

reits bestehende Literatur, stellt diese in neue Kontexte und stellt wichtige Wechselbeziehungen und Zusammenhänge her. Salzmanns Perspektive bewegt sich entsprechend auf der Makro- und Mesoebene. Detaillierte Einblicke in lokale Zusammenhänge kann und will Salzmann entsprechend nicht leisten – hierdurch entsteht allerdings teils eine schematische Darstellung bzw. Konstruktion von Akteuren und Akteursgruppen, wie beispielsweise der Gruppe der „Kleinbauern“ oder internationaler Organisationen. Handlungsspielräume, Dynamiken oder Machtgefüge innerhalb dieser Akteursgruppen werden nur begrenzt dargestellt. Obgleich Salzmann sich dieser „Objektivierungsproblematik“ bewusst ist, kann er dieser aufgrund seiner Vorgehensweise nicht immer entkommen.

Im Fazit: Philipp Salzmann hat ein ausgesprochen politisches, in seinen Zielen transparentes und reflektiertes Buch geschrieben, das einen spannenden Einstieg in die Zusammenhänge des globalen Ernährungssystems liefert und einen Überblick über seine Ausgestaltung und bestehenden Machtgefüge, Mechanismen der Ungleichheit und damit existierenden Herausforderungen liefert. Diese, so zeigt Salzmanns Analyse überzeugend, sind nicht unlösbar und keineswegs unbekannt. Sein Buch ist damit sowohl eine Anklage der politisch Verantwortlichen dieses Systems, als auch Aufruf, die gegenwärtige Ernährungssicherungslage nicht tatenlos hinzunehmen, sondern zu ihrer Veränderung beizutragen.

**Stuart Elden: *The Birth of Territory*,
Chicago: University of Chicago Press
2013, 491 S.**

Rezensiert von
Elena dell’Agnese, Milan

The “Birth of Territory” is a remarkable book, which displays an enormous amount of knowledge, tells a very long story, and, notwithstanding its extensive quotes and notes, provides an enjoyable and at times fascinating read. It also suggests more than one layer of meaning. The main object of Elden’s research naturally offers the primary one – the birth of territory – while the second, more generally speaking, is the kind of geographical imagination that underlies it. As stated in the opening paragraph of the first chapter, “[...] we cannot simply find a birth of territory, a singular moment, which could be outlined and its lineages traced backward. Rather, the approach taken here is to ask questions of the texts in terms of the relations between place and power that they pose” (p. 21). “Where do we begin?” is the first question considered. It cannot easily be solved: Elden goes back to Greek authors and philosophers (Chapter One, “The Polis and the Khorá”) in order to demonstrate that “Ancient Greek theories and practices cannot serve as a direct source of modern conceptions” (p. 52). Then, he tackles Latin documents and texts (Chapter Two, “From Urbis to Imperium”) and again has to admit that “Rome’s political and military practices have less of a legacy in terms

of the question of territory than its legal and surveying technologies” (p. 93). The following four chapters are devoted to a period that, notwithstanding being “exasperatedly labelled Middle Ages”, must not be considered a “‘middle’, but a beginning of Europe” (Olson, quoted by Elden, p. 99). Indeed, as remarked by Elden (p. 101), “we can only understand the legacy of the classical age, and in particular the rediscovery of Greek political thought and Roman law, in the light of the ‘Medieval’ period”. Chapter Three (“The Fracturing of the West”) and Chapter Four (“The Reassertion of Empire”) bring conclusions not dissimilar to the ones of the previous chapters. “‘Territory’ is a much later category that does not really make sense in the period and place of Beowulf” (p. 128), since “the Middle Age [...] did not have a territorial system and lacked an articulated concept of territory” (p. 156). So, after considering the question of the temporal power of the Pope and the work of Thomas Aquinas (Chapter Five: “The Pope’s Two Swords”), and the “Challenges to the Papacy” (Chapter Six) moved by authors like Dante Alighieri, Marsilius from Padua, and William of Ockham, we are fascinated by the complex development of the relations between place and power on time, but are left in suspense as far as the birth of “territory” is concerned. With “The Rediscovery of Roman Law” (Chapter Seven), Elden helps the reader to unearth the work of two authors much less famous than the ones previously analyzed (at least for those of us who are not experts on the history of the law), but indeed, much more relevant to the issue: the Post-Glossators Bartolus of Sassoferrato (1314–1357) and his student Baldus de Ubaldis. The “post-glossa-

tors were not political thinkers, but jurists” (p. 218). All the same, they faced some very political issues, such as “the extent of law, of jurisdiction” and “the relation between political units” (p. 220). Bartolus even makes use of the word “territorium” in a significant way since, for him, territorium is “the very thing over which political power is exercised”. Consequently, “Bartolus paved the way for the modern conception of territorial sovereignty” (p. 223). Chapter Eight (“Renaissance and Reconnaissance”) brings us back to more popular authors, like Machiavelli, Bodin, Botero and Shakespeare. In Chapter Nine, “The Extension of the State”, we meet authors like Johannes Althusius (1563–1638) and Andreas Knichen (1560–1621), who, working on the basis of Bartolus and Baldus’ work but offering a political and more than legal meaning, eventually claim that “jurisdiction and territory inhere in each other” (p. 287). Drawing on their works, Theodor Reinking (1590–1664) advances the solution and declares that “the limits of the territory are the limits of jurisdiction” (p. 309), while the “fundamental moment in the development of Western political thought” is offered by Leibniz, when he states that the sovereign is he “who is master of a territory” (p. 321). With Leibniz, we witness the birth of territory and we have the principal answer we have been looking for.

The curiosity stimulated by the second layer of meaning offered by the book is partially satisfied. Chapter Two, for instance, offers some intriguing insights about Caesar and the way he “describes landscapes [...] as he encountered them as a military reader, viewed from the ground; and the connection of places [...] as an itinerary”

(p. 56), which is useful to understanding that he did not have a map in his mind, in fact that he probably did not use a map at all. He had just a “horse-sense” of geography, to use Halford J. Mackinder’s expression¹, not a “cartographic logic”, to use Franco Farinelli’s.² The question is also broached in the paragraph “Cartography from Rome to Jerusalem” (Ch. 4), which is explicitly devoted to the representation of land and offers a glimpse of the discussion between those who believe that the Romans had maps similar to our own, and those who believe that they thought “about the relation between the mode of representation and the object represented in a quite different way” (p. 143). The issue is raised again in the Coda of the volume, entitled “Territory as a political technology”. The key, writes Elden, is “what kind of map is required, or what kind of cartographic techniques are needed for the production of territory” (p. 326). But, as hinted previously by the author, it is not just a question of “technique”, it is something more complex, which has to do with the way we understand the world. For this reason, and here it is possible to find a fault in this otherwise impressive book, this second layer of reading is not entirely satisfying. The “relation between the mode of representation and the object represented” is not just a political technology; it is a “logic”, as suggested both by Mackinder and Farinelli, even if in different ways. Its contribution to the “birth of territory” deserves deeper investigation.

Notes:

1 J. H. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, London 1919, p. 19.

2 F. Farinelli, *I segni del mondo: immagine cartografica e discorso geografico in età moderna*, Florence: 1992.

**Rebekka Habermas / Richard Hölzl
(Hrsg.): Mission Global. Eine Verflechtungsgeschichte seit dem 19. Jahrhundert, Köln: Böhlau Verlag 2014, 348 S.**

Rezensiert von
Felicity Jenz, Münster

By the nineteenth century, the Christian missionary movement was global. Stretching from Europe, where many of the missionaries originated, to the furthestmost parts of European imperial realms, the flows of knowledge, people, faith, and money wove together disparate places, creating networks across the globe. Secular historians have recently used the history of Christian missions as a lens to examine such topics as cultural contact, European notions of the self, knowledge transfer, and gender norms. Through broadening the focus of mission historiography, such histories have demonstrated and emphasised the importance of the global context of missionary work.

This global context differs from earlier, often missionary society specific historiographies, which were more focused upon one-way transfers of knowledge (particularly that of the Christian faith) rather than reciprocal transfers, contact zones, third-spaces, hybrid identities, and the subaltern voices. In their introduction to this edited collection, Rebekka Habermas