



Emotional Cities: Debates on Urban Change in Berlin and Cairo, 1860-1910

Joseph Ben Prestel

Print publication date: 2017

Print ISBN-13: 9780198797562

Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: September 2017

DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198797562.001.0001

Conclusion

Towards a Global History of Urban Change

Joseph Ben Prestel

DOI:10.1093/oso/9780198797562.003.0008

Abstract and Keywords

The conclusion argues that the study of debates on urban change in Berlin and Cairo reveals a parallel periodization in the history of these two cities. During the second half of the nineteenth century, contemporaries in both places moved from associating the transformation of these cities with shifting emotions to efforts of actively shaping the emotions of city dwellers through reform. The conclusion presents the argument that the prominence of emotions in these debates can be explained through their functionality as being both universal and adaptable to a local context. Drawing on this similarity, it calls for a reconsideration of regional categories in historical research on cities with a stronger focus on the role of empire, capitalism, and nationalism as components of a potentially global urban history.

Keywords: urban history, emotion, nineteenth century, Berlin, Cairo, empire, nationalism, capitalism

Today, portrayals of Berlin and Cairo do not dwell on the similarities between the two cities. With an estimated fifteen to twenty-five million inhabitants, the sprawling metropolis on the Nile has far outgrown the German capital with its population of around three and a half million. The comparatively much higher number of Cairo's inhabitants often leads authors to refer to the Egyptian capital as a prime example for the challenges of "mega cities" in the "Global South." With this divergence comes the representation of the city as a foreign, if not challenging experience for "Western" visitors. In the words of a recent German guidebook: "For Northern Europeans, Cairo is a metropolis that equally

fascinates and needs getting used to.”¹ Specific elements, such as the city’s traffic infrastructure, underpin this representation of difference in travel literature. History counts among these elements. In guidebooks, the passages about Cairo’s past mostly dwell on the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mameluke periods between the tenth and the fifteenth centuries. In comparison, the nineteenth century is depicted as an interlude, during which Muhammad Ali and Ismail began to “open” the country to “the West.”² Behind this narrative lies the idea that the true essence of Cairo can be found in its “Islamic” past. From this perspective, the changes that occurred during the nineteenth century only represent a kind of deviation from a history that was shaped by Islamic civilization. Travel literature thus resonates with urban history scholarship that is predicated on a clear-cut difference between Europe and the Middle East. Here too, the nineteenth-century history of Cairo appears as a process of “Westernization”—an effort to copy the urban achievements of Europe that diverged from the “Islamic” past of the city.³

The present book has suggested a different look at urban change during the nineteenth century. By comparing debates about the transformation of Berlin and Cairo, the preceding chapters have highlighted the limitations of a strict separation of urban history into “European” and “Middle Eastern” compartments. Once historians look beyond these labels, parallel processes in the two cities come into view. Between 1860 and 1910, contemporaries in Berlin and Cairo shared **(p.190)** increasingly corresponding ideas about the effect of the two capitals on their inhabitants. The notion of specifically urban emotions became common in both settings. This observation sheds light on a different story about cities during the nineteenth century in which the histories of two cities, which scholars have treated as being part of two separate civilizations, begin to talk to each other—more and more so as the nineteenth century came to a close.

This finding resonates with arguments of scholars of global history, who have stressed increasing similarities and parallels in far-distant places as a result of the growing long-distance connections in the nineteenth century.⁴ It is in this context that the concluding pages of this book widen the analytical frame. Here, I turn to the implications of the preceding chapters for a global history of urban change during the nineteenth century. The comparison between Berlin and Cairo has shown three central aspects of such a history: parallel processes, particular universalisms in a connecting world, and difference as an effect of connection. Considering these three aspects in detail highlights the new vista that beckons once scholars reconsider urban history’s regional compartmentalization.

Parallel Processes

The remarkable similarities between arguments in Berlin and Cairo bring out a parallel periodization. In the 1860s and 1870s, the question of urban change became a topic of contentious debates in both places. Contemporaries began to

increasingly discuss the effects of the cities' transformation on the emotions of their inhabitants during this period. While a number of authors in Berlin stressed the danger of losing a shared feeling for morality, journalists and government clerks in Cairo painted a somewhat more optimistic picture. These members of the middle class in the Egyptian capital highlighted positive consequences of the changing city for male rationality. Portrayals of urban change in the two cities took on a gloomy tone between the 1870s and the turn of the twentieth century. A host of printed publications in Berlin and Cairo argued that the transformation of these cities risked making men lose control over their emotions. In both cases, the concern about a loss of control was tied to the rise of new neighborhoods of entertainment: the Azbakiyya neighborhood in Cairo and the area around Friedrichstraße in Berlin. Out of these arguments emerged reform projects that sought to change the cityscape as well as city dwellers' feelings through suburbs and physical exercise. Beginning in the 1890s, these reform projects spread in both cities. Debates about urban emotions thus became manifest in brick and stone, as new neighborhoods started to mushroom around the Egyptian and the German capital. This last phase marked the beginning of a process that reached well into the 1920s, when suburbs and sports still flourished as a means of individual reform in the two places.⁵

(p.191) With this parallel periodization it becomes clear that debates about the transformation of Berlin and Cairo followed a corresponding trajectory. Were these debates therefore simultaneous? The question of simultaneity is, of course, fraught. What does "at the same time" mean? Some authors had already pointed to a simultaneity between Berlin and Cairo in their travelogues around 1900. This was the case with those travel writers who likened Helwan to Potsdam.⁶ Others, like the German missionary Carl Seher, saw similar activities in the centers of the two cities. Seher noted in 1902: "Commerce and trade provide the most colorful life. On Cairo's main streets is a life just like in Berlin on Friedrichstraße."⁷ Yet contemporary descriptions that presented Berlin and Cairo as similar were the exception rather than the rule. It was the insistence on a temporal difference that became a central component of European representations of the Egyptian capital. At the end of the nineteenth century, travelogues, guidebooks, and newspaper articles were rife with depictions of the city's "backwardness" or its "medieval" character.⁸ These depictions were intimately bound up in imperial projects. Here, the temporal "backwardness" of non-European people and their cities justified colonialism as a project that spread progress all over the world.⁹ The civilizing mission was reflected in the distinction between the "modern" European and the "traditional" Middle Eastern city. Portrayals of temporal difference, in other words, have often been politically charged. It only makes sense that historians tread carefully. What complicates the concept of simultaneity further is the fact that historians use it in different ways. Scholars who work on the impact of the telegraph during the

nineteenth century, for instance, can be interested in a simultaneity that is measured in minutes or even seconds.¹⁰ When writing about social history, however, scholars tend to measure simultaneity in years and decades rather than minutes.

These caveats illustrate that claims about simultaneity are always combined with a specific argument. Put differently, the question whether simultaneity is measured in seconds or decades depends on the research interest. A focus on temporal difference that is counted in days, months, or years has been a fundamental component of narratives that portray Middle Eastern and European urban history during the nineteenth century as two separate stories. What matters here is the date on which a certain technology was first introduced into the urban realm, a month in which a specific city planning campaign was conceived, or a year in which a **(p.192)** particular change was introduced into urban governance.¹¹ In this book, I have suggested that a shift away from the question of origins towards the negotiation of urban change provides a different vista on urban history. Neither in Berlin, nor in Cairo did debates about the effects of urban change evolve by the day or by the month. Years and decades provide a more fitting temporal framework for looking at these phenomena. Ultimately, it is this wider temporal framework that shows how the history of the two cities followed a parallel trajectory rather than two temporally diverging “paths of development.”

The observation of simultaneity eventually raises new questions and opens up fresh avenues for inquiry. One of these avenues concerns the history of suburbs. A number of scholars have described the spread of suburbs in various cities during the second half of the nineteenth century. Research interested in the origins of this development might seek to track down the first of this kind of suburb. Looking at suburbs in the context of a social negotiation of urban change, however, shifts the research interest. From the perspective of a wider temporal framework, it becomes obvious that suburbs flourished around the same time not only in Berlin and Cairo, but also in Bombay, New York, Tokyo, and other cities.¹² The debates presented in Chapters 5 and 6 further illustrate how a more global urban history can point to an explanation for the emergence of these projects. It was the common currency of a negative impact of urban change that made the success of suburbs in Berlin and Cairo possible. To be sure, arguments about emotions were not the only driving factor in this process. The examples from the German and the Egyptian capital show that other elements such as rail infrastructure and a dynamic real estate market also played pivotal roles. Yet the creation and propagation of suburbs in Berlin and Cairo would have taken on a very different form if it had not been for the shared understanding of cities’ detrimental influence on their inhabitants.

Transfers between cities contributed to this shared understanding. In fact, the circulation of knowledge marked all three of the phases mentioned in the periodization above. While transfers were not the driving factor behind the parallel historical trajectory of Berlin and Cairo, they were an important reason for the similar content of arguments about urban change in the two cities. At the turn of the twentieth century, for instance, contemporaries in both places discussed English cities as examples for the creation and potential benefits of suburbs.¹³ **(p.193)** Likely the most important transfers for the concept of urban emotions happened in the realm of knowledge about feelings. During the second half of the nineteenth century, actors in Berlin and Cairo increasingly drew on findings from the natural sciences, in particular medicine, psychology, and neurology, when writing about emotions. These sciences were part of a highly internationalized knowledge that traveled easily between cities. But does the observation of transfers not imply a return to the question of origins? The preceding chapters have shown that these kinds of transfers had little to do with a process of copying or diffusion from one place to the other. Transfers between cities were highly selective, multidirectional, and flexible. They often resembled an act of innovation as much as an act of appropriation. Contemporaries in Berlin and Cairo adapted and mixed models for urban planning, practices in nightlife, or scientific knowledge with other influences. The concept of rationality in turn-of-the-century Cairo, for instance, had not just a single origin. English, French, German, and Arabic books on medicine and physiology accounted partially for this concept. At the same time, it also proceeded from Arabic and Islamic philosophy, and, probably most importantly, the argumentative twist that authors gave to these different elements.¹⁴ While it therefore does not fit into a narrative of origins, the circulation of knowledge can give an explanation for the specific content of certain debates.

This, however, leaves the question why these debates occurred in two different places. Clearly not every kind of knowledge traveled—a fact that the historian Samuel Moyn has fittingly called the non-globalization of ideas.¹⁵ The discussion of folk psychology, for instance, remained mostly centered on Berlin, just as debates about professional mourners were more prominent in the Egyptian than the Prussian capital. Transfers therefore raise the question why particular arguments circulated. Why did contemporaries in Berlin and Cairo draw on emotions in their debates about urban change? What made knowledge about emotions a kind of knowledge that traveled?

Particular Universalisms in a Connecting World

A possible explanation for the similar prominence of emotions in debates about urban change could lie in city dwellers' shared experience. David Harvey and others have suggested that a specific urban experience emerged in tandem with the rise of "modernity" and capitalism during the nineteenth century.¹⁶ From this perspective, the similar arguments about emotions in Berlin and Cairo would simply reflect the similarities in the ways in which city dwellers

experienced urban space. This **(p.194)** approach risks, however, relying on a pre-social or prelinguistic concept of experience and emotions. The preceding chapters have illustrated that concepts and knowledge about emotions were central for contemporary descriptions of the effects of urban space. Concepts such as *Sitte* and *'aql* were not fixed in time and changed between the 1860s and the turn of the twentieth century. But how can historians explain the prominence of emotions if not by drawing on a shared experience? The comparison between Berlin and Cairo has shown that arguments about emotions spoke to the concerns of specific groups in these two cities.

Due to the rising authority of the natural sciences, emotions offered a seemingly universal category that allowed addressing specific issues in both places. Emotions bridged the categories of thinking and feeling, ideal and material, as well as body and mind. They therefore allowed for claim-making in such diverse discourses as colonial hierarchies in Cairo or gender differences in Berlin. It was this functional equivalence that turned emotions into a compelling category, rather than a prelinguistic experience that was the same in Berlin and Cairo. This point can be further illustrated with the example of love. Instead of a seemingly intrinsic quality of love in the urban realm, it was the claim-making qualities of concepts like natural love versus love in accordance with *Sitte* that made this emotion such a prominent category in mid-nineteenth-century Berlin.

Various examples in this book have demonstrated that the arena in which the functional equivalence of emotions played out was class formation. In Berlin and Cairo, debates about urban change and emotions reflect an increasingly shared “lexicon of bourgeois civility” that stressed aspects of emotional control and self-determination.¹⁷ Journalists, petitioners, city clerks, and scholars kept stressing that the two changing cities encroached upon city dwellers’ ability to control their feelings. Thereby, they reinvigorated the importance of this middle-class norm in an urban society that they perceived as being in transformation. Debates about urban emotions were, therefore, predicated on the prominent position of middle-class actors with similar interests in Berlin and Cairo.

A crucial aspect of the functional equivalence of the category of emotions was that it proved to be versatile in the two local contexts. While the scientific understanding of emotions was not an “empty signifier,” it could be wedded to a variety of older and locally specific concepts. In the case of the concept of *Sitte* in mid-nineteenth-century Berlin, for instance, scientific knowledge about emotions played a role in grounding older notions of morality in city dwellers’ bodies. In turn-of-the-century Cairo, scientific arguments equally played a role in localizing the concept of *'aql* as rationality in the brain. The concepts of *Sitte* and *'aql* preceded the natural scientific knowledge about emotions that circulated during the second half of the nineteenth century. Due to their longer history, these concepts were already associated with a particular, local knowledge. The German concept of *Sitte* combined notions of morality with questions of manners

and customs in a society. The Arabic concept of *'aql* could refer to an Islamic context **(p.195)** with particular religious meanings. Contemporaries in the Egyptian capital were therefore able to discuss natural scientific findings together with passages from the Koran. Rather than contradict older meanings, scientific knowledge breathed new life into existing concepts relating to emotions. In this way, it was possible for authors in Berlin and Cairo to present their arguments about emotions as being grounded in their specific locality, as well as in universal scientific knowledge. The category of emotions thus functioned as a particular universalism—a universalism, which allowed for particularistic claims.¹⁸

Ultimately, this functionality contributed to the combination of emotions with nationalism. The preceding chapters have shown how the trajectory of Berlin and Cairo during the second half of the nineteenth century was intimately bound up in the history of empires. Berlin's role as the rising capital of imperial Germany affected the city, just as Cairo's position in the Ottoman Empire and incorporation into the British Empire shaped its transformation. In debates about the effects of urban change, however, questions of national character took on an increasingly central role. While some feared that the emotionality and nervous weakness of Berliners shed light on a dangerous dynamic at the very heart of the German nation, authors in Cairo claimed that Egyptians had to leave the negative influences of the city behind to gain national independence. Suburbs were construed as a kind of cure for the dangerous impact of urban change which seemed to threaten the German and the Egyptian nation. Here, the category of emotions became part of particularistic claims that emphasized a kind of cultural "authenticity" that was expressed through feelings. This discourse is apparent in various portrayals of the countryside as the place of true emotions for the nation. With their connection to the countryside, suburbs were valued as a means to instill the emotional roots of nationalism in city dwellers.

The connection between the category of emotions and the nation was also present in a number of derogatory portrayals of unauthentic, urban emotions. In Berlin and Cairo, these arguments mostly concerned women, members of the working and upper classes, as well as subjects who were simply framed as "foreign." In these arguments, class formation dovetailed with the question of national emotions. The attacks on "French feelings" in Berlin or the criticism of "European" nightlife in Cairo show that ideas about what it meant to feel like a "German" or an "Egyptian" were intertwined with debates on urban change. While the institutional circumstances were different, the composition of the national body politic was a contested topic in Berlin and Cairo during this period. From a middle-class perspective, Egyptian and German citizenship had to be earned.¹⁹ The specific arguments about appropriate feelings and emotional control were a way to prove that a subject was worthy of being a citizen of the nation. The ideal subject whom **(p.196)** these discourses established was a

middle-class and nationally specific man, a citizen of the German or the Egyptian nation.

Difference as an Effect of Connection

Behind every comparison lurks the question of difference. Stark differences between Berlin and Cairo have been the present absentee of this book. An entirely different narrative could have guided the preceding chapters, highlighting dissimilar phenomena. The book could have dwelled, for instance, on the divergent audiences of contemporary publications about urban change. How many people read about emotions in the two cities? At the turn of the twentieth century about 200,000 out of 10,000,000 people in Egypt, i.e. 2 percent of the country's population, are estimated to have been able to read and write.²⁰ In Berlin, the *Berliner Morgenpost*, one of the city's largest newspapers, alone had an edition of about 390,000 in 1913, i.e. around 20 percent of the city's population.²¹ These numbers are in themselves debated and different reading practices, such as reading out loud, could expand the readership of printed publications beyond the circle of those being able to read.²² Regardless of the statistical inaccuracies inherent in such figures, these numbers throw the divergence in the spread of printed publications between Berlin and Cairo into sharp relief. The observation of differences complements the claim of the present book. At the center of the preceding chapters lies the argument that similar dynamics are clear and present despite differences between the two cities. Berlin and Cairo did not simply become the same, but the way in which contemporaries in the two cities negotiated urban change became increasingly similar. Around 1900, even growing differences could be framed in a corresponding vocabulary.²³

Moreover, differences also need to be situated in a global historical context. The comparison between the two cities points here again beyond two individual urban biographies: dynamics that increasingly spanned the world such as capitalism, imperialism, and the spread of the natural sciences contributed significantly to what came to be seen as diverging phenomena in Berlin and Cairo. As class formation was an important driver behind debates about urban change, for instance, historians need to take economic relations that reached beyond a single city and region into account. The debates in Berlin and Cairo show that the middle-class actors who propagated arguments about emotions in both cities often held the same jobs, including government clerks, doctors, and journalists. As the example of the expansion and contraction of Egypt's state income from the cotton market illustrates, these jobs could be the result of international flows of capital. Mirroring the hierarchical global landscape of capitalism, these flows contributed to an unequal distribution of wealth. Differences between cities appear in a different **(p.197)** light from this perspective. To revisit the question of numbers: The smaller readership of printed publications in Cairo was also the result of a smaller offer of education, which was a direct outcome of the government's financial cuts after the state

bankruptcy of 1876 and the British occupation in 1882.²⁴ In addition to economic relations between regions and cities, the circulation of ideas could also contribute to a consolidation of difference. The transfer of natural scientific knowledge propelled, for instance, the spread of the universal concept of emotion. When contemporaries sought to reform emotions through suburbs, however, they drew on the idea of emotions that were specific to the German or the Egyptian nation. While these were claims about national difference, the very argument that enabled these claims would have been unthinkable without the universal concept of emotions.

Last but not least, new connections shaped the understanding of difference in scholarship on cities. Many of the concepts that scholars continue to use today to differentiate between regional urban histories emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century. The concept of the Islamic City, for example, gained its prominence through the writings of French scholars between the 1910s and the 1940s.²⁵ André Raymond has highlighted how the imperatives of French colonial rule in Algeria, where the categories of “native” and “Muslim” became merged, underpinned the concept of the Islamic City.²⁶ The emergence of this concept was thus based on colonialism as a thread that connected Europe and the Middle East. At the same time, the concept of the European City was also predicated on global connections.²⁷ Early proponents of the social sciences, such as Max Weber, contemplated the specificity of cities in Europe by way of worldwide comparisons.²⁸ In Weber’s reflections, the type of the European City only came into view once it was contrasted with cities in other world regions, including, prominently, the Middle East.²⁹ Traces of global connections’ importance for the scholarship on cities are also apparent in other examples. Representations of “the primitive” played, for instance, a defining role for understanding “the urban” in several foundational texts of urban sociology.³⁰

What can historians of cities take away from this observation? The very concepts of difference that were penned at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries informed narratives that continue to be influential in urban history. Research that focuses on the urban past from a global or comparative perspective has to take this into account. The reconsideration of regional categories eventually allows scholars to rethink their analytical vocabulary. Categories such as “Europe” or the “Middle East” are too often used as seemingly natural, self-evident **(p.198)** truths. In this book, I tried to show that especially accounts that draw on reified concepts of a “European” and an “Islamic” civilization hold little explanatory power for the history of cities during the second half of the nineteenth century. Research will, of course, continue to pay attention to this civilizational vocabulary when it is present in the sources studied. But instead of using it in terms of analytical categories, scholars are better served by looking at the historical processes that gave meaning to categories such as the “European” or the “Islamic” city in the first place. This approach ultimately opens up a possibility for urban historians to account more

for the parallel processes that stretched beyond the confines of a single nation state or region, suggesting a new understanding of cities' transformation during the second half of the nineteenth century. Instead of highlighting the different urban histories of separate civilizations, this narrative would demonstrate how forces of capitalism, empire, and nationalism created parallels as well as differences between cities. The debates in Berlin and Cairo show how these potentially global forces could play a pivotal role for urban change in Europe and the Middle East. Ultimately, such an approach promises a better understanding of how a world of comparable, yet different cities emerged.

Notes:

(¹) Isa Ducke and Natascha Thomas, *Ägypten: Die klassische Nilreise* (Ostfildern: Dumont Reiseverlag, 2014), 126.

(²) *Ibid.*, 127.

(³) André Raymond's influential history of the city, for instance, draws on the concept of Westernization to describe the changes during Khedive Ismail's rule: Raymond, *Le Caire*.

(⁴) Bayly, *Birth of the Modern World*.

(⁵) Jacob, *Working Out Egypt*; Russell, *Creating the New Egyptian Woman*; Föllmer, *Individuality and Modernity*, 105–31.

(⁶) Steckner, *Beim Fellah und Khediven*, 122; Preminger and Loewy, eds., *Festschrift des Institut Medical*, 127.

(⁷) Carl Seher, *In der Welt des Halbmondes: Reisen und Studien in Persien, Armenien, Kurdistan, Mesopotamien und Aegypten* (Elmshorn: Gebr. Bramstedt, 1902), 184.

(⁸) Nezar Alsayyad, Irene A. Bierman, and Nasser Rabbat, eds., *Making Cairo Medieval* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005).

(⁹) See on this argument also Michael Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 153–5.

(¹⁰) Roland Wenzlhuemer, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World: The Telegraph and Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

(¹¹) Taken to its logical conclusion, this approach eventually leaves little room for simultaneity at all, since it is rarely the case that the same historical change happens in two different places at the exact same time. Fernand Braudel has even pointed to the futility of the concept of simultaneity in this context: Fernand Braudel, "History and the Social Sciences," in *Economy and Society in*

Early Modern Europe: Essays from Annales, ed. Peter Burke (Routledge: London, 1972), 26. For a critical discussion of coevalness, see also Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

⁽¹²⁾ Alisa Freedman, *Tokyo in Transit: Japanese Culture on the Rail and the Roads* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 27–67; Nikhil Rao, *House, But No Garden: Apartment Living in Bombay's Suburbs, 1898–1964* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

⁽¹³⁾ Michael Geertse, “The International Garden City Campaign: Transnational Negotiations on Town Planning Methods, 1913–1926,” *Journal of Urban History* 42 (2016): 733–52; Stephen Ward, ed., *The Garden City: Past, Present, and Future* (London: Spon, 1992).

⁽¹⁴⁾ For this argument, see also Elshakry, *Reading Darwin in Arabic*.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Samuel Moyn, “On the Non-Globalization of Ideas,” in *Global Intellectual History*, ed. Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 187–204.

⁽¹⁶⁾ David Harvey, *The Urban Experience* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); Harvey, *Paris*; Kenny, *Feel of the City*.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 8.

⁽¹⁸⁾ This argument relates to Christopher Hill's observation about relativizing universalisms in the nineteenth century: Christopher L. Hill, “Conceptual Universalization in the Transnational Nineteenth Century,” in *Global Intellectual History*, ed. Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 150–4.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Geoff Eley, “Liberalism, Europe, and the Bourgeoisie,” in *The German Bourgeoisie*, ed. Richard Evans and David Blackbourn (London: Routledge, 1991), 300; Jacob, *Working Out Egypt*.

⁽²⁰⁾ Ayalon, *The Press in the Arab Middle East*, 50–62.

⁽²¹⁾ Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin*, 78.

⁽²²⁾ Yousef, *Composing Egypt*; Kholoussy, *For Better, for Worse*, 1–21.

⁽²³⁾ For this argument, see also Bayly, *Birth of the Modern World*, 1–22.

(²⁴) Yousef, *Composing Egypt*.

(²⁵) Abu-Lughod, "The Islamic City"; Raymond, "Islamic City."

(²⁶) Raymond, "Islamic City."

(²⁷) On the prominent role of the "American City" in definitions of the "European City," see Kaelble, "Die Besonderheiten der europäischen Stadt."

(²⁸) Hinnerk Bruhns and Wilfried Nippel, eds., *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000).

(²⁹) Masters, "The Middle Eastern City."

(³⁰) Robinson, *Ordinary Cities*, 21–8.

Access brought to you by: