of domesticity played a central role as the staging ground for family life and its commemoration. Home dominated the emotional universe of the nineteenth-century German middle class, it held the key to personal development, it offered continuity and security through its memories, and its loss engendered longing.

Until now, the growing literature on historical memory has focused primarily on national memory. Although studies of monuments, national holidays, and representations of the past in popular culture have enlarged our understanding of communal memory,<sup>8</sup> historians have yet to fully engage with the dynamics of family and personal memory.<sup>9</sup> Then and now, people perform work in the everyday by cataloging family photographs and videocassettes or researching genealogy. Historians have done much to historicize family structure,<sup>10</sup> but the intimate practices of the home ought to be historicized as well.

Academics across different fields have begun to explore the relationships between identity and domestic space. In the field of historical anthropology, Frykman and Lofgren's classic *Culture Builders* showed how the Swedish middle class used the home to inculcate bourgeois values in their children.<sup>11</sup> In history, John Gillis's *A World of Their Own Making* ably laid out the ways that Victorians elevated domesticity and forged modern understandings of home. For the most part, however, studies of domesticity and domestic space have yet to grapple with the crucial ways that memory organized domestic space and how it provided emotional meaning to it. Antoinette Burton's *Dwelling in the Archive*, which treats the memoirs of three women in late colonial India, represents an important exception. In this work, she theorized that the home acted as an "archive" for women, who were barred from the conventionally accepted sources of state archives.<sup>12</sup> Drawing on the sources of their domestic surroundings, they could write their own accounts of the past. Although the metaphor of home as archive will not be extended in quite the same way here, I will argue that middle-class Germans transformed their own homes into repositories of the past. The middle class's quest to domesticate time marked the home by filling it with knick-knacks, decorating it with portraits, and ascribing commemorative meaning to certain spaces within the home.

### THE INNER ARCHITECTURE OF THE BOURGEOIS HOME

To understand the dynamics of memory within the home, we first need to explore the unique living environment of the nineteenth-century middle class referenced earlier by Hobsbawm. The layout of a typical bourgeois home differed greatly from the "modern" designs that first arose in the early twentieth century and set the stage for the dwellings familiar to us today. Older designs emphasized ornament and as a result often organized space in an almost haphazard manner. Reformist impulses drove Modernist architects, expressed most notably in the avant-garde Neues Wohnen and Bauhaus groups, who felt that traditional interiors failed to serve dwellers' needs. After the turn of the century, and especially after the First World War, reformers in Germany and Austria praised function over form, and designed living spaces that placed a premium on light, space, and technology. Most strikingly, in their innovative designs, bourgeois kitchens went from simple backrooms used only by domestic servants to modernized spaces meant for the whole family.<sup>13</sup>

The less rationalized space of old-style bourgeois homes contained more rooms than later homes, many of them irregularly sized. With less light, unadorned backrooms, and living rooms covered floor to ceiling with knick-knacks in the manner described by Hobsbawm, homes created an aura of coziness that could, at times, also evoke feelings of oppressive stuffiness in their occupants. Above all, the nineteenth-century home segmented domestic space to a degree inconceivable today, separating

space based on the gender and status of the home's occupants. Children were often forbidden from parents' bedrooms; the father's office was the exclusive, undisturbed realm of the family patriarch; and the household staff had their own dwellings in the basement or a backroom. Despite the domestic ideology that public and private ought to be strictly separated, bourgeois homes had both public and private spaces, what some scholars have termed the "front stage," where families represented themselves to others, and a "backstage," where the residents lived and worked.<sup>14</sup> In being public and private at the same time, "the home was both a showcase for the world and a shelter against it."<sup>15</sup> The varied spaces of old-style homes fall into three regions: communal space, private space, and backstage, with the last referring to the areas used primarily by servants.

Living rooms, dining rooms, and salons make up the first area, places where guests would congregate and where family events would take place. Although the middle class considered the home to be a sacrosanct place whose four walls sheltered the family from the ravages of the outside world, it welcomed in the public sphere through a variety of gatherings. Despite the prevailing "separate spheres" ideology, the middle class still put their domestic worlds on "continual display."<sup>16</sup> Family archives abound with references to meetings of political and religious groups, young women who meet to speak French or English, and musical events hosted by bourgeois patrons.

Bourgeois family members congregated primarily in the living room, the focal point and most important site for domestic life. In addition to the living room and more important for the public function of domestic space, homes contained a room variously termed a *salon* (*Saal*, literally "hall") or *good room* (*Gute Stube*) that was used exclusively for big events involving guests. Curt Neumann, in his memoir of childhood in Berlin, offered an apt explanation of the phenomenon:

In general, a bourgeois home without a "good room" was unthinkable; with the good room's essential feature being that it would be aired out, heated, and entered only when receiving guests. Usually the doors stayed closed for weeks, even months, with the good plush furniture covered up to protect against dust.<sup>17</sup>

Their limited use outside of such special occasions illustrates how the space of home, thought to be a private place, served a public purpose. The *Gute Stube* exhibits to an even further degree the specialized nature of space in these homes, and the taboos and heightened meanings ascribed to certain places. Although the middle class made emotional investments in their homes, domestic space still served a representative function, with the salon being the representational space par excellence. Having a completely representational space marked one's class, displaying the ability to afford a room without function. In fact, working-class dwellers of more modernized dwellings at the turn of the century often sought to erect their own *Gute Stuben*.<sup>18</sup> In doing so, they could set themselves apart from their peers, and also create a space for self-expression in the home, which had heretofore been the luxury of others.

Interior decorating styles reflected the urge by the rising middle class to convey its wealth, apparent in the replacement of the simple Biedermeier style by ornate Historicist interiors during the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>19</sup> The former style had emphasized simplicity and exuded a sense of modesty, whereas the latter imitated more gaudy historical styles like the Baroque and Renaissance. By calling on older

artistic modes, Historicist interiors created a sense of stability and success by grounding the home in the authority of venerated artistic styles of the past. Projecting prosperity came at a high price; bourgeois families spent a large portion of their budgets on representational items like decorations and furniture for the living room.<sup>20</sup> That fact alone points to the salience of domestic interiors for public, not just private, bourgeois life.

Bedrooms, offices, and nurseries made up the private places of the home, placed behind or above the “front-stage” public areas. The more private places of the home, especially bedrooms, offered opportunities for individual, personal space rare in previous home styles. Unlike the working class, the middle class could afford to give its members “a room of one’s own.”<sup>21</sup> Due to the radical segmentation of domestic space, certain private rooms took on heightened properties. For example, children regarded their parents’ room with an air of mystery, and memoir literature abounds with childhood fascinations with the unused rooms of the home.

Gender-based domestic organization, however, quite palpably showed the home’s patriarchal hierarchy and the subservient behavior expected from women. Henrik Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* provided a well-known example of the ways that bourgeois men treated their offices like their own personal territory. In the play, Nora Helmer must converse with her husband, Torvald, through his office door, because the office is a space entirely reserved for him. Many bourgeois husbands had their business offices in their homes and so expected not to be disturbed in the place where they worked to provide for the family. The prohibitions against disturbance could extend toward leisure time: the narrator in *Der Nachsommer*, Austrian novelist Adalbert Stifter’s Bildungsroman, described his father’s habit of reading in his own space after work:

He would sit and read for an hour or two, even longer sometimes, at an artistically carved antique table that stood in the library on an equally ancient carpet. During that time he was not to be disturbed; indeed no one was allowed to even walk through the library.<sup>22</sup>

Most bourgeois fathers had such sanctuaries against the clamor of children, whereas most mothers had to be “on task” at all times in the home.

For women, the domestic ideology demanded that mothers educate and cultivate their children. Middle-class families used the nursery (*Kinderstube*) to implant the *Bildung* necessary to create good bourgeois subjects, overseen by mothers, nannies, and governesses.<sup>23</sup> Just as the domestic ideology strictly divided gender roles between men and women, these gender divisions could be seen in the very organization of bourgeois homes, whose compartmentalized space was always divided with gender in mind.

The ornate and segmented bourgeois home relied on servants, who were normally consigned to a “backstage” area of the home with poorer living quarters. Those who served in the homes of the middle class remind us that we cannot think of the nineteenth-century bourgeois home merely as a refuge or site of leisure.<sup>24</sup> Typically, only servants went into the kitchen because of the “taboo” against manual labor for bourgeois women.<sup>25</sup> “Dirty work” carried the taint of the lower classes, and middle-class people avoided manual work to delineate their bourgeois status. These taboos and prohibitions represented a marked difference from working-class and especially peasant households, where the kitchen formed the central communal space in the home.<sup>26</sup> In working-class homes, for instance, kitchens had to be washrooms, dining

rooms, and surrogate living rooms all at once, and often had to be shared with other families within the same building.<sup>27</sup>

The possession of a servant was the most visible marker of middle-class status, but the presence of domestics created a variety of responses.<sup>28</sup> These ran the gamut from the sentimental affection accorded to a childhood nurse, to derision toward the rural and uneducated origins of many servants, to the outright mistrust of servants allowed to have intimate contact with the family's children and property. Household servants often lived in rather drab and unhealthy conditions. The 1851 diary of Engel Marie Thiermann, a Bremen housewife, recorded her attempts to hire a new cook, and her account shows the difficulties that came with domestic service for both mistress and servant. One prospective employee refused to live in the "bedroom in the Souterrain" on the grounds that the dank and drafty quarters would be enough to make her ill. This cook, who had already worked ten and a half years for another family, turned down the job. Thiermann eventually hired a younger woman from the country, reflecting the rather limited options for younger, less experienced domestics.<sup>29</sup>

Servants occupied a tenuous place within the bourgeois home. Some families might treat certain servants like members of the family, but most were employees so faceless that they failed to appear in the records of family archives. On the former count, Gustav Parthey used the diminutive "Luischen" when remembering Luise, his family's servant of fifty-four years, who was even allowed to take part in the memory rituals of the family. They gave her a small celebration for her fiftieth anniversary in their service that included giving her the gift of a portrait that Parthey claimed he still had in his collection when he wrote his memoir late in life.<sup>30</sup> Servants could achieve quasi-familial status in only a minority of cases; most go unmentioned in the accounts of their employers, invisible and forgotten.

Although practical considerations prompted the division between the "front-stage" and "backstage" parts of the home, family rituals could add a more emotional meaning to certain domestic spaces. For example, bourgeois memoirists almost universally speak of the transformation of one of the home's rooms into a "Christmas room" during the holiday season. Parents marked off this space before Christmas and did not allow their children to see it until they unveiled the illuminated Christmas tree to them on Christmas Eve. The rituals involved with the conversion of the ordinary household space into ritual space not only heightened the meaning of said space but also drew their power from preexisting ways of seeing the home that sacralized domestic space. The rules surrounding the Christmas room could be integrated into the quotidian taboos of domestic space, such as those surrounding the father's study, the kitchen, or the "good room."

Other important family rituals took place in the living room, although not always with the same taboos associated with the Christmas room. Before the advent of the ornate white wedding at about the turn of the twentieth century, families held weddings in the home and staged the other important milestone rituals there. The home hosted birthdays, anniversaries, and postconfirmation celebrations, not to mention Sunday family gatherings. Most of the bourgeois family's intricate rituals occurred within the bounded space of the home, usually in the living room. Using the home for family rituals helped imbue its spaces with memory because rituals were engines of memory.<sup>31</sup> Bourgeois families very self-consciously created mementoes for the future as part of these rituals. They generated wedding programs full of special poetry, wrote of holidays and rituals in family chronicles, and generally intended to

shape an idyllic past for future use. In that process, the home would be remembered as the sacred site of all the well-remembered rituals and holidays and be filled with mementoes, talismans against oblivion.

### FILLING THE HOME WITH MEMORY

Reminders of the family past were ubiquitous in bourgeois homes. Middle-class families, in their attempts to be “at home” in their domestic environments, festooned their walls with family photographs and portraits, put family heirlooms on display, and sat in furniture that had adorned the homes of their ancestors. The home, like no other space, became the repository for memory, a node of preservation in a world in flux. According to the reigning domestic ideology, the home provided refuge and solace from the stresses of the outside world. The home’s warehouse of memory created a sense of continuity and tranquility that reinforced the domestic ideology’s definitions of home life. Of course, such attitudes did not reflect the realities of unhappy families, repressed emotions, and gender inequality, but the families “we live by” are just as important to understand as “the families we live with.”<sup>32</sup>

Heirlooms and other family historical relics embodied the past and could give a comforting sense of continuity in the present, a comfort consciously acknowledged by bourgeois home dwellers, for many heirlooms provided a tangible, material link to pasts that lacked strong associations in memory. Portraits constituted an especially important way of remembering bygone ancestors. The practice of commissioning and keeping portraits, like genealogy and many other aspects of bourgeois memory, originated in the aristocracy.<sup>33</sup> Despite that provenance, middle-class families used portraits in their own ways and powerfully embodied memory in them. A portrait’s display kept its subject’s memory alive in the home; portraits connected far-flung relatives and preserved the images and memories of the deceased.

Photography preserves memory, even (or especially) if by its very nature it replaces remembered experiences with a counter-memory verified by its materiality.<sup>34</sup> Families used photographs to hold onto idealized pictures that obscured as much as they revealed. Still, the immediacy of photographs made them puissant reminders of the past, ones inescapably located in a particular time and place. In the evocative terminology of Roland Barthes, early cameras were “clocks for seeing.”<sup>35</sup> Through its unique ability to register the passing of time and its relative accessibility, photography allows tactile contact with the family past. In the words of Annette Kuhn, “Family photographs are about memory and memories: that is, they are about stories of a past, shared (both stories and past) by a group of people that in the moment of sharing produces itself as a family.”<sup>36</sup> Families thus create themselves through memory practices like photography; by defining their memory, they define themselves. The quest for self-definition driving family photography permeated domestic practices from holidays to interior decoration.

Because of its need to create a narrative for individual families, contemporary family photography is typified by snapshots “solemnizing and immortalizing the high points of family life,”<sup>37</sup> which are then placed in albums to tell the family’s narrative, or at least the image the family would like to have about itself. The amateur art of photo albums so common today did not arise until after George Eastman’s Kodak camera went on sale in 1888,<sup>38</sup> and it did not achieve widespread popularity in Germany until after the turn of the twentieth century. Before that time, family photographs came from



professionals and had a much more formal quality about them that made their presence on the wall even more authoritative in shaping an ideal image. In that way, photographs fulfilled a similar function as the painted portraits that had preceded them. Family portraits displayed in prominent domestic spaces demonstrated above all that people lived in their homes alongside their memories of others.

An example from the Schulz family of Bremen illustrates the ways that families used portraits. The 1895 diary of adolescent student Paul Schulz tells of the death of his sixty-three-year-old father in September, after which he, his siblings, and his mournfully depressed mother made several visits to the cemetery. On the day of the funeral, young Paul took a leaf from near his father's grave as a "memory" of the day, and later often mentioned his desire to preserve his father's memory. He and his brother acted on this desire by commissioning a pencil-drawn version of one of their father's photographs. They kept the new portrait secret from their mother and gave it to her for Christmas that year.<sup>39</sup> Eventually, the family hung the portrait in a prominent place next to a living room window, where it was easy to see. Paul commented in his diary, "Every time I go through the room I stay and stand before the picture, and each time I feel better."<sup>40</sup> By purchasing the new portrait of his father for his mother,<sup>41</sup> and through his mother's display of it, the Schulz family took the memory of their paterfamilias and cast it into material form. The ability of photographs to capture the presence of a deceased loved one was in fact a general and wide-ranging appeal of photography.<sup>42</sup> If Schulz's father could no longer live inside of the family home, then at least his memory could still reside there.

Indeed, because the portraits on its walls marked the changes throughout time in the family, the home became in a very literal sense its archive. Bourgeois children grew up looking at the faces of those who came before them, even ancestors who they had not had the chance to know personally. A childhood memoir written for the popular "family paper" *Daheim* in 1874 recalled,

I also at least got to know my great-grandparents through pictures. In the somewhat dim and musty guest room with the double bed and half-blinded gold-framed mirror, facing the courtyard and garden, hung two large oil paintings of my great-grandfather . . . and his wife.<sup>43</sup>

The description of the great-grandparents' faces that followed reflected the many hours spent by the author gazing on the visual relics of his family's past. We also get a sense of the hierarchy of memory within the home from this passage and the ways in which the passage of time forces some memories to be marginalized. Relatives who pass out of living memory, like those described in the *Daheim* piece, have their memories deposited in more marginal places in the home, such as the guest bedroom. The middle class certainly preserved its family past, but mostly that which lay within living memory. It is a good reminder that memory does not exist without forgetting, and the accumulation of new artifacts meant the tossing out of the old.

Through the association of his great-grandparents' faces with a particular "dim" and "musty" household space, the article only reinforced the connection between domestic space and memory. The ordinary guest bedroom, despite being far from the center of the home, nevertheless achieved significance in the home because of the memory stored there. Soon, though, new portraits would replace those of his great-grandparents, once their memory no longer held importance for the oldest generation in the home.

Although portraits sought to engender feelings of continuity and the notion that one was a link in a long ancestral chain, that chain usually stretched only three generations. In a sense, the dusty backroom with portraits on the wall became the place where the memory of the grandparents “lived,” and like people memories too must eventually perish. Regardless of the turnover of generations, portraits continually reminded home dwellers of their family identity, creating it through a sense of a shared past.

With motives similar to the display of portraits, bourgeois families collected mementoes from past generations. Collecting became an increasingly popular pursuit in the course of the nineteenth century,<sup>44</sup> a manifestation of the larger popularity of the past in Germany marked by the popularity of written histories, museums, and public monuments.<sup>45</sup> According to an 1867 article in *Daheim*, the hobby held an interest “for people who give full appreciation to the *Zeitgeist*, but who nevertheless have an unbounded sympathy for ‘that which is lost’ [*Verflossene*].”<sup>46</sup> The interest in recovering lost worlds mentioned in terms of autograph hunters in this particular article drove all collectors in their tasks, giving their artifacts added resonance beyond mere curiosity value. The “unbounded sympathy” for “that which is lost” that motivated collectors showed how collectibles ascribed memorial meaning to material objects.<sup>47</sup>

Although many collected stamps, curiosities, and autographs, the collection and preservation of family mementoes carried the most significant emotional weight due to its greater emotional resonance. Furthermore, as economic and social forces literally pushed extended families farther apart, the portraits, mementoes, and heirlooms saved and collected by the middle class took on greater meaning, tenuously linking relatives living in faraway places.<sup>48</sup> Emigrants often sent photographs of themselves over the oceans to their families as Christmas gifts, in effect allowing for their physical presence at Yuletide family gatherings through their image. Like family photographs, heirlooms covered the walls of the home, sat in glass-encased cabinets, and could serve important purposes in domestic rituals.

Used in rituals and preserved from oblivion, heirlooms could be transformed into literal relics of the home’s religious cult. An anonymous southern German related his memoirs in a series of articles appearing in *Daheim* in 1874, and talked of his memories of his favorite aunt, a young and vivacious woman who had died at the young age of twenty-two. In his sorrow, the author kept her memory alive through material remnants of her life:

I dedicated myself to her as a protective spirit of what became an obsessive cult, but by no means doing any damage to my developing personality. I preserved a lock of her brown hair, cut off after her death and bound in blue silk as a valuable relic, which I still possess today.<sup>49</sup>

Treating his beloved aunt like a saint, he remembered her by assembling a reliquary, illustrating the apt nature of his “cult” metaphor. Relics forged a physical link to the deceased, which was probably why the practice of saving the hair of dead loved ones was quite common in Great Britain as well as Germany at the time.<sup>50</sup> The elements of the sacred present in the rituals practiced in the home and in the protection of their attendant relics thus extended to the very contents and furnishings of the home themselves. Sacralizing the home provided a sense of comfort and safety in its environs: one could look around the walls and corners and see evidence of one’s place in a longer, continuous family story.

As part of the sacralization of the home, everyday items like furniture and books often took on a more spiritual quality. A wonderfully deep description of the use and meaning of family heirlooms and furniture that illustrates the transference of materiality into meaning comes from the childhood memoir of the great German novelist Theodor Fontane, written near the end of his life. He wrote at length on his father's office, detailing the furniture, especially the secretary where he used to write and the sofa where his father would rest. The space, and especially that surrounding the secretary "of the most bourgeois quality," fascinated young Theodor, perhaps because he was forbidden from "disturbing" his father,<sup>51</sup> giving meaning to the office through its taboos. A painting and a wall clock, both handed down through the family, hung above the sofa, the one location where his father could rest undisturbed. In the painting, "a piece of splendor [*Prachtstueck*] from my grandfather's inheritance," his grandfather had copied from the "well known picture from the painter Cunningham" of Friedrich the Great with his generals at Sans Souci, the king's summer palace in Potsdam. Fontane remembered his obsession with the painting and the hours he spent looking at it even after decades of distance.

The wall clock of his father's study received less youthful study but was still part of his life: "This wall clock is now in my possession, both my grandfather and father died by its clang, and I will do the same."<sup>52</sup> Fontane seemed to have treasured the clock because it gave him a sense of rootedness, the same feeling of certainty that motivated all kinds of family memory activity. Fontane's intention to pass out of his life with the same clock that accompanied his father and grandfather to the ends of theirs thus illustrates the feelings of continuity and security sparked by heirlooms. That bourgeois quest for stability, so well embodied by Fontane's wall clock, permeated family memory as a whole. Innumerable others in Fontane's time acted on the same impulses for continuity through securing connections to their family past in the form of heirlooms and mementoes.

Books were passed down from one generation to the next, commensurate with the bourgeois passion for literacy and cultivation. One could easily characterize family and *Bildung* as the two most sacred ideas of the middle class, and the two certainly intertwined. Parents read aloud to their children, and they took them to symphonies, theaters, museums, art galleries, and the opera, the ornate summit of bourgeois artistic appreciation.<sup>53</sup> Parents tried to cultivate their children through dance lessons and music lessons, and by hosting language societies to help them learn English, French, Latin, and Italian. The most important conveyors of the sacred value of *Bildung*, books could easily take on a commemorative value.

More than the mere means to cultivation, books could embody the memory of their former owners. A scene from Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* vividly conceived the connection between books and memory. One of Stifter's characters, Matilde, a widowed mother, decides to give her son Gustav her volumes of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's collected works, a ubiquitous accoutrement in respectable bourgeois homes of the time. In a novel in which Stifter wove together the twin bourgeois values of family and *Bildung*, the books signified the family's importance in transmitting culture. Because culture and family are so intertwined, the books are intended to be mementoes as well as instruments for cultivation. Matilde tells her son that because "you already live away from me and will probably be even further away in the future," she wants to give him her books as a memento. They will not only educate but also spur memory:

Whenever you read these books, you will be reading the words of the author as well as the heart of your mother. . . . In the future when I read passages I have underlined [in her new edition], I shall think: here he will remember his mother; when my eyes look over pages where I had made comments in the margin, your eyes will hover before me. . . . Thus, the books will always be a bond between us wherever we may be.<sup>54</sup>

Her emphasis on the physical distance between her and her son, and on a future in which they will have even less contact with each other, explicitly connects the conflicting demands of modern mobility and family memory. Reacting to this distance, she desires “a bond between us wherever we may be.” Like those who sent photographs of themselves overseas to their distant families, Matilde wants to give a physical reminder of her presence. Family memory could thus transform fairly ordinary objects into relics and material reminders of loved ones who must be separated by distance.

The very furnishings of the home, including the shelves and cases holding Stifter’s enchanted books, evoked memories. Even seemingly mundane, utilitarian items like curtains could be invested with commemorative meaning. For example, Bremen widow Engel Marie Thiermann, writing in her 1850 diary, noted how her summer curtains could recall the past:

Today the curtains given for my wedding forty years ago and knitted by my cousin, have been put up in the living room and the room next to it, they look as good as new. If I only look into them, each time my Hermann’s [her deceased husband] eyes live again too, and the same [curtains] decorated the room for Johann’s [her son’s] baptism.<sup>55</sup>

The curtains, woven by family members, given for her wedding, and present at important events in the history of the home, conjured up the past and allowed her to relive the baptism of her son and the time when her husband was still alive. In this manner, the home functioned as a domestic archive where the past lived along with the present and inspired memory. Although it is tempting to think that stuffy bourgeois interiors embodied consumerism above all else, Thiermann’s curtain-inspired memories reveal meaning that eclipsed any presentation or consumer value associated with them.

Similarly, the very furniture of the home marked time and referenced the past. Middle-class writers, both public and private, ascribed personalities to household furniture and ascribed the capacity to literally tell stories about the past. In doggerel poetry intended for family consumption, bourgeois authors spoke in the voice of furniture, giving sofas and desks their own personalities. One good example comes from the hand of the Hamburg bourgeois Ernst Wegener. It praised the place where the children had learned Greek and Latin, where he had celebrated his own engagement meal, and where guests came to meet and talk. It begins,

I know a table in this house,  
if it could tell and sing,  
it would make a thick volume of history,  
and much would sound in your ears.<sup>56</sup>

In his portrayal, the table told the history of the home, and through relating its story, Wegener narrated the life of the family. The personalization of the table, giving it the ability to sing and tell history, speaks to the levels of meaning given to household furnishings by the German middle class. In fact, it was quite common for people in

the nineteenth century to ascribe personalities and storytelling abilities to furniture, which served to “cultivate unique associations which told about their past and their interests, creating as they did the private lifetime of the family.”<sup>57</sup> Ernst Wegener’s poem fit that schematic, personalizing furniture so that it can attest to family history. Written in the guest book of the Kippenberg home in Bremen, Wegener intended that the poem be a memento of his visit. Memory mediated domesticity through its ability to transform the home from a mere living space to a landscape containing reminders of the family’s history. Bourgeois individuals seeking security and comfort in the private realm found it by forging a link to the past.

The desire to house the family past in the home found expression in furniture designed to display artifacts and relics. Cabinets intended for this purpose appeared in guides to home furnishing in the 1880s<sup>58</sup> and in contemporary accounts. A serialized childhood memoir from *Daheim* tells of the fascination such collections could have for children:

What wonderful treasures Grandpa kept in his high, heavy, old-fashioned commode, which stood in this room [the living room]! There were big shimmering mother-of-pearl shells, colored sea mussels, color-stained cups, tea sets with Chinese figurines, a fruit fork with a golden sound. If the old man was in a good mood, he would let me see something from this secret treasure.<sup>59</sup>

The story attested to the fetishizing of and fascination with relics, which provided a tactile connection to former times. The “treasures” described by the author, splendorous in themselves, carried with them the added meaning of family continuity, especially in the case of items owned by grandparents, the figures most connected to the family past. By displaying such objects in glass cabinets, bourgeois subjects could have comforting reminders of their place as links in a familial chain, much in the same way that family portraits visualized one’s progenitors.

To achieve the link to the family past and its comforting feeling of continuity and security, families preserved documents and objects alike. Meticulously stored and organized, the contents of bourgeois cabinets archived the history of the home. For example, Anne Stockfleth’s memoir described her father’s cabinet, which contained silhouettes he had taken down while he was younger, plus a collection of all of the calling cards left by visitors to the house.<sup>60</sup> The organized collection of calling cards constituted an archive of the house’s past, although it had more the enchantment of a tabernacle than the grayness of a file cabinet. Like family portraits and heirlooms, the calling card archive acknowledged the family to be a historical entity and imparted a sense of stability to people in the present by making the family past legible. One could flip through the files, feel a connection to the past, and be comforted that their own memory would be passed on.

Because it typically housed archival material, no piece of furniture had the memorial significance of the secretary. It held the important papers of the home, most importantly the correspondence. That correspondence, collected and organized, could tell its own stories about the family and the past. Rituals like Christmas and birthdays produced letters saved for the future so that they would be mementos of times past; weddings generated poetry and humor meant to preserve the memory of the day forevermore. Like the collection of calling cards described by Stockfleth, the boxes of letters saved in the secretary recorded the family’s history in a rigorously archival fashion.

A literary example courtesy of Thomas Mann's famous novel of family decline, *Buddenbrooks*, illustrates the practical and symbolic uses of the secretary. At a crucial point in the story, Tony, daughter of the Buddenbrook family, was asked to marry Gruehnlich, an altogether distasteful man with whom she has little in common. While contemplating the choice, she went into her father's desk and took out his family chronicle, which contained all the important dates in the family's history. Her encounter with her family's past changed her mind about the marriage:

She felt in awe of herself; the old, familiar feeling of her personal importance coursed through her, but heightened now by the spirit of what she had just read; she almost shuddered at the thrill. "Links in a chain," Papa had written. Yes, yes! And as a link in that chain, she had a higher, more responsible importance; she was called to help shape, by deeds and personal resolve, the history of her family.<sup>61</sup>

Not only is this a good example of how the history of the family was maintained within the home, it also displays how powerful the sense of continuity imparted by family memory could be.

Fictional as well as flesh-and-blood families thus stored and maintained their documents to maintain links with the past. More than anything else, the use of the secretary points to a very literal interpretation of the home as archive, and in the example of Tony Buddenbrooks, we see how these archives could be used in the present.

### REMEMBERING THE HOME

The German middle class sculpted their homes into living memorials of the family past. Family portraits decorated their walls, and home dwellers sat in furniture handed down through the generations, read books owned by their predecessors, and, in the case of Theodor Fontane, comforted themselves in the knowledge that they would die hearing the tick-tock of the same clock that had seen their ancestors to their graves. The association of the home with memory extended beyond interior design and drove men and women to write down dedications to domesticity. Personal memoirs, poetry albums, guest books, and the pages of family magazines abounded with fond recollections of home. Most often associated with childhood, these various genres of memory all sought to recapture a lost world, an endeavor indicative of the unique place held by the home in the bourgeois mind. Memoirists, affected by the contemporary concerns over loss, fixated on the home as the one place where the dislocations and disruptions of the world could be resolved by comfort and security.<sup>62</sup> Adults looked back nostalgically for the childhood home and its attendant protections. The conflation of domestic life with childhood in the literature memorializing the home is hardly coincidental; the German middle class idealized both the home and childhood. Childhood was innocent and happy, and the home a paradise on earth, regardless of more stark realities. The nostalgia-laden accounts of home do not reflect an anguished longing for childhood; they performed family. Memoirists writing for their families intended to pass down narratives shaped by the genre rules of family memory, whereas those writing within the genre of individual memory spoke of home more with the genuine language of loss.

Before we delve into the differences between individual and family in their constructions of the home, we ought to get a sense of the general template by which

“home” was constructed. The tendency to see the home as a place of shelter and sentiment can be found easily in the writings of adolescents in their *Poesiealben*, which translates literally into “poetry albums.” Friends of bourgeois adolescents typically filled them with quotations from famous poets like Goethe, Novalis, or Jean Paul, or in some cases they provided their own verse dedicated to the album’s owner. The themes almost always tend toward memory and loss, and are a good place to find constructions of the domestic. An 1871 entry in the poetry album of the teenaged Antonia Fritzsche living in Frankfurt am Oder expressed a typical picture of the sentimental attachments to home and childhood.<sup>63</sup> Written by her friend Regina, the poem “Father’s House” tells the story of a young man who has left the home of his birth to go “to a foreign land” and looks back to his home longingly:

And we found it painful to take  
The last look on our dear home  
You, house of youth’s sweet hours,  
We pull away from you sadly.

Like other writing on domestic life, the poem associated home with childhood, when one had experienced “youth’s sweet hours.” These hours of youth must not be forgotten, and the memories of the home take on a sustaining quality in a later stanza:

O! Submerge me forevermore  
Sweet rapturous time of bloom  
O! Sweep away nothing more  
From me, forgetfulness!

The childhood home, which has formed and nourished the narrator, must never be forgotten by him. He desires to be thrown back into the past, to be drowned by it, to return to the home that represents all of his childhood happiness. *Poesiealben* abound with similar poems that praised the home’s refuge and sanctity, connecting the sweetness of home to that of childhood. Adolescents writing in poetry albums intended to preserve the feelings of the past for the future, essentially to offer a ready-made idyllic childhood. By reading the poem later in life, the album’s keeper could use it to think about her own family home and the “sweet rapturous time” spent there. The basic schematic of home and memory in this poem, from its associations with an idealized childhood to the home’s formative role, dominates other memories of home, especially within the extensive memoir writing of the time. Those themes fit well within the general nature of family ideology and family memory, both of which represented domestic life in an idyllic fashion.

Such unproblematic attitudes about domestic life ought to be contrasted with the strong feelings of loss registered by Louise Solmitz, a sixteen year old from Hamburg attending school in France in 1905. While there, she received the news from her parents in a letter that they were moving from their home. This turn of events deeply shocked young Louise, whose diary had already contained many expressions of extreme homesickness, longing for her parents, and despair at her current environment. In large capital letters, she underlined,

We have moved from Stiftstrasse Nr. 20. Is it possible? Oh, I could and can not believe it!!!  
Today I received this unbelievable news from my dear mother!!! Moved! Gone. . . .  
From that which provided me my golden childhood years. . . . No, no!<sup>64</sup>

Referring to her native Hamburg, Solmitz wrote, "I do not wish to go back" later in the entry, expressing her attachment to home and the sorrow over never being able to return to it. Already dislocated from home through her time in France, the lack of the familiar domestic life to return to seems almost too much for her to bear. Here is but one example of how the centrality of the home in the bourgeois emotional universe could be expressed in the most anguished terms, and how the lip service paid to "home sweet home" had genuine feelings attached to it.

Those feelings might find intense expression in the private practice of diary keeping, but written memories intended for posterity constructed a more pleasant narrative. Instead of loss, they dwelled on the happiness of the childhood home, especially in memoirs written with a family audience in mind. The nineteenth century saw an explosion in autobiographies and memoirs, and many thoroughly nonfamous middle-class authors wrote and printed the stories of their lives. It was a time

swamped with unremarkable self-revelations. Literally thousands wrote them, men and women with no claim to fame of any kind. They left their memoirs moldering in attics or buried in local archives, or asked a job printer to make an unpretentious book.<sup>65</sup>

These legions of amateur memoirists usually claimed that their families had asked to know of their younger lives or that they wished to pass on the experience and wisdom of their lives for their posterity. They wrote most extensively on childhood and their childhood homes, but did so not motivated by loss but by family memory's quest to emphasize continuity through the performance of the family idyll.

Idealized visions permeated writing on childhood in the nineteenth century; writers continually characterized it as the *Kindheitsparadies* (paradise of childhood). Bourgeois memoirists repeated the sentiments of Antonia Fritzsche's *Poesiealbum* that crafted a highly nostalgic vision of the childhood home. One of Anne Stockfleth's memoirs from her 1880s Hamburg childhood included such a reverie:

There are many ways to God: one of them goes through the family home. And the most beautiful, that this beautiful World has to offer, belongs to a happy family life. . . . [Y]ears as carefree and joyful as those in the Eppendorfer Chausee [the street of her childhood home] can no longer exist, and what the memory from them has preserved, can be found loyally rendered here.<sup>66</sup>

Stockfleth commemorated her childhood's bygone pleasures from a time full of boundless happiness, transforming her childhood home into an earthly paradise. Her expressions of nostalgia seem indicative of loss on the surface, but in reality they repeated the pieties of family rather than individual anguish. The genre of family memory relied on the repetition of comedic tropes, and that repetition would mark bourgeois memories of home and childhood intended for a family audience. In doing so, memories reinforced feelings of order and stability in a changing modern world.

Despite the diversity of the opinions, backgrounds, and occupations held by the hordes of amateur memoirists, all of them spent significant time describing the home's inner workings and rituals. To set the scene for the domestic theater, almost all memoirs contained a descriptive mapping of the home. They wrote thickly detailed portraits of the layout of the different rooms, cataloging their furnishings along the way. They tended to think of their parents' homes both in terms of refuge and in terms of *Bildung*, perhaps the reason why many memoirists wrote only on



their childhood. By detailing their early lives, they had in effect laid out the basis of their future, adult selves. Carolyn Steedman aptly explained the phenomenon: "The interiorized self, understood to be the product of a personal history, was most clearly expressed in the idea of 'childhood' and the idea of 'the child.'"<sup>67</sup> That notion, that childhood was the key to future development, motivated many to put down their memories of their youth. Some, like Fontane, who sought an end to his depression, undertook investigations into their pasts for psychiatric rather than sentimental reasons, but the idea that childhood laid the foundation of a person's nature in adulthood was always present. That sense of being formed by family within the home lent itself well to the genre of family memory, and especially its focus on the ability of family to provide security and continuity.

With the ideals of *Bildung* in mind, bourgeois autobiographers remembered the homes where they received the instruction and participated in the cultivation that formed them into the wise old figures capable of imparting their knowledge to younger generations. One memoirist told of her family's "school room," where she and her siblings did their schoolwork and "afterwards busied ourselves with collections," with her oldest brother acting as "chairman."<sup>68</sup> Johanne Kippenberg's memoir told similar anecdotes, and she even wrote of these formative experiences in her letters to her fiancé in 1864. In relating a conversation she had about her family with a fellow schoolteacher, she commented, "What an infinite influence parents have on their children, and what magic and charm lay in a happy family life."<sup>69</sup> The enchanted language of *charm* and *magic* as well as the positive words for her parents fit with the general impulse to idealize childhood and home.

Interestingly, most memoirs possess colorful descriptions of the homes of grandparents as well as the memoirists' childhood homes. As the oldest members of the family, the grandparents represented a link to a more distant past. Roles for grandparents had changed by the second half of the nineteenth century, and many fewer grandparents lived in the homes of their children and grandchildren. Although grandparents no longer occupied the same domestic space that their descendants did, the relationship between child and grandparent became invested with an unprecedented emotional meaning. With demographic trends leading to more children who had grandparents, they were able to grow up under their influence, reflected in grandparents' prominent place within bourgeois memoirs.<sup>70</sup>

In the memories of homes, the grandparents' house was often a slightly strange place with outmoded furnishings, but nevertheless was key to understanding the family past. Curt Neumann, for instance, claimed that his grandparents' house had a smell like no other, one imprinted on his memory but unable to be repeated,

That was quite a different kind of mix of scents, different from that which hung in Grandfather Neumann's tailor shop, or father's fur business. Eau de Cologne, fresh laundry, and cooking; peculiar, but not unpleasant. Yet this aroma gave the household its special mark, the household that I was never able to enter again. Alas!<sup>71</sup>

The anecdote of the odd smells of Neumann's grandparents' home fit with tendencies that imbued homes of grandparents with an air of mystery. Neumann's story, like others, gave domestic environments their own, unique characteristics. In fact, some accounts impart the nature of homes better than the nature of the people who lived within them.

Memoirists also lovingly recalled the special rituals and traditions associated with their visits to their grandparents, continuing many of the same tropes. For instance, a writer for *Daheim* remembered the feeling of peace he felt when his grandmother prayed over him during the first night of each visit:

Each bed-down, to which Grandma brought me on the first evening to comfort me, stayed, furthermore, a trusted nest for the softly settled, flightless little bird. How certain and safe I slept there in the early evening, after grandmother whispered “the reigning God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” in prayer over the children!<sup>72</sup>

Other accounts abounded with similar references to special rituals connected to the grandparents’ home, intensifying the connection between that home and memory. Like the parental home, the home of grandparents connoted not only refuge and safety but also a place that one connected to an even more remote family past. Residing with grandparents meant living among the oldest memories of the family past.

Surprisingly, when one considers the gulf between established gender roles at the time and the gendered nature of domestic space, men and women alike memorialized the home. Because, however, women had much more invested in the domestic realm in terms of their social status,<sup>73</sup> their praise of the home, and level of detail deployed in engaging with it in writing, was more intense than that of men. Although the memoirs of both men and women painted detailed portraits of the rooms and furniture, male memoirists eschewed the minute discussion of domestic space once they reach adulthood, whereas women richly described their adult homes in highly detailed terms. The importance of home for bourgeois women’s self-identity certainly played a part in this, as well as a male feeling that masculine concerns did not include obsession over the minutiae of domestic life. This is not to say that men did not retain strong attachments to home,<sup>74</sup> but their ascribed gender roles pushed them to concentrate on their professional and occupational achievements. Although men and women both invested the home with memory, women’s memories of home betray a richer sense of memory as something that can be stored in the physical space of the home.<sup>75</sup> Their confinement to the domestic sphere at the time certainly plays a large factor in the disparity.

In the nineteenth-century bourgeois world, one that Stefan Zweig aptly called “the Golden Age of Security,”<sup>76</sup> nothing represented security quite like the home. The special places of the home—filled with their knick-knacks invested with meaning, with some of the furnishings, like the father’s secretary, taking on the quality of a shrine—could not be merely replaced or replicated. Certainly, many did fill their homes to impress their neighbors or enjoy possessing fine objects, but these material things, and the spaces that contained them, held an importance that transcended consumerism.

Their homes are strange creatures in comparison to the contemporary world’s more rational and functional housing. As we have seen, the different gender roles ascribed to men and women at the time found their spatial embodiment in the organization of the home. Men had office spaces that were off-limits to other family members, and the kitchen and nursery were governed by women. The kitchen itself, placed in the back of the home away from its public functions, was almost always a place for domestic servants alone, who, although having varying levels of acceptance in bourgeois homes, nevertheless lived and worked in the “backstage” of the home. The elaborate separation of space and its resultant taboos certainly contributed to the power of domestic space to engender memory.

Families filled these homes with memory so that those in the present lived among reminders of the past. They put family portraits on display, saved and collected family heirlooms, passed down books and furniture through the generations, and carved out special places to house the historical materials of the family. The *Gute Stube*, which housed heirlooms, portraits, and mementos, was a museum; and the secretary full of family documents functioned like an archive. In these ways, the continuity and security sought by family memory sculpted domestic space.

The home became a safe harbor in countless bourgeois memoirs, letters, and scraps of doggerel poetry. Amateur memoirists and poets praised the homes of their parents, fondly remembering the site of their development and education. The homes of their grandparents were welcoming places where they could come into contact with the oldest living connections to the distant family past. Both home and childhood held to family memory's guidelines in memoirs, whereas more individual genres like the diary could betray a more anguished sense of loss underneath the idyllic veneer.

Memory functioned in the home in a quotidian fashion, a practice inseparable from the bourgeois living environment filled with portraits and souvenirs. Moreover, in the genre of family memory as a whole, the home imparted a sense of continuity and security. Although real homes may have experienced the strife and pain common to family life, memories of home idealized and sanitized through their useful narratives. These vernacular memory narratives allow a glimpse into the emotional universe of the nineteenth-century middle class and give further insight into the manifest symbolic and cultural power of "family" during that era. Furthermore, they display how the upheavals of modernity, both real and perceived, could prompt reactions and the need for comforting narratives in day-to-day life.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge Peter Fritzsche, Matti Bunzl, Harry Liebersohn, and Mark Steinberg for their invaluable advice and guidance. Also, I would like to thank Grace Coolidge and Jason Crouthamel for lending a critical eye to my manuscript. Most of all, I am grateful to Lori Perez for support, without which this may not have been possible.

### NOTES

1. Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1975), 231.
2. Katherine C. Grier, *Culture and Comfort: Parlor Making and Middle-Class Identity* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988), 10-12.
3. Joseph Perry, "The Private Life of the Nation: Christmas and the Invention of Modern Germany" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2001); and Gary Cross, "Just for Kids: How Holidays Became Child Centered," in *We Are What We Celebrate: Understanding Holidays and Rituals*, ed. Amitai Etzioni and Jared Bloom (New York: New York University Press, 2004).
4. Nancy R. Reagin, *Sweeping the German Nation: Domesticity and National Identity in Germany, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 49-71.
5. John Gillis, *A World of Their Own Making: Myth, Ritual, and the Quest for Family Values* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 114.
6. Eugene Rochberg-Halton, *Meaning and Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 184-86.

7. In the modern-day setting, a typical family photo album full of vacation, holiday, and birthday snapshots comes from the same impulse for an uncomplicated narrative of the family past. For an account of how snapshots became the twentieth-century mode for family memory, see Nancy Martin West, *Kodak and the Lens of Nostalgia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000), esp. ch. 5.

8. Exemplary works in the historiography of Germany include Rudy Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870-1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); and Ranier Kipper, *Der Germanenmythos im deutschen Kaiserreich: Formen und Funktionen historischer Selbstthematisierung* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000). For a recent, rich example in the American context, see Susan M. Stabile, *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in the Eighteenth Century* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004).

9. For two exceptions to this trend in German history, see Claudia Vorst, *Familie als Erzählkosmos: Phänomen und Bedeutung der Chronik* (Munster, Germany: Lit, 1995); and Miriam Gebhardt, *Das Familiengedächtnis: Erinnerung in deutschen-jüdischen Bürgertum 1890 bis 1932* (Stuttgart, Germany: F. Steiner, 1999).

10. David Warren Sabean, *Property, Production, and Family in Neckerhausen, 1700-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Mary S. Hartman, *The Household and the Making of History: A Subversive View of the Western Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Andreas Gestrich, *Geschichte der Familie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999); and Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Die deutsche Familie: Versuch einer Sozialgeschichte* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974).

11. Jonas Frykman and Orvar Löfgren, *Culture Builders: A Historical Anthropology of Middle-Class Life* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987).

12. Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home, and History in Late Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

13. For a good look at the housing reform movement, see Adelheid von Saldern, *Neues Wohnen: Wohnungspolitik und Wohnkultur im Hannover der Zwanziger Jahre* (Hannover, Germany: Stadtarchiv Hannover, 1993).

14. Donna Birdwell-Pheasant and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, "Introduction: Houses and Families in Europe," in *House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe*, ed. Donna Birdwell-Pheasant and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 4.

15. Frykman and Löfgren, *Culture Builders*, 127.

16. Inga Dryden and Janet Floyd, *Domestic Space: Reading the Nineteenth Century Interior* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999), 1.

17. Curt Neumann's childhood memoirs, Günther Neumann's Papers, file E. 200-20 Acc. 2253 #4, Landesarchiv Berlin.

18. Heidi Rosenbaum, "Die gute Stube, das war so'n Heiligtum: Zur Bedeutung der 'guten Stuben' in der Arbeiterschaft des beginnenden 20. Jahrhunderts," in *Altes und Neues Wohnen: Linden und Hannover im frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Sid Auffarth and Adelheid von Saldern (Hannover, Germany: Kallmeyersche, 1992), 49.

19. Barbara Mundt, *Historismus: Kunstwerk zwischen Biedermeier und Jugendstil* (Munich: Keyser'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981), 82.

20. Sybille Meyer, *Das Theater mit der Hausarbeit: Bürgerliche Repräsentation in der Familie Wilhelmschen Zeit* (Frankfurt: Corpus, 1982), 25.

21. Peter Gay, *Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle-Class Culture* (New York: Norton, 2002), 269.

22. Adalbert Stifter, *Indian Summer*, trans. Wendell Frye (New York: Peter Lang, 1985), 10.

23. For more on nurseries, see Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Die Kinderstube* (Frankfurt: Insel, 1991). These nurseries fit in with new ideas on childhood that emphasized the need for parents to provide children with light and space.

24. Moira Donald, "Safe Havens," in Dryden and Floyd, *Domestic Space*, 104.

25. Meyer, *Das Theater mit der Hausarbeit*, 92.
26. Birdwell-Pheasant and Lawrence-Zuniga, "Introduction," 16.
27. Heidi Rosenbaum, "Wohnen in Arbeiterquartier: Lindener Wohnverhältnisse um die Jahrhundertwende," in Auffarth and von Saldern, *Altes und Neues Wohnen*, 41.
28. Gunilla Frederiecke-Budde, *Auf Dem Weg ins Bürgerleben: Kindheit und Erziehung in deutschen und englischen Bürgerfamilien* (Göttingen, Germany: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 276.
29. Diary entry of Engel Marie Thiermann, 11 October 1851, Thiermann Family Papers, file 7,27,5, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.
30. Gustav Parthey, *Jugend-Erinnerungen. Handschrift fuer Freunde*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Berlin: private printing, 1907), 50-51.
31. I deal with the idea of rituals as "engines of memory" in the third chapter of my dissertation; see Jason Tebbe, "Domesticating Time: Family and Memory in the Nineteenth Century Middle Class" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 2006), 108-52.
32. Gillis, *A World of Their Own Making*, xvi.
33. For more on the aristocracy and memory, see Marcus Funck and Stephan Malinowski, "Masters of Memory: The Strategic Use of Autobiographical Memory by the German Nobility," in *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture*, ed. Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).
34. Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Noonday, 1981), 91.
35. *Ibid.*, 15.
36. Annette Kuhn, *Family Secrets: Acts of Memory and Imagination*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 2002), 22.
37. Pierre Bourdieu, *Photography: A Middle Brow Art* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 19.
38. Marianna Hirsch, *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 6.
39. This is yet another example of the confluence of Christmas and memory.
40. Diary entry of Paul Schulz, 26 December 1895, Brinkmann-Schulz Family Papers, file 7,161, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.
41. A small, wallet-sized copy of it still exists in the Schulz family archive.
42. Elizabeth Edwards, "Photographs as Objects of Memory," in *Material Memories: Design and Evocation*, ed. Marius Kwint, Christopher Breward, and Jeremy Aynsley (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 232.
43. "Jugenderinnerungen. Von einem süddeutschen Freunde des Daheim," *Daheim* 10, no. 16 (1874): 250.
44. Susan A. Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth Century Germany* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press), 7.
45. For more on the rise of historical consciousness, see *ibid.*
46. Bruno Krüger, "Die Börse der Unsterblichkeit," *Daheim* 3, no. 20 (1867): 296.
47. For more on this process, see Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 140.
48. For information on this phenomenon in the United States, see Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 165.
49. "Jugenderinnerungen. Von einem süddeutschen Freunde des Daheim," *Daheim* 10, no. 16 (1874): 487.
50. Marcia Pointon, "Materializing Mourning: Hair, Jewelry, and the Body," in Kwint, Breward, and Aynsley, *Material Memories*, 42.
51. Theodor Fontane, "Meine Kinderjahre," in *Gesammelte Werke in Vier Bänden* (Frankfurt: Sigbert Mohn, 1961), 49. In the recollections of childhood by adults, the secretary dominates discussions of furniture; it not only seems to represent the lodestone of the bourgeois activity needed

to provide for the family but also housed correspondence and other important family papers that had the greatest ability to call forth the past.

52. *Ibid.*, 51.

53. For more on bourgeois art appreciation, see Jürgen Kocka and Manuel Frey, eds., *Bürgerkultur und Mäzenatentum in 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Fanneit Walz, 1998).

54. Stifter, *Indian Summer*, 145.

55. Diary entry of Engel Marie Thiermann, 25 May 1850, Thiermann Family Papers, file 7,27,4, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.

56. Ernst Wegener's book of poetry, Kippenberg Family Papers, file 7,12,D,VII,2, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.

57. Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*, 190.

58. F. Schwenke, *Gründerzeit: Möbel und Zimmer-einrichtung* (Hannover, Germany: Schäfer, 1885).

59. "Jugenderinnerungen. Von einem süddeutschen Freunde des Daheim," *Daheim* 10, no. 16 (1874): 250.

60. Anne Stockfleth's memoir, file 622-1 Stockfleth,1, Hamburg Staatsarchiv.

61. Thomas Mann, *Buddenbrooks*, trans. John E. Woods (New York: Vintage, 1993), 155. Mann actually used texts such as this from his own family to write his novel; see Hugh Ridley, *Buddenbrooks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 10.

62. Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*, 180.

63. Antonia Fritzsche's poetry album, file E. 200-20, #2253, #1, Landesarchiv Berlin.

64. Diary entry of Louise Solmitz, 1 July 1905, file 622-1 Solmitz,1,Bd.1, Hamburg Staatsarchiv.

65. Peter Gay, *The Naked Heart* (New York: Norton, 1995), 109.

66. See note 60 above.

67. Carolyn Steedman, *Strange Dislocations: Childhood and the Idea of Human Interiority, 1780-1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 5.

68. Paula Hermann's memoir, file 7,500,43, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.

69. Letter from Johanne Kippenberg to August Kippenberg, 19 March 1864, file 7,12,D,II,2, Staatsarchiv Bremen, Germany.

70. Erhard Chvojka, *Geschichte des Großelternrollen vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003), 214-15.

71. See note 17 above.

72. "Jugenderinnerungen. Von einem süddeutschen Freunde des Daheim," *Daheim* 10, no. 16 (1874): 250.

73. See Reagin, *Sweeping the German Nation*; and Ann Taylor Allen, *Feminism and Motherhood in Germany, 1800-1914* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1991).

74. John Tosh has documented the convergence of domesticity and masculinity in the English context. John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999).

75. Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive*, 6.

76. Stefan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 1.