

Institutions of the public sphere

Jürgen Habermas

From Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, (translated by Burger T.), Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 31–8, 41–3.

Institutions of the public sphere

In seventeenth century France *le public* meant the *lecturs, spectateurs*, and *auditeurs* as the addressees and consumers, and the critics of art and literature,¹ reference was still primarily to the court, and later also to portions of the urban nobility along with a thin bourgeois upper stratum whose members occupied the loges of the Parisian theatres. This early public, then, comprised both court and 'town'. The thoroughly aristocratic polite life of these circles already assumed modern characteristics. With the Hôtel de Rambouillet, the great hall at court in which the prince staged his festivities and as patron gathered the artists about him was replaced by what later would be called the *salon*.² The hotel provided the model for the *ruelles* (morning receptions) of the *precieuses*, which maintained a certain independence from the court. Although one sees here the first signs of that combination of the economically unproductive and politically functionless urban aristocracy with the eminent writers, artists, and scientists (who frequently were of bourgeois origin) typical of the salon of the eighteenth century, it was still impossible, in the prevailing climate of *honnêteté*, for reason to shed its dependence on the authority that turns conversation into criticism and *bons mots* into arguments. Only with the reign of Philip of Orleans, who moved the royal residence from Versailles to Paris, did the court lose its central position in the public sphere, indeed its status as the public sphere. For inasmuch as the 'town' took over its cultural functions the public sphere itself was transformed.

The sphere of royal representation and the grand *goût* of Versailles became a facade held up only with effort. The regent and his two successors preferred small social gatherings, if not the family circle itself, and to a certain degree avoided the etiquette. The great ceremonial gave way to an almost bourgeois intimacy:

At the court of Louis XVI the dominant tone is one of decided intimacy, and on six days of the week the social gatherings achieve the character of a private party. The only place where anything like a court household develops during the Régence is the castle of the Duchess of Maine at Sceaux, which becomes the scene of brilliant, expensive and ingenious festivities and, at the same time, a new centre of art, a real Court of the Muses. But the entertainments arranged

by the Duchess contain the germ of ultimate dissolution of court life. They form the transition from the old-style court to the *salons* of the eighteenth century – the cultural heirs of the court.³

In Great Britain the Court had never been able to dominate the town as it had in the France of the Sun King.⁴ Nevertheless, after the Glorious Revolution a shift in the relationship between court and town can be observed similar to the one that occurred one generation later in the relationship between *cour* and *ville*. Under the Stuarts, up to Charles II, literature and art served the representation of the king. 'But after the Revolution the glory of the Court grew dim. Neither the political position of the Crown, nor the personal temperament of those who wore it was the same as of old. Stern William, invalid Anne, the German Georges, farmer George, domestic Victoria, none of them desired to keep a Court like Queen Elizabeth's. Henceforth the Court was the residence of secluded royalty, pointed out from afar, difficult of access save on formal occasions of proverbial dullness.'⁵ The predominance of the 'town' was strengthened by new institutions that, for all their variety, in Great Britain and France took over the same social functions: the coffee houses in their golden age between 1680 and 1730 and the *salons* in the period between regency and revolution. In both countries they were centres of criticism – literary at first, then also political – in which began to emerge, between aristocratic society and bourgeois intellectuals, a certain parity of the educated. Around the middle of the seventeenth century, after not only tea – first to be popular – but also chocolate and coffee had become the common beverages of at least the well-to-do strata of the population, the coachman of a Levantine merchant opened the first coffee house. By the first decade of the eighteenth century London already had 3000 of them, each with a core group of regulars.⁶ Just as Dryden, surrounded by the new generation of writers, joined the battle of the 'ancients and moderns' at Will's, Addison and Steele a little later convened their 'little senate' at Button's; so too in the Rotary Club, presided over by Milton's secretary, Marvell and Pepys met with Harrington who here probably presented the republican ideas of his *Oceana*.⁷ As in the *salons* where 'intellectuals' met with the aristocracy, literature had to legitimate itself in these coffee houses. In this case, however, the nobility joining the upper bourgeois stratum still possessed the social functions lost by the French; it represented landed and moneyed interests. Thus critical debate ignited by works of literature and art was soon extended to include economic and political disputes, without any guarantee (such as was given in the *salons*) that such discussions would be inconsequential, at least in the immediate context. The fact that only men were admitted to coffee-house society may have had something to do with this, whereas the style of the *salon*, like that of the rococo in general, was essentially shaped by women. Accordingly the women of London society, abandoned every evening, waged a vigorous but vain struggle against the new institution.⁸ The coffee house not merely made access to the relevant circles less formal and easier; it embraced the wider strata of the middle class, including craftsmen and shopkeepers. Ned Ward reports that the 'wealthy shopkeeper' visited the coffee house several times a day,⁹ this held true for the poor one as well.¹⁰

In contrast, in France the *salons* formed a peculiar enclave. While the

bourgeoisie, for all practical purposes excluded from leadership in state and church, in time completely took over all the key positions in the economy, and while the aristocracy compensated for its material inferiority with royal privileges and an ever more rigorous stress upon hierarchy in social intercourse, in the *salons* the nobility and the *grande bourgeoisie* of finance and administration assimilating itself to that nobility met with the 'intellectuals' on an equal footing. The plebeian d'Alembert was no exception; in the *salons* of the fashionable ladies, noble as well as bourgeois, sons of princes and counts associated with sons of watchmakers and shopkeepers.¹¹ In the *salon* the mind was no longer in the service of a patron; 'opinion' became emancipated from the bonds of economic dependence. Even if under Philip the *salons* were at first places more for gallant pleasures than for smart discourse, such discussion indeed soon took equal place with the *diner*. Diderot's distinction between written and oral discourse¹² sheds light on the functions of the new gatherings. There was scarcely a great writer in the eighteenth century who would not have first submitted his essential ideas for discussion in such discourse, in lectures before the *académies* and especially in the *salons*. The *salon* held the monopoly of first publication: a new work, even a musical one, had to legitimate itself first in this forum. The Abbé Galiani's *Dialogues on the Grain Trade* give a vivid picture of the way in which conversation and discussion were elegantly intertwined, of how the unimportant (where one had travelled and how one was doing) was treated as much with solemnity as the important (theatre and politics) was treated *en passant*.

In Germany at that time there was no 'town' to replace the courts' publicity of representation with the institutions of a public sphere in civil society. But similar elements existed, beginning with the learned *Tischgesellschaften* (table societies), the old *Sprachgesellschaften* (literary societies) of the seventeenth century. Naturally they were fewer and less active than the coffee houses and *salons*. They were even more removed from practical politics than the *salons*; yet, as in the case of the coffee houses, their public was recruited from private people engaged in productive work, from the dignitaries of the principalities' capitals, with a strong preponderance of middle-class academics. The *Deutsche Gesellschaften* ('German Societies'), the first of which was founded by Gottsched in Leipzig in 1727, built upon the literary orders of the preceding century. The latter were still convened by the princes but avoided social exclusiveness; characteristically, later attempts to transform them into knightly orders failed. As it is put in one of the founding documents, their intent was 'that in such manner an equality and association among persons of unequal social status might be brought about'.¹³ Such orders, chambers, and academies were preoccupied with the native tongue, now interpreted as the medium of communication and understanding between people in their common quality as human beings and nothing more than human beings. Transcending the barriers of social hierarchy, the bourgeois met here with the socially prestigious but politically uninfluential nobles as 'common' human beings.¹⁴ The decisive element was not so much the political equality of the members but their exclusiveness in relation to the political realm of absolutism as such: social equality was possible at first only as an equality outside the state. The coming together of private people into a public was therefore anticipated in secret, as a public sphere still existing

largely behind closed doors. The secret promulgation of enlightenment typical of the lodges but also widely practised by other associations and *Tischgesellschaften* had a dialectical character. Reason, which through public use of the rational faculty was to be realized in the rational communication of a public consisting of cultivated human beings, itself needed to be protected from becoming public because it was a threat to any and all relations of domination. As long as publicity had its seat in the secret chanceries of the prince, reason could not reveal itself directly. Its sphere of publicity had still to rely on secrecy; its public, even as a public, remained internal. The light of reason, thus veiled for self-protection, was revealed in stages. This recalls Lessing's famous statement about Freemasonry which at that time was a broader European phenomenon: it was just as old as bourgeois society – 'if indeed bourgeois society is not merely the offspring of Freemasonry'.¹⁵

The practice of secret societies fell prey to its own ideology to the extent to which the public that put reason to use, and hence the bourgeois public sphere for which it acted as the peacemaker, won out against state-governed publicity. From publicist enclaves of civic concern with common affairs they developed into 'exclusive associations whose basis is a separation from the public sphere that in the meantime has arisen'.¹⁶ Other societies, in contrast (especially those arising in the course of the eighteenth century among bourgeois dignitaries), expanded into open associations access to which (through co-optation or otherwise) was relatively easy. Here bourgeois forms of social intercourse, closeness (*Intimität*), and a morality played off against courtly convention were taken for granted; at any rate they no longer needed affirmation by means of demonstrative fraternization ceremonies.

However much the *Tischgesellschaften*, *salons*, and coffee houses may have differed in the size and composition of their publics, the style of their proceedings, the climate of their debates, and their topical orientations, they all organized discussion among private people that tended to be ongoing; hence they had a number of institutional criteria in common. *First*, they preserved a kind of social intercourse that, far from presupposing the equality of status, disregarded status altogether. The tendency replaced the celebration of rank with a tact befitting equals.¹⁷ The parity on whose basis alone the authority of the better argument could assert itself against that of social hierarchy and in the end can carry the day meant, in the thought of the day, the parity of 'common humanity' ('*bloss Menschliche*'). *Les hommes*, private gentlemen, or *die Privatleute* made up the public not just in the sense that power and prestige of public office were held in suspense; economic dependencies also in principle had no influence. Laws of the market were suspended as were laws of the state. Not that this idea of the public was actually realized in earnest in the coffee houses, the *salons*, and the societies; but as an idea it had become institutionalized and thereby stated as an objective claim. If not realized, it was at least consequential.

Secondly, discussion within such a public presupposed the problematization of areas that until then had not been questioned. The domain of 'common concern' which was the object of public critical attention remained a preserve in which church and state authorities had the monopoly of interpretation not just from the pulpit but in philosophy, literature, and art, even at a time

when, for specific social categories, the development of capitalism already demanded a behaviour whose rational orientation required ever more information. To the degree, however, to which philosophical and literary works and works of art in general were produced for the market and distributed through it, these culture products became similar to that type of information: as commodities they became in principle generally accessible. They no longer remained components of the Church's and court's publicity of representation; that is precisely what was meant by the loss of their aura of extraordinariness and by the profaning of their once sacramental character. The private people for whom the cultural product became available as a commodity profaned it inasmuch as they had to determine its meaning on their own (by way of rational communication with one another), verbalize it, and thus state explicitly what precisely in its implicitness for so long could assert its authority. As Raymond Williams demonstrates, 'art' and 'culture' owe their modern meaning of spheres separate from the reproduction of social life to the eighteenth century.¹⁸

Thirdly, the same process that converted culture into a commodity (and in this fashion constituted it as a culture that could become an object of discussion to begin with) established the public as in principle inclusive. However exclusive the public might be in any given instance, it could never close itself off entirely and become consolidated as a clique; for it always understood and found itself immersed within a more inclusive public of all private people, persons who – insofar as they were propertied and educated – as readers, listeners, and spectators could avail themselves via the market of the objects that were subject to discussion. The issues discussed became 'general' not merely in their significance, but also in their accessibility: everyone had to be able to participate. Wherever the public established itself institutionally as a stable group of discussants, it did not equate itself with the public but at most claimed to act as its mouthpiece, in its name, perhaps even as its educator – the new form of bourgeois representation. The public of the first generations, even when it constituted itself as a specific circle of persons, was conscious of being part of a larger public. Potentially it was always also a publicist body, as its discussions did not need to remain internal to it but could be directed at the outside world – for this, perhaps, the *Diskurse der Mahlern*, a moral weekly published from 1721 on by Bodmer and Breitinger in Zurich, was one among many examples.

In relation to the mass of the rural population and the common 'people' in the towns, of course, the public 'at large' that was being formed diffusely outside the early institutions of the public was still extremely small. Elementary education, where it existed, was inferior. The proportion of illiterates, at least in Great Britain, even exceeded that of the preceding Elizabethan epoch.¹⁹ Here, at the start of the eighteenth century, more than half of the population lived on the margins of subsistence. The masses were not only largely illiterate but also so pauperized that they could not even pay for literature. They did not have at their disposal the buying power needed for even the most modest participation in the market of cultural goods.²⁰ Nevertheless, with the emergence of the diffuse public formed in the course of commercialization of cultural production, a new social category arose.

[...]

In the institution of art criticism, including literary, theatre, and music criticism, the lay judgement of a public that had come of age, or at least thought it had, became organized. Correspondingly, there arose a new occupation that in the jargon of the time was called *Kunstrichter* (art critic). The latter assumed a peculiarly dialectical task: he viewed himself at the same time as the public's mandatary and as its educator.²¹ The art critics could see themselves as spokesmen for the public – and in their battle with the artists this was the central slogan – because they knew of no authority beside that of the better argument and because they felt themselves at one with all who were willing to let themselves be convinced by arguments. At the same time they could turn against the public itself when, as experts combating 'dogma' and 'fashion,' they appealed to the ill-informed person's native capacity for judgement. The context accounting for this self-image also elucidated the actual status of the critic: at that time, it was not an occupational role in the strict sense. The *Kunstrichter* retained something of the amateur; his expertise only held good until countermanded; lay judgement was organized in it without becoming, by way of specialization, anything else than the judgement of one private person among all others who ultimately were not to be obligated by any judgement except their own. This was precisely where the art critic differed from the judge. At the same time, however, he had to be able to find a hearing before the entire public, which grew well beyond the narrow circle of the *salons*, coffee houses, and societies, even in their golden age. Soon the periodical (the handwritten correspondence at first, then the printed weekly or monthly) became the publicist instrument of this criticism.

As instruments of institutionalized art criticism, the journals devoted to art and cultural criticism were typical creations of the eighteenth century.²² 'It is remarkable enough', an inhabitant of Dresden wrote in justified amazement, 'that after the world for millennia had gotten along quite well without it, toward the middle of the eighteenth century art criticism all of a sudden bursts on the scene'.²³ On the one hand, philosophy was no longer possible except as critical philosophy, literature and art no longer except in connection with literary and art criticism. What the works of art themselves criticized simply recalled its proper end in the 'critical journals'. On the other hand, it was only through the critical absorption of philosophy, literature, and art that the public attained enlightenment and realized itself as the latter's living process.

In this context, the moral weeklies were a key phenomenon. Here the elements that later parted ways were still joined. The critical journals had already become as independent from conversational circles as they had become separate from the works to which their arguments referred. The moral weeklies, on the contrary, were still an immediate part of coffee-house discussions and considered themselves literary pieces – there was good reason for calling them 'periodical essays'.²⁴

When Addison and Steele published the first issue of the *Tatler* in 1709, the coffee houses were already so numerous and the circles of their frequenters already so wide,²⁵ that contact among these thousand-fold circles could only be maintained through a journal.²⁶ At the same time the new periodical was so ultimately interwoven with the life of the coffee houses

that the individual issues were indeed sufficient basis for its reconstruction. The periodical articles were not only made the object of discussion by the public of the coffee houses but were viewed as integral parts of this discussion; this was demonstrated by the flood of letters from which the editor each week published a selection. When the *Spectator* separated from the *Guardian* the letters to the editor were provided with a special institution: on the west side of Button's coffee house a lion's head was attached through whose jaws the reader threw his letter.²⁷ The dialogue form too, employed by many of the articles, attested to their proximity to the spoken word. One and the same discussion transposed into a different medium was continued in order to re-enter, via reading, the original conversational medium. A number of the later weeklies of this genre even appeared without dates in order to emphasize the trans-temporal continuity, as it were, of the process of mutual enlightenment. In the moral weeklies,²⁸ the intention of self-enlightenment of individuals who felt that they had come of age came more clearly to the fore than in the later journals. What a little later would become specialized in the function of art critic, in these weeklies was still art and art criticism, literature and literary criticism all in one. In the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the *Guardian* the public held up a mirror to itself it did not yet come to a self-understanding through the detour of a reflection on works of philosophy and literature, art and science, but through entering itself into 'literature' as an object. Addison viewed himself as a censor of manners and morals; his essays concerned charities and schools for the poor, the improvement of education, pleas for civilized forms of conduct, polemics against the vices of gambling, fanaticism, and pedantry and against the tastelessness of the aesthetes and the eccentricities of the learned. He worked toward the spread of tolerance, the emancipation of civic morality from moral theology and of practical wisdom from the philosophy of the scholars. The public that read and debated this sort of thing read and debated about itself.

Notes

1. Auerbach, E. finds the word, in the sense of a theatre audience, documented as early as 1629; until then, the use of 'public' as a noun referred exclusively to the state or to the public welfare. See *Das französische Publikum des 17. Jahrhunderts*, München, 1933, p. 5.
2. At that time it still referred to the state room in the sense of the Italian Renaissance, and not to the cabinet, the circle, the redoute, etc.
3. Hauser, A. *The Social History of Art*, Vol. 2, pp. 505–6.
4. Unlike Paris, London was never directly subject to the king. The city, which administered itself by means of elected councillors and maintained public order through its own militia, was less accessible to the court's and Parliament's administration of justice than any other town in the country. Around the turn of the eighteenth century its approximately 12,000 taxpayers, almost all of whom were members of the 89 guilds and companies, elected 26 councillors and 200 council members – a broad, almost 'democratic' base without equal during this period. Nevertheless, after the Glorious Revolution a shift occurred in the relationship between court and town that was comparable, say, to the development under the regency.

5. Trevelyan, G. M. (1944) *English Social History: A Survey of Six Centuries from Chaucer to Queen Victoria*, London, p. 338.
6. Stephen, L. (1903; most recently, 1947) *English Literature and Society in the 18th Century*, London, p. 47. See also Reinhold, H. (1958) *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Kaffees und des Kaffeehauses*, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Vol. 10 (review of a group of works).
7. Westerfrölke, H. (1924) *Englische Kaffeehäuser Sammelpunkte der literarischen Welt*, Jena.
8. As early as 1674 there appeared a pamphlet, 'The women's petition against coffee, representing to public consideration of the grand inconveniences according to their sex from the excessive use of that drying, enfeebling liquor'.
9. Trevelyan, *English Social History*, p. 324, footnote.
10. See 'The clubs of London', *National Review*, Vol. 4, No. 8, April, 1857, p. 301. 'Every profession, trade, class, party, had its favourite coffee-house. The lawyers discussed law or literature, criticised the last new play, or retailed the freshest Westminster-Hall "bite" at Nando's or the Grecian, both close on the purlieus of the Temple . . . The cits met to discuss the rise and fall of stocks, and to settle the rate of insurances at Garraway's or Jonathan's; the parsons exchanged university gossip, or commented on Dr Sacherverell's last sermon at Truby's or at Child's in St. Paul's Churchyard; the soldiers mustered to grumble over their grievances at Old or Young Man's, near Charing Cross; the St James's and the Smyrna were the head-quarters of the Whig politicians, while the Tories frequented the Cocoa-Tree or Ozinda's, all in St James's Street; Scotchmen had their house of call at Forrest's, Frenchmen at Giles's or old Slaughter's in St. Martin's Lane; the gamesters shook their elbows in White's, and the Chocolate houses, round Covent Garden; the *virtuosi* honoured the neighbourhood of Gresham College; and the leading wits gathered at Will's, Button's, or Tom's, in Great Russell Street, where after the theatre, was playing at piquet and the best of conversation till midnight.'
11. Hauser, *The Social History of Art*, Vol. 2, pp. 506-7.
12. Nos écrits n'opèrent que sur une certaine classe de citoyens, nos discours sur toutes' (Our writings have an impact only on a certain class of citizens, our speech on all).
13. Manheim, E. (1923) *Die Träger der öffentlichen Meinung*, Wien, p. 83.
14. Language is considered 'the organ of a transcendental communal spirit' and 'the medium of a public consensus'; see Manheim, *Die Träger der öffentlichen Meinung*, pp. 88 and 92.
15. Lessing, Ernst, and Falk (1778) *Gespräche für Freimaurer*. On the entire complex, see Lennhoff, E. and Posner, O. (1932) *Internationales Freimaurerlexikon* Zürich; also Fay, B. (1935) *La Franc-maçonnerie et la révolution intellectuelle du XVIIIe siècle*, Paris.
16. Manheim, *Die Träger der öffentlichen Meinung*, p. 11.
17. H. Plessner, admittedly in a different context, defines the public sphere as the 'sphere in which tact rules'. Diplomatic relations arise between role bearers, relationships of tact between natural persons; see his *Grenzen der Gemeinschaft*, Bonn, 1924, esp. p. 100.
18. Williams, R., *Culture and Society 1870-1950*, London, 1958, pp. xv, xvi: 'An art had formerly been any human skill [art in the sense of artfulness, ability. J.H.]; but Art, now, signified a particular group of skills, the 'imaginative' or 'creative' arts. . . . From . . . a 'skill,' it had come . . . to be a kind of institution, a set of body activities of a certain kind.' To this corresponded the change in the meaning of 'culture': ' . . . it had meant, primarily, the 'tending of natural growth' [culture in the sense of the cultivation of plants. J.H.], and then, by analogy, a process of human training [e.g. a 'man of culture.' J.H.]. But this latter use, which had usually been a culture of something, was changed . . . to culture as such, a thing in itself.'

Also Wittram, R. (1958) *Das Interesse an der Geschichte*, Göttingen, who offers several observations on the history of the concept of culture.

19. See Altick, R. D. (1957) *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public*, Chicago, especially the first chapter, the results of which are summarized on p. 30. 'If, speculating from such little information as we have, we tried to chart the growth of the reading public in the first three centuries after Caxton, the line would climb slowly for the first hundred years. During the Elizabethan period its rate of ascent would considerably quicken. The line would reach a peak during the Civil War and Commonwealth, when interest in reading was powerfully stimulated by public excitements. But during the Restoration it would drop, because of the lessening of popular turmoil, the damage the war had done to the educational system, and the aristocratic domination of current literature in the age of Dryden. A fresh ascent would begin in the early eighteenth century, the time of Addison and Steele, and thereafter the line would climb steadily.'
20. Watt, I. (1957) 'The reading public'. *The Rise of the Novel*, London.
21. In principle anyone was called upon and had the right to make a free judgement as long as he participated in public discussion, bought a book, acquired a seat in a concert or theatre, or visited an art exhibition. But in the conflict of judgements he was not to shut his ears to convincing arguments; instead, he had to rid himself of his 'prejudices'. With the removal of the barrier that representative policy had erected between laymen and initiates, special qualifications – whether inherited or acquired, social or intellectual – became in principle irrelevant. But since the true judgement was supposed to be discovered only through discussion, truth appeared as a process, a process of enlightenment. Some sectors of the public might be more advanced in this process than others. Hence, if the public acknowledged no one as privileged, it did recognize experts. They were permitted and supposed to educate the public, but only inasmuch as they convinced through arguments and could not themselves be corrected by better arguments.
22. As soon as the press assumed critical functions, the writing of news letters developed into literary journalism. The early journals, called *Monthly Conversations*, *Monthly Discussions*, etc. had this journalism's origin in convivial critical discussion written all over them. Their proliferation may be observed in exemplary fashion in Germany. The beginning was made clear with the *Gelehrte Anzeigen* which, developing out of the Thomasian journals, through articles and reviews submitted philosophy and the sciences to public discussion. After 1736 the well-known *Frankfurtische Gelehrte Zeitungen* too concerned themselves with the 'fine arts and sciences'. Following upon Gottsched's efforts, the journals devoted to literary criticism reached their point of fullest development with the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freyen Künste*, founded in Berlin in 1757 by Nicolai. Beginning with Lessing's and Mylius's *Beiträge zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters* in 1750 a journalistic theatre criticism arose. Journals for music criticism were also founded, although less frequently than those dealing with the stage, once Adam Hiller in Leipzig had created the model with his *Wöchentliche Nachrichten und Anmerkungen die Musik betreffend* in 1767.
23. Dresdner, *Die Entschung der Kuntskritik*, p. 17.
24. Stephen, L., *English Literature and Society*, p. 76. 'The periodical essay represents the most successful innovation of the day . . . because it represents the mode by which the most cultivated writer could be brought into effective relation with the genuine interests of the largest audience.'
25. The *Tatler* expressly addressed the 'worthy citizens who live more in a coffee house than in their shops' *Tatler*, 17 May, 1709.
26. The *Tatler* immediately reached an edition of 4000. How strong the interest was

244 *The public sphere*

is demonstrated by the universal regret expressed when the *Tatler* suddenly ceased publication in 1711. For details, see Westerfrölke, *Englische Kaffeehäuser*, p. 64.

27. From then on the submitted letters were published weekly as the 'Roaring of the Lion'.
28. The British models remained valid for three generations of moral weeklies on the continent, too. In Germany *Der Vernünfftler* was published in 1713 in Hamburg. Later on the *Hamburger Patriot* was much more successful, lasting from 1724 until 1726. In the course of the entire century the number of these journals grew to 187 in Germany; during the same period in Great Britain the number is reported to have been 227; in France, 31.