"An Indigenous and Not an Exotic Plant": Toward a History of Germanics at Penn

JOHN A. MCCARTHY

It is commonly argued that Germanics in America was an essentially uncritical recipient of the German model of the profession well into the second half of the twentieth century (Koepke 1989: 46–50). Unfortunately, the actual heterogeneity of the emerging profession in Germany and its equally heterogenous reception in America is too little reflected in renditions of the discipline. The discipline was defining itself on both sides of the Atlantic during its first 100 years (1816–1916). This study is an attempt to provide a more differentiated view of that monolithic perception, adding details and archival information in the manner of Uwe Meves and Holger Dainat in their close and discriminating investigations into the professionalization of Germanics in Germany up to 1913–14 (Meves; Dainat).

My main focus is on the shaping of Germanics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century at the University of Pennsylvania (colloquially dubbed "Penn"). The early phase of Germanics in the United States at Penn represents an Americanized version of *Germanistik* which proved decisive in its critical approach, its thematic preferences, and its admiring yet not uncritical reception of *Germanistik* even during the so-called "period of contentment from 1900 to 1915" (Rippley 1985: 221). The purpose of American Germanists in this early phase was first and foremost to integrate Germanics into the American academic mainstream; they did that long before the outbreak of hostilities between Germany and the United States. Thus I call into question the view that Germanics before 1917 had totally identified with the traditional image of Germany and the German mandarins as the appropriate model (Schmidt 1985: 205; Koepke 1989: 49). Given the richness of the archival material available at Penn, the disciplinary developments there after 1917 can only be hinted at here. It is a fascinating and complex phenomenon deserving of a full dress rehearsal. A detailed account of those later developments is necessary to test the accuracy of the thesis that Germanics from 1900 to 1967 sought to establish its disciplinary legitimacy through a fundamental alignment with *Germanistik,* avoided conflict by choosing "safe" texts, and practiced New Criticism as the dominant critical methodology in splendid isolation (cf. Trommler 1989: 13–14). This essay, then, is intended as a contribution to the institutional history of the profession of Germanics. I have chosen to focus on the very fertile early phase of Germanics in this country, especially in the very early part of the twentieth century because I believe the evidence demonstrates that Germanics

then had the function more of a *Leuchtturm* than as an *Elfenbeinturm.*[1] A full and accurate view of the "shaping forces" of Germanics from an institutional perspective can be achieved only by examining the discipline's development at several key universities and colleges (e.g., Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio State, Wisconsin, Yale). Documentation in support of the argument presented here could not be included because of length restrictions.

The history of Germanics at the University of Pennsylvania is long, central, instructive, and as yet virtually unexplored. As host to one of the oldest German programs in the nation, Penn represents fertile ground for plotting the historical contours, past challenges, and future prospects for our profession. Tracing the ebb and flow of the department's appeal, student enrollment, curricular offerings, German Studies component, outreach efforts, publishing strategies, and placement of its graduate students can afford greater insight into the continuities and discontinuities in the history of Germanics in the United States. Last but not least, it can also serve to establish a historical framework for our current efforts to "authenticate" the Americanization of our profession (Trommler 1989: 239, 255).

The University of Pennsylvania, founded in 1740, first offered German in 1754, hired its first professor of German in 1857, and awarded its first Ph.D. in German in 1891. Numerous notable Germanists have graced its faculty from the appointment of the Göttingen-trained Oswald Seidensticker (1825–1893) in 1867 and include such "academic mandarins" (Ringer 1969) as Marion Dexter Learned (1857–1916), Daniel B. Shumway (1868–1939), Alfred Senn (1899–1978), Ernst Jockers (1887–1957), Adolf Klarmann (1904–1976), Otto Springer (1905–1991), André von Gronicka (1912–), Horst Daemmrich (1932–) and Frank Trommler (1939–). Additionally, Klaus Weimar, Hermann Weigand, and Albert R. Schmitt began their academic careers there, while George Schoolfield and W. Detlev Schumann also once served on the faculty.

The precipitous decline in enrollment in German across the Unites States in the wake of World War I represents a clear interruption in the growth of Germanics in this country (Schmidt 1985: 211; Rippley 1985: 221). Although much of the lost momentum could be regained during the 1920s and 1930s following the Supreme Court's action in 1923 regarding state-level bans on teaching German, the renewed hostilities with Germany and the horror of the Holocaust caused another decline in the teaching of German taught in the schools and colleges. The elimination of foreign-language requirements at many colleges in the 1960s and 1970s represented yet another blow to rebuilding efforts. These developments are chronicled in Frank Trommler's two-volume tricentennial assessment, *America and the Germans,* as well as in his *Germanistik in den USA.* However, those dramatic downturns, especially that of 1917, should not blind us to the real struggles our colleagues experienced both before 1917 and after in their quest for disciplinary legitimacy. Their "rhetoric for survival," as Henry J. Schmidt labeled the phenomenon (1985), that is, their endeavors to persuade colleagues, students, administrators, educators, and the general public of the value of the German language and culture was itself an

echo of eighteenth-century efforts to "save" the German language and heritage from extinction in the United States. (Roeber 1995). That "rhetoric of survival" has lost none of its urgency today. Despite the benefit of close ethnic ties to the fatherland, students in the late eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries were not clamoring to major in German or even to enroll in an occasional German class any more than they are in the late twentieth century. *Fin-de-siècle* America was not a golden age of German studies. The reasons for that reluctance were multiple. Although demographic shifts can partially explain the lack of interest in Germanics approaching the year 2000, some of the earlier reasons still obtain.

Part of that enrollment problem surely had to do with the split noted between the "soul" and the "stomach" Germans among those who had recently immigrated to America (Schmidt 1985: 205). Even among American intellectuals there was no real willingness to learn a modern foreign language, a fact attested to by the difficulties experienced even by the field of History, which felt constrained to justify its methodology and focus in an age clearly inclined to the natural sciences (Pennsylvania, *Bulletin* [1893]: 8). Remarkable in this context, however, is the phenomenal growth that the Wharton School of Management and Business experienced at Penn in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, enrolling as many students as the College did. Because of these circumstances, the Philadelphia effort to establish Germanics as a visible discipline proved unusually successful.

Two early Germanists at Penn—the German-born and -trained Oswald Seidensticker and the American-born and -trained Marion Dexter Learned—achieved great distinction within and outside their institution. They are good examples of the rise of the mandarin mentality which held sway in academia between 1890 and 1933, although they are far from uncritical in their adoption of *Germanistik*. Their achievements were celebrated in distinctive ways. When Oswald Seidensticker, who had served the university as Professor of the German Language and Literature for 26 years (1867–93), died in 1893, the University of Pennsylvania was closed for the day to mark and honor his passing, so respected and beloved was he as teacher and colleague. Seidensticker's successor as chair, Marion Dexter Learned (1857–1916), was eulogized upon his death 20 years later in 1916 by a large group of distinguished citizens: a trustee of the university (Joseph G. Rosengarten), a former mayor of Philadelphia (Rudolph Blankenburg), and a former ambassador to Germany (David Jayne Hill), as well as by colleagues at Penn (Daniel B. Shumway), Cornell (A. B. Faust), and Johns Hopkins (Henry Wood).

Given space limitations I cannot hope to render a complete history of Germanics at Penn. It seems more appropriate to focus on the early developmental phase as a means to understanding what is happening in the profession today, 100 years later. To this end I seek: (1) to place the debate on the significance and role of Germanics in the larger context of the development of a university which accompanied the emergence of the discipline; (2) to trace briefly the development of German at Penn; and then (3) to focus on activities in the Department at the turn of the century. By limiting my purview to Germanics in the United States during the

period 1882–1916, I seek to shed light on the opportunities for and challenges to our profession today. That period displays striking parallels to our own turn from the twentieth to the twenty-first century, for we are challenged by a similar anti-intellectualism to legitimize our work and to (re)constitute our professional ethos. The old adage that everything is new and nothing is new still obtains. It is always worthwhile for us to pause in our headlong rush into the future to reflect upon the past, for that past was once someone else's future. We can learn from their expectations, aspirations, and strategies for success, gain consolation from their trials and tribulations, and draw inspiration from their dedication and innovation. The opening and closing frames of my inquiry are determined by the establishment of the Graduate School of Arts and Science at Penn in 1882 and the death of Marion Dexter Learned in 1916.

German and the Idea of a University

The idea of a university formulated in 1881 by Daniel C. Gilman, the founder of Johns Hopkins University, sketches the debate on the nature of the university and its relationship to traditional college education, a debate the legacy of which endures today (witness Allan Bloom 1987). That debate and Gilman's positioning on it provide the framework for the specific work of Germanists at the undergraduate and graduate levels both in the late nineteenth and the late twentieth centuries. The graduate program in German at Penn was established in the early 1880s in conjunction with that debate. In fact, because of its institutional structure, which was less indebted to the British model, Penn was always better positioned to fill the role of a university than the colleges of Yale and Harvard, of Virginia, California, Vanderbilt, and Cornell (the institutions specifically cited by Gilman). On the other hand, newly founded universities such as Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and Chicago were more forward-looking in their organizational structure and concept of mission, as noted by Learned himself (Learned, "Germanistik" 10).

Gilman calls for an indigenous, *American* university, one *not* slavishly beholden to the much-lauded German model or any of the European variations.[2] Good ideas for higher education can be gleaned from many quarters, yet, Gilman emphatically asserts, "an indigenous and not an exotic plant will thrive best in our climate and on our soil" (1881: 356). These words still ring true as we seek to define the Americanization of Germanics. Moreover, the idea of the university is grounded on the belief that the college of humanities must be at its center, must serve as the foundation if any higher structure is going to have any chance of enduring. The early study of mathematics, "the foundation of science," and of language, "the foundation of the humanities," are a sine qua non for university study, that is, for graduate work in any discipline. Gilman concludes: "it is obvious that the growth of American universities is not to be promoted by the abandonment of colleges" (1881: 359). Thus, "universities must include or must rest upon colleges" (1881: 357).

In 1904 Alexander R. Hohlfeld, who had just moved a few years earlier from

Vanderbilt University to the University of Wisconsin to build up the German department in Madison, and who served as president of the MLA in 1914, chose as his lecture topic to honor several professors visiting from Germany: "The Influence of German University Ideals on American Higher Education" (Hohlfeld 1904: 242–51). He notes that the older American college system (e.g., Harvard, Yale, Princeton) was indebted to the English model, whereas the university system concept is indebted to the German model. Interesting here is Hohlfeld's suggestion that the English college model is archly conservative, interested solely in preserving the traditions of the past and inculcating that canonical knowledge into students in rote fashion.

By contrast the progressive German model values the independence of thought and method of the individual scholar, who has total freedom in the choice of topic and sweep of intellectual content. Only the latter, Hohlfeld concludes, is really qualified to train the teachers and scholars of the future (246). Nevertheless, like Gilman a generation earlier, he grants that the American character is essentially different from the German, although both nations are driven to seek the truth through rigorous scientific inquiry: "Der treibende Geist streng methodischer Wahrheitsforschung wird sicher in beiden der gleiche sein; daran ist nicht mehr zu zweifeln. Doch dieser Geist wird sich in beiden Ländern in verschiedenen Formen und Einrichtungen ausdrücken" (247). The latter formulation echoes Gilman's prognosis that American institutions of higher learning must be like "an indigenous and not an exotic plant" in order to thrive. Hohlfeld locates the difference in the Americans' eager quest to find practical applications for all kinds of theoretical knowledge. This connection between practicality and theoretical innovation will always remain stronger in American than in German universities, he concludes, citing specifically the "practical tasks and demands of life in American academia" (247; cf. Bledstein 1977). This clash between theory and practice, between college canons and the relativizing research conducted in graduate programs continues to mark academic life today and strongly suggests that American Germanics must be "an indigenous and not an exotic plant" if it is to have a chance for long-term survival.

Manifest here are the dual roles of the teacher-scholar which are to be separated from one another. Dedicated teaching and the disciplining of the mind find their proper place in undergraduate (college) settings, while open inquiry is primarily at home in graduate (university) programs (see D. Gilman 1969: 360). What we learn from Gilman's and Hohlfeld's commentaries on the peculiar character of American higher education, moreover, is that Henry Schmidt's emphasis on the presumed chauvinism of American Germanists in the period 1882–1917 is perhaps one sided, as is his strong, negatively tinged suggestion that the Americans necessarily see themselves as "high priests of culture, as builders of character, and as interpreters of ultimate moral values" in alleged blind adherence to the German Germanist's model (Schmidt 1985: 205). While that notion (seen disparagingly) certainly dominated the educational views of such eighteenth-century clergymen as Justus Heinrich Christian Helmuth, founder of the Mosheim Society (1789) and

German schools in Philadelphia, its transferral from pietistic missionaries in colonial America to academic mandarins 100 years later obscures the larger picture of an altered academic world confronted by the pressures of capitalism and nascent consumerism. This is where Learned comes into the picture.

In a lecture at Columbia University around 1900 entitled "Germanistik and schöne Litteratur in Amerika," Learned offers his view of the relationship between the history of Germanics and American culture, especially during the nineteenth century. He refers to that influence not just as "leitend" but also as "umbildend" ("Germanistik" 5) and notes specific affinities between German culture and American culture: (1) religious earnestness (but with the German brand marked by humane tolerance); (2) principles of freedom and equality which caused the German emigrants to protest the slave trade in 1688; (3) the German colonists like the Puritans valued public schooling ("Volkserziehung"); and (4) the German colonists promoted book culture in much more emphatic fashion than the Puritans did ("Germanistik" 6).

Having noted these similarities between German and "American" culture, Learned remarks that there have been two major periods of German cultural influence in America. The first begins around 1815 ("die man kurzweg die *deutsche* nennen darf") and is associated with such men as George Ticknor, Edward Everett, and George Bancroft, all of whom studied in Göttingen where Georg Friedrich Benecke, Jeremias David Reuß, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, and Friedrich Bouterwek offered courses on literary history. Benecke was joined in 1829 by Jakob Grimm and in 1835 by Wilhelm Grimm (Meves 1994: 122, 201). In 1824 Karl Beck and Karl Follen arrived in America and began teaching at Harvard. With Follen's activities in Cambridge, Learned avers, "eine neue Epoche in der Geschichte der Germanistik in Amerika [beginnt]" (8), whereby "Germanics" is understood to include the teaching of language, as was the case in Germany at the time, too. In 1826 he published his *Deutsches Lesebuch für Anfänger,* Henry Edwin Dwight produced his widely read *Travels in the North of Germany in the Years 1825–26,* and Alexander Hill Everett promulgated German culture (esp. Schiller) in the pages of the *North American Review* (9). The impact that Follen had on Margaret Fuller and Ralph Waldo Emerson is well known and is referred to by Learned. He also notes Longfellow's indebtedness to the "Altmeister" Goethe (9). Not surprisingly, Learned concludes this section by stating: "In dieser Periode der deutschen Anregung in Neu-England haben wir die Anfänge der amerikanischen Germanistik zu suchen" (9).

Learned dates a second major phase of German influence with the end of the Civil War (1861–65). It is institutional in nature rather than bound to the efforts of literary figures such as Fuller, Emerson, Longfellow, Everett, or James Russell Lowell. After 1865, namely, a number of "real" ("wirklichen") universities were founded which saw the introduction of German instructional methods (most notably the "Seminar" and philological rigor): Johns Hopkins, Stanford, Chicago. Additionally, older colleges were reorganized into universities: Harvard, Yale, Co-

lumbia, Pennsylvania, Cornell. "Gerade diese neuen Universitäten," Learned writes, "sind die Hauptstützen der germanistischen Studien in Amerika" (10). Strides made in these institutions had led to recognition in academic circles abroad, but at home little note had been taken of the accomplishments of these early Germanists. The reason for the lack of public recognition, Learned opines, lies in the superficiality and myopia of "our authors" (11).

The Columbia lecture on "Germanistik and schöne Litteratur in Amerika" provides an explanation for Learned's lifelong efforts as teacher and scholar. From the outset he advocated the study of Germanics in the broadest sense of the term (despite the German *Germanistik* in his title) as a way of promoting an American culture worthy of inclusion with the great cultures of the world, past and present.[3] Of course, his project must be seen against the backdrop of the major deleterious tendencies of the late nineteenth century, tendencies which he himself lists as follows: (1) the materialistic spirit [i.e., consumerism, capitalism, pragmatism] which has led to the decline of interest in humanistic studies and the overvaluing of monetary gain; (2) the rise of the newspaper culture which values local news ("Lokalgeschichten") and sensationalism ("Sensationen") at the expense of noble sentiment, originality, and cultured insight; (3) an insatiable demand for "Novellen" ("Novellenwut") which overshadows all other literary forms; (4) the loss of high standards in literary criticism ("Oberflächlichkeit und Kleinmalerei unserer Schriftsteller" 11).

The above sketches the intellectual climate within which German Studies first succeeded in profiling itself in America *avant les lettres* as a scholarly field of inquiry. We do well to recall that this debate more or less coincides with the institutionalization of the discipline in Germany, where it reaches back to the early nineteenth century. However, not until the 1850s did *Germanistik* begin to flower fully in Germany. New appointments ("o. Professoren") were made in Heidelberg (1852), Erlangen (1852), Kiel (1854), Würzburg (1856), Göttingen (1856), München (1856), Rostock (1858), Leipzig (1858), and Königsberg (1859). The Wilhelmine era saw the establishment of a great number of new departments and a drastic rise in enrollment, quintupling between 1871 and 1914.[4] Between 1910 and 1932 the number of "Ordinarien" doubled again, rising from 87 to 196. With this background information in mind, we have a context for the institutional history which shaped the emergence of Germanics at Penn as "an indigenous" plant on American soil, despite its close ties to *Germanistik*.

The University of Pennsylvania: A Brief History

The University of Pennsylvania likes to trace its origins back to the "Charity School" established in 1740 at Fourth and Arch Streets in Philadelphia, which was subsequently absorbed into the "Academy" established by Benjamin Franklin and other leading lights of the day in the winter of 1749–50. Benjamin Franklin served as the first president of the Academy's Trustees and is thus considered the "father"

of the university. However, not until 1755 was the Academy converted into a "College" with the power of conferring collegiate degrees. At the first commencement, held 17 May 1757, seven students received the B.A. More notably for our current query, the state legislature, which had confiscated all the rights and properties of the Trustees in 1789, passed an act in 1791 "amalgamating the old College with the new University" (Pennsylvania, *Bulletin* [1940–41]: 25). That legislative act amounted to the first duly constituted university in the United States. Since then the official corporate title has been the University of Pennsylvania. From the French Revolution to the Civil War, things remained essentially unchanged; the number of students graduated in the Arts and Sciences from year to year hovered around 25, the entrance age remained at 14 years, the required courses continued as before, and the Medical School enrolled two to three times as many students as the "Collegiate Department" and "Academical Department" combined.[5]

German was first offered to students in the early days of the Academy, when a Mr. Craemer was appointed in 1754 to teach French, Italian, and German. Following the Revolutionary War, pastor Johann Christoph Kunze, a graduate of Halle and founder of a Lutheran preparatory seminary in Philadelphia, was appointed Professor of German and Oriental Languages at the College and in 1780 was made Master of a special "German School" added to the earlier lower schools, where German-speaking boys could be prepared for the higher studies and where others could be taught German. All subjects in the curriculum were taught in German in this new school. Beginning in 1780 the German Society of Pennsylvania awarded a few fellowships upon the recommendation of their German-speaking pastors to help young students pursue their studies (Roeber 1995: 161). On 9 April 1792, the board of newly elected trustees of the University of Pennsylvania made appointments to the newly formed "Faculty in the Arts." Six professorships were filled: one each in natural philosophy, moral philosophy, Latin & Greek, mathematics, English and Belles Lettres [!], and one in the German & Oriental Languages. The Rev. Justus Heinrich Christian Helmuth, D.D., was named "Professor of the German and Oriental Languages" (Pennsylvania, *Charters* 1853: 36).

There then appears to be a gap in the coverage of German from the late eighteenth century to the early 1830s. While I have not yet found an adequate explanation for this absence, I should note that the Pennsylvania legislature shifted its support from the Latin school (where Kunze, then Helmuth, taught everything in German) to transforming Franklin Academy in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, into Franklin College (today: Franklin and Marshal College). In a report to the Fränkische Stiftungen in Halle dated 27 October 1789, Johann Christoph Kunze remarked that German would surely die out, for "the people here are completely English, the coming generation understands no German and no new Germans are arriving here" (Roeber 1995: 173). Helmuth's frantic efforts to encourage instruction in German through such projects as the Mosheim Society attest to even this avid believer's real fear that German morals and customs would be lost with the demise of the German language. Of interest in this regard are the several pamphlets

extolling the virtues of knowing German penned by Helmuth in the late 1780s and the 1790s under such titles as "Colloquium of Two Friends Concerning the Blessings of a Good Education" and "Humble Suggestions of a Plan How Religious Schools Might be Established" (Roeber 1995: 163). Other German Americans such as Schmidt and Mühlenberg joined Helmuth and Kunze in identifying the "lack of vision among the Pennsylvania German laity as a primary cause" of the failure to attract more students to study German (Roeber 174). Strikingly, all this occurred at a time when fully one-third of Pennsylvania's population was of German heritage (Roeber 162).

The earliest college catalogues available in the University Archives date from the 1830s. The bulletin for 1834–35 lists one Hermann Bokum as Instructor of German.[6] However, from 1836 to 1850 no instructor of German is registered. From the 1830s onward the following notation was frequently printed in the "Course of Instruction" as well as in the running description: "French, Spanish, and German, may be pursued if required by parents" (Session 1834–35: 28). In 1846–47, the notation reads: "The modern languages are taught by approved instructors, at a moderate additional expense" (31). In the academic year 1852–53 that fee is listed as $10. For the 1863–64 session tuition is raised to $35 per term, but the fee for each professor in the Department of Modern Languages remains steady at $10 (Pennsylvania, *Catalogue* 27). Despite some gains, then, German was offered until the end of the Civil War primarily on an ad-hoc basis to those students who explicitly requested it.

In 1850–51 John C. Brunner is announced as "Teacher of German" (*Catalogue* 1850–51: 7). In a "Report of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania" published internally in July 1851, major changes in the structure of the University were announced due to the continued growth of the institution. On 11 May 1851, the following plan was adopted, which proved decisive for the development of Germanics: "There shall be Departments of Ancient Languages, of Mathematics, of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry, of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, of English Literature, of Modern Languages, of Physiology and Natural History, and such others as may hereafter, from time to time be adopted" ("Report" 1851: 2). What that amounts to is the formation of Penn's first Department of Modern Foreign Languages. Courses in five of the above departments were required for the B.A. degree. The minimum age for admission was 16.[7]

Most notably, we find here the first mention of the creation of a chair for the German language with the notation: "This chair has not yet been filled" ("Report" 1851: 7). Also a professorship of Italian Language and Literature is mentioned for the first time.[8] By contrast, a chair for French was established early on. The Italian position was filled in 1852, but the German one remained open until 1857, when the Rev. Charles C. Schaeffer (no academic degrees indicated) was appointed the first "Professor of German Language" at Penn, albeit not as a member of the Faculty of the Arts (*Catalogue* 1857–58: 5, 7). Strikingly, his appointment occurred the same year that the Deutsches Seminar at Rostock was established. Nevertheless, it

was not until the 1867–68 academic year that a professor of the German Language and Literature in the modern sense of the title was named: Oswald Seidensticker, Dr. Phil., Göttingen (*Catalogue* 1868: 5). His appointment at Penn coincided with the founding of the "Deutsches Seminar" at the University of Tübingen in 1867. Thus, we might view the establishment of the discipline of Germanics at Penn as echoing the rise of the field in Germany.

Enrollment and Curricular Statistics

In order to keep the development of the German program in perspective, it is useful to document some comparative statistics for the College at Penn during its first 150 years. The number of students enrolled in the college was, as mentioned, small, averaging throughout most of the nineteenth century between 115 and 150 students for all four years. By contrast, the Medical School regularly enrolled 450 students from 1830 to about 1890, when the numbers increased substantially.[9]

Statistics of Attendance, College Department, 1740–1891

Academic Year	Number of Students Enrolled
1740–81	161
1781–91	113
1791–1801	97
1801–11	82
1811–21	135
1821–31	141
1831–41	194[10]
1841–51	1,011
1851–61	1,162
1861–71	1,327
1871–81	2,569
1881–91	3,991

The numbers increased dramatically after the Civil War years, and there was even a gradual rebuilding of the strong student base from the South in the School of Medicine. A retrospective of the University (1740–1893) notes unprecedented growth at Pennsylvania between 1882–83 and 1892–93, when student enrollment more than doubled: from 984 to 2,066. In the same time frame, the faculty grew from 124 instructors to 255. Of these, there were 618 students and 88 faculty in the College Department in 1893, and 117 students and 42 instructors were active in the Department of Philosophy (Graduate School).[11] It is claimed, moreover, that by 1893 "the University attract[ed] its students from a wider area than any other American institution," drawing them from 44 States and Territories and 77 foreign countries (Pennsylvania, *History* 14). By the 1893–94 academic year, Penn had enrolled over

70,000 and graduated 14,900 students, had a physical plant then valued at 3.1 million dollars, an endowment of $1.6 million, could claim 110,000 bound volumes in its library, 24,000 of which were in classical literature (i.e., Greek, Latin) and another 24,000 in modern languages and criticism (*History* 10, 14).

The numbers of students from Germany studying at the University grew dramatically from 1851 to 1891; that is, from one in the decade 1841–51, to four in the years 1851–61, to three from 1861 to 1871, 10 from 1871 to 1881, and eventually to 45 from 1881 to 1891 (*Bulletin* 1.3 [1893]: 5; cf. Geitz 1995).

For most of the nineteenth century tuition remained at $25 per annum. Following the Civil War it increased to $35. Until the appointment of Oswald Seidensticker, students who opted to study a modern foreign language—Greek and Latin were required of all students—could expect to pay an additional fee of $10. But that fee structure changed radically near the end of the century. In the 1884–85 academic year, for instance, tuition amounted to $150 per annum (14); room and board were estimated at between $150 and $210; textbooks ranged from $10 to $50; clothing cost between $30 and $100; and extras ran anywhere from $25 to $100. Thus, the total cost to attend the year at Penn ranged between $245 and $660 in 1884–85 (*Catalogue* 1884–85: 15). The tuition at Penn in 1896–97, 12 years later, ranged from $160 to $200, and the total estimated cost reached from a low of $334.50 to a high of $500 depending upon the course of study, type of accommodations, meal plan, and the amount of pocket money desired. Textbooks cost from $10 to $50 (*Catalogue* 1896–97: 54). Tuition for the Graduate Program (i.e., the Department of Philosophy) in the academic year 1897–98 was $100 plus a $25 graduation fee.

Admission to the college was based on entrance examinations in three general areas: I. English, History, Mathematics; II. Foreign Languages (Greek, Latin, French, German); and III. Mathematics, Physics. High school diplomas were subject to review by a faculty committee. The entrance examinations were offered twice a year at locations throughout the East, Midwest, and in California. Noteworthy is the condition expressed in the 1886–87 *Catalogue* that no candidate will be accepted "whose work [in English] is notably defective in spelling, punctuation, idiom or division into paragraphs" (*Catalogue* 1886–87: 56). Much earlier, beginning with the *Catalogue* of the University of Pennsylvania for 1873–74, a general statement of the educational goals and expectations was published:

> The Department of Arts is designed mainly to give that comprehensive and liberal culture, and to secure that mental training and discipline which was until recent years the sole aim of the best known American colleges. The methods by which these objects are sought have been enlarged here by the adoption of a carefully arranged elective system, by the introduction of new subjects of study (notably the modern languages), and by giving greater prominence to certain old ones. (*Catalogue* 1873–74: 9)

The entrance requirements for German courses stipulated knowledge of "Collar and Eysenbach's *German Lessons* (Longer Course) or an equivalent." The

candidate's knowledge of grammar was tested partly by translating a simple passage of English prose into German. A minimum of 200 pages of modern German prose was also required. The passages were to be drawn from three of five named authors: [Roderich] Benedix (1811–1873), Hauff, Heyse, [Wilhelm Heinrich] Riehl (1823–1897) and [Heinrich] Zschokke (1771–1848) (*Catalogue* 1886–87). With the Nobel prize winner Paul Heyse (1830–1914) and perhaps Wilhelm Hauff (1802–1827) as the only truly canonical figures, the selection of authors reveals a German Studies approach rather than a narrowly literary one. The emphasis is nationalistic and patriotric; the preferred genre is the Novelle and other prose. Worthy of note is the fact that the Wharton School and the Department of Biology required German as one of the foreign languages (*Catalogue* 1886–87: 59). All other programs note that French or German could be used to satisfy the entrance requirement. Beginning in 1898 the admission test for German throughout the university was standardized. The stipulation for German reads:

> A. Grammar. The declension of the articles, adjectives, pronouns, and such nouns as are readily classified; the common prepositions; the simple uses of the modal auxiliaries; the elementary rules of syntax and word order. The test will consist in part of direct grammatical questions, and in part of translation into German of simple sentences.
>
> B. Sight Translation. The ability to translate at sight a passage of easy prose containing no rare words. The passage set will be adapted to the proficiency of candidates who have read not less than two hundred pages of simple German. (*Catalogue* 1896–97: 66)

Moreover, a foreign language (whether Greek, Latin, French, or German) had to be studied as an "elective" for a minimum of three hours during each of the eight semesters spent at the university. German was paired with either Latin, French, or English. Juniors had to take a four-hour "elective" in "German Classics, Prose Composition, [or] History of German Literature," while seniors had to invest five hours in "Classical German Prose and Drama, History of German Literature, [or] German Composition" regardless of the combination with Latin, French, or English (*Catalogue* 1896–97: 69–70).

Examples of the readings to be expected at each level were given in the catalogue descriptions following the Civil War. For example, the catalogue for 1870–71 lists the following:

1st year: German not required.

2nd year: German "grammar, both practical and theoretical (Douai). Hauff's *Mährchen.*"

3rd year: "German (Elective with Latin or Italian). Grammar continued. German Phrases and Dialogues. Storm's *Immensee.* Schiller's *Poems.* Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea.*"

4th year: "German (Elective with Greek or Spanish). History of the German

Language and Literature, with characteristic specimens for Reading." (*Catalogue* 1870–71: 33)

The list is slightly varied in the catalogue for 1871–72:

1st year: German not required, but French was.
2nd year: "Plate's *German Studies.* Practical Exercises in Translation.
3rd year: (Elective with Greek or Spanish). Douai's Grammar. Hauff's *Mährchen.* Lessing's *Nathan.* (32)
4th year: History of German Language & Literature with characteristic specimens of reading."

There was little change in 1872–73:

1st year: as before
2nd year: as before
3rd year: "German (Elective with Greek). Plate's *German Studies.* Whitney's *German Grammar.* Schiller's *Maria Stuart.*"
4th year: "German (Elective with Greek). Schiller's *Poems;* Goethe's *Faust.* Synonyms." (*Catalogue* 1872–73: 35)

A dozen years later we find some of the same canonical authors: Lessing, Goethe, Schiller. The university *Catalogue* for 1884–85 gives examples of readings to be expected at each level:

Junior Class: "German.—Whitney's *German Grammar.* Schiller's *Maria Stuart.* Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea.* Storm's *Immensee.*
Senior Class: "German.—Goethe's *Torquato Tasso.* Lessing's *Dramaturgie.* Reading at Sight. Schiller's *Poems.* Translations into German. History of German Literature." (*Catalogue* 1884–85: 20)

The pattern which emerges is quite clear: throughout the post-Civil War years until the end of the century, very little changed in the expectations of students studying German at the undergraduate level. Compared to contemporary requirements, expectations seemed to be higher. However, there is a clear disjuncture between the entrance requirements and the actual course work once the student arrived at the University. While the former had a German Studies slant, the latter reveal a clear bias toward "canonical" literary studies at the undergraduate level. This bias is mirrored in Learned's lecture at Columbia University at century's end on "Germanistik und schöne Litteratur in Amerika."

Foundations of Graduate Study at Penn

Graduate studies in Germanics at Penn got off to a slow start. Although the Graduate School of Arts and Science was founded in 1882, the first real advanced program

is created under Marion Dexter Learned. Thus, no graduate program is listed for the 1884–85 academic year. Seidensticker's lectures on German literature, so we are informed by a special notation, are open to "persons of both sexes . . . without examination" (*Catalogue* 1884–85: 6).

According to the *Bulletin of the University of Pennsylvania* 1.1 for 1893, the rule of thumb in the "Department of Philosophy" (i.e., Graduate School) is a dual concentration. German is always combined with something else. A few examples can serve to illustrate this tendency. The Rev. Max Felix Dumstrey of Philadelphia (who attended Gymnasium in Berlin) combined a major in philosophy with European History and German Language and Literature (3). Dana Carleton Munro, also of Philadelphia, majored in European History with concentrations in Political Economy and German Language and Literature (3). The Rev. John Richelsen of Philadelphia, who had attended Latin School in Flensburg, Schleswig-Holstein, combined philosophy with experimental psychology and German. Isaac Joachim Schwatt, a native of Mitau in Kurland, Russia, had spent three-and-one-half years at the Polytechnic School in Riga and a year at Berlin University before coming to Penn to study mathematics, experimental psychology, and German language and literature. Of an additional 34 students listed (but not named) in the category "special student," none majored in German (*Bulletin* 1.1 [1893]: 4). At the time, the total enrollment in Arts and Science at Penn was a little more than 2,000 (*Bulletin* 1.2 [1893]: 4).

The first year in which the graduate program in German took on a clear profile was the 1897–98 academic year. The *University Catalogue* lists the fellowship recipients and the numbers of students taking German full and part time. Regular students numbered 103, while there were 52 special students (presumably part-time) and one postdoctoral fellowship: Charles Reed Miller, who held the Ph.D. in Germanics. He received a Senior Fellowship of the George Leib Harrison Foundation. Five such postdoctoral stipends were open (only) to men in any discipline who had taken the Ph.D. at Penn. It paid $800 per annum (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 453). Martin Schütze was a first-year graduate student on a Full Fellowship from the George Leib Harrison Foundation. This fellowship rotated among graduate programs at Penn and carried a stipend of $500 per annum plus $100 for books. The fellowship was reserved for those who had already pursued graduate studies at "another reputable institution" and who had a good reading knowledge of French and German; the candidate had to be in the humanities or social sciences. No teaching was required. There were five such Full Fellowships. Schütze was an 1886 graduate of the Gymnasium at Güstrow, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and had studied at the Universities of Freiburg and Rostock (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 453, 188). Thomas Seltzer, a first-year student, had graduated with a baccalaureate from Pennsylvania in 1897. He held one of 14 scholarships open to men who had studied at Penn (again offered by the George Leib Harrison Foundation). The nonrenewable scholarship included tuition remission plus $100 for one year.

In addition to the postdoctoral candidates and the two graduate fellowship holders, five regular students and one special student pursued the M.A. in 1897–98. Of these one was a teaching assistant, the other an instructor in German:

Eleanor Anne Fyfe Andrews (Sheffield, Mass.). German & French, 2nd year.
George Griffiths Bartlett (A.B. Harvard, 1885). German, 3rd year.
Samuel B. Heckman (Union College, Ohio), H.B. (Earlham College, 1893), A.B. (Harvard, 1894); graduate student at Harvard, 1894–95; Instructor in English Literature and Modern Languages at Juniata College, Huntingdon, Penn., 1895–97. Germanics. 1st year (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 389).
Cornelius William Prettyman (Salisbury MD). A.B. (Dickinson, 1891), graduate student at Johns Hopkins, 1895–96; Fellow and student assistant in German, Johns Hopkins, 1896–97. Assistant in German. Germanics, 1st year (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 390).
Edward Charles Wesselhoeft (Philadelphia). Graduate of the Real-Schule (Johanneum) of Hamburg, Germany, 1877. Instructor in German, Pennsylvania, 1891 to date. Germanics, 1st year (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 391).
Hannah Edna Sleeper (Philadelphia). Special student. Germanics 1st year (*Bulletin* [1897–98]: 94).

As can be seen, graduate students in German were eventually drawn from a wide geographical area and include a mix of recent arrivals from Germany as well as native talent. After the turn of the century graduate students in Germanics at Penn came from the Midwest and California as well as from Philadelphia and the East Coast. To be sure, there were times when large numbers of candidates hailed from the immediate area. In passing let it be noted that both Prettyman and Wesselhoeft were hired into the program that produced them and spent long and active careers at Penn. In the twentieth century, Adolf Klarmann (Ph.D. 1931), Adoph C. Gorr (Ph.D. 1934), and Heinz Moenkemeyer (Ph.D. 1951) are further examples of Penn hiring its own students. Of these three, Klarmann enjoyed national prominence from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s. Moenkemeyer was recognized as a dix-huitiémist and Goethe scholar in the 1960s and 1970s. Gorr became a dominant personality in the local German American community.

The course of instruction for a graduate major during Seidensticker's tenure is instructive as a point of orientation for subsequent developments. It was divided into four general categories which reveal an emphasis on traditional philology ("Altphilologie") together with a German Studies thrust. An example follows, drawn from the *Bulletin* for 1893, augmented by later catalogues of the University of Pennsylvania.

Requirements for the Major:

A. "Germanic Language and Literature"
   1. "Gothic." This course dealt with phonology and grammar. The required textbook was Braune's Gothic Grammar; Selections from Ulfilas' *Translation of the Gospels and Epistles* were included. (Prof. O. Seidensticker)
   2. "Middle High German." The textbook was Paul's *Grammar* with selections from the *Nibelungenlied* and the lyric poets (Seidensticker) (6)
   3. "History of German Literature." Textbook: Wilhelm Scherer's *History of German Literature* and Müller's *Selections*.
B. "Philosophy"
   1. "Philosophy of Kant" (Lecturer William Romaine Newbold)

Requirements for a Minor Subject:

A. European History: "The ability to make use of French and German works is almost indispensable in advanced historical work" (*Catalogue* 1897–98: 10).
B. Experimental Psychology: "Such a general knowledge of the subject as may be gained from Wilhelm Wundt's *Physiologische Psychologie* plus two other works, in English."
C. German Philology and Literature:
   1. "A thorough knowledge of German Grammar."
   2. "Reading of German texts at sight."
   3. "A good knowledge of the History of German literature."
D. Romance Philology and Literature: recommended text—Schwann, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen*
E. German texts also cited for Semitic Languages & Literatures, Mathematics (*Catalogue* 1897–98: 10).

Seidensticker's curricular legacy at Penn proved enduring, holding sway throughout the twentieth century. Both Seidensticker and his more famous successor, Marion Dexter Learned, were productive scholars in terms of the number of books written. Learned, however, proved to be more active in the town-gown arena.

When Learned moved from Baltimore to Philadelphia in 1895, he introduced significant changes to the graduate program at Penn. By 1897–98 a clear profile had emerged, as is clear from the above survey. Learned is even credited with having established the Penn department as the United States' premier German department around the turn of the century.[12] Striking—and perhaps instructive for us—are Learned's personal and professional qualities cited as contributing to the success of the program. For example, he: (1) was well read and had an excellent memory; (2) introduced the seminar method "by means of which the students should receive practical training in the preparation of scientific papers" (Shumway, *German-American Annals* [*GAA*] 19.5/6 [1917]: 152); (3) established the Germanic Association; a monthly meeting of faculty and students at which research papers were read and discussed; (4) founded the international journal, *Americana Germanica* [*AG*] (1897–1902; from 1903 to 1919 it continued under the new title *German-American*

Annals); (5) established a monograph series for the publication of seminal studies on German American relations, exercising strict editorial control and ensuring high standards (it is thus not surprising that the *German-American Annals* ceased publication a few short years after his death in 1916); (6) carefully advised students, endeavoring to animate them to achieve their very best (Shumway, *GAA* 19.5/6 [1917]: 152); (7) afer seeing them through their studies, he continued to counsel and encourage his former students (Shumway, *GAA* 19.5/6 [1917]: 153). Moreover, upon his recommendation the University of Pennsylvania (8) established the German Traveling Scholarship which enabled students from various disciplines to study abroad (reported by Rosengarten, *GAA* 19.5/6: 149). Finally, Learned (9) proved singularly successful in placing his students in teaching positions (Shumway, *GAA* 19.5/6: [1917]: 153).

When Learned arrived in Philadelphia there were but one or two students in the graduate program, as Shumway recalls. By the time of his death there were about a dozen, several of them on scholarships. Learned went about his work with such dedication and devotion that David Jayne Hill, former U.S. Ambassador to Germany, could remark: "Not for generations, if ever, will any scholar of American birth, without a trace of German blood, devote himself to the study and teaching of German culture with the disinterestedness, the enthusiasm, and the wholeheartedness that characterized the devotion of Dr. Learned." Little could David Hill know that Daniel B. Shumway, Dr. Learned's former assistant and anointed successor, would in fact compete with Learned's devotion to German culture, although he, like Learned—as Hill put it—was just "an American of the Americans in heredity, in spirit, and in understanding" (*GAA* 19.5/6 [1917]: 160). The phrase is a salient assessment of the man who intuitively realized that Germanics must be cultivated as "an indigenous and not an exotic plant" to ensure survivability.

In recognition of his role as an "interpreter of Germanism to America" Learned was "commended by the Kultusministerium of the German Empire as a worthy recipient of high honor at the hand of the Emperor" (Hill in *GAA* 19.5/6 [1917]: 161). He served as treasurer of the Modern Language Society of America (1893–95), organizer and secretary of the Association of Teachers of German in Pennsylvania (1898), president of the Nationaler Deutsch-Amerikanischer Lehrerbund (1899–1900) and one of the prime organizers (as well as first elected Secretary) of the German-American Historical Society, incorporated in 1901. In 1899 a special fund was established to advance the publication of materials pertinent to German American Studies. For the benefit of this "German Publication Fund of America," the University of Pennsylvania sponsored two German plays, produced by director Heinrich Conried of the Irving Place Theatre in New York.[13]

The "course of instruction" in the graduate program at Penn in the academic year 1897–98 is instructive for its evidence of continuity from the late nineteenth to the late twentieth century. Two professors are listed: Professor Learned and Dr. Shumway. The majors or areas of concentration offered were "Germanic Literature" and "Germanic Philology." Students of Germanics had to take a two-year course in Old Norse, while students of medieval history were expected to take "Sixteenth-Century Drama" (Learned/Shumway) and "Seventeenth-Century Drama" (Shumway). Students of English or Romanic literature had to take six courses selected from among "The Classical Period" (Learned), "The Romantic School" (Learned), "German Literature in America" (Learned), and "America in the German Novel" (Learned). Finally, students of English or Romanic philology were required to take six courses chosen from among "Old Norse" (Learned), "Old High German" (Shumway), "Gothic" (Shumway), "Middle High German" (Shumway), "German Dialects" (Learned), "Germanic Philology" (Shumway), "Comparative German Syntax" (Shumway), and "History of the German Language" (Learned).

Moreover, those students majoring in Germanics who did not have a "satisfactory command of colloquial German" were required to enroll in German Conversation, to participate in the Germanic Association, and to participate in an advanced seminar or "Germanic Seminary." The Germanic Association, still functioning today as a forum for guest speakers at Penn, originated under Learned "as an essential part of the work in German." Faculty and students were expected to present "original papers" in the course of an academic year. That was an innovation at Penn which helped develop the professional skills of the department. Additionally, graduate students in German were required to enroll in at least one advanced seminar during the three-year cycle of offerings. As is still the case today, these specialized seminars were designed for advanced students who had a knowledge of Gothic, Middle High German, High German, New High German, and a general grasp of German literary history. One of the two seminars offered in 1897–98 focused on Goethe's shorter poems, the other on Old High German. The following year the topics were Goethe's Faust and German Minnesong (see *Catalogue* 1897–98: 196–200 and *Catalogue* 1898–99: 195–200).

The designation "The Classical Period" actually referred to the *Sturm und Drang* and *Aufklärung* rather than the period 1787–1805. Moreover, the course on the Romantic Period traced Romantic elements through the earlier eighteenth century as well as stressed its political context by noting its relationship to the "German ideals of 1813–1848" (*Catalogue* 1897–98: 199). Consequently, the research in Romanticism dating from around 1980 to the present which sought to reveal the roots of the Romantic school in the literary feud between Leipzig and Zürich or to underscore the political relevance of the allegedly "esoteric" Romantics was not innovative at all. That double thrust was anticipated by Learned at the outset of Germanics in America.[14]

Moreover, Penn's emphasis on reception studies—German literature in America in the nineteenth century, America in the nineteenth-century German novel—were equally highly innovative, revealing the rootedness of the nascent discipline in native American soil. Learned's course on the German ballad in 1897–98 evinces not only the nationalistic interest in "das Volk," but also an early interest in genre studies. And the several courses offered by Shumway and Learned on Sebastian

Brant, Hans Sachs, Thomas Murner, Ulrich von Hutten, Johannes Fischart, and Martin Luther highlight the Department's interest in the literature and politics of the sixteenth century. They were, of course, in tune with the general thrust of *Germanistik* in Germany, which was widely driven by the search for a German identity.

Finally of interest is a notation in the 1897–98 *Catalogue* that a course in "reading scientific German" was available and was taught by C. W. Prettyman, an assistant in German. The course was open to graduate students in other programs wishing to improve their knowledge of German. That course survives today as German for Reading Knowledge (Jannach), in which texts in the sciences and social sciences dominate the selections. Moreover, the fact that Prettyman, a first-year student, taught the course underscores the forward-looking nature of Learned's conception, for the teaching assistants were stand-alone teachers who were entrusted with more than first- or second-year German.

At the same time that Learned was reorganizing the course of graduate studies in Germanics, he also launched a scholarly journal to carry the thrust of the new program to an audience far beyond the walls of College Hall or the city limits of Philadelphia. That journal, *Americana Germanica,* was first published in 1897 with a distinguished international editorial board which included 33 Germanists from Austro-Hungary, Belgium, England, Germany, and Scotland. While they presumably served more as window dressing given Learned's penchant for tight control of the journal (he made all final decisions), we find among them such luminaries as Konrad Burdach, Max Koch, Jakob Minor, Franz Muncker, Bernhard Seuffert, Oskar Walzel, and Georg Wittkowski. The stated purpose of the journal was "to furnish a distinct medium for the publication of results obtained from the comparative study of the literary, linguistic, and other cultural relations between Germany and America" and to stimulate research on these connections on both sides of the Atlantic. The scope of the journal was intentionally broad, being aimed at reception and translation studies of German literature in America but also of American literature in Germany. Also welcome were dialect studies in the Germanic languages, investigations of "the cultural relations (exclusive of the literary and linguistic) of Germany and America, particularly folklore, manners, customs, industries and arts," and "articles on the general field of Germanics written in America" (*AG* 1.1 [1897]: v). These topics coincided closely with Learned's own research interests.

The inaugural volume offered contributions by leading American Germanists of the day. In addition to Learned and Shumway, who published pieces on "Ferdinand Freiligrath in America," "Pastorius' Bee-Hive" (both by Learned), and "The Verb in Thomas Murner" (Shumway), the volume contained articles by A. B. Faust (Wesleyan) on "Charles Sealsfield's Place in Literature," Kuno Francke on "Cotton Mather and August Hermann Francke," and a critical review of Francke's seminal *Social Forces in German Literature* by Herman Schoenfeld. Articles by G. A. Mulfinger on "Lenau in Amerika," T. S. Baker (Johns Hopkins) on "America as the Political Utopia of Young Germany," and Karl Knortz' "Die Plattdeutsche Litteratur Nordamerika's" rounded out the volume (*AG* 1.1 [1897]).

In the third number of volume one, Learned published an editorial lauding the newly founded *Journal of Germanic Philology* (*JEGP*) edited by Gustaf E. Karsten (Indiana) in cooperation with Albert S. Cook (Yale), Horatio S. White (Cornell), George A. Hench (Michigan), and George Holz (Leipzig). Of special note for us is Learned's judgment that the initial volumes of the *JEGP* gave "ample evidence that the scientific method has taken root in American soil and will grow as a native plant" (*AG* 1.3 [1897]: 106). In a footnote to that remark, Learned explains that his own journal and Karsten's undertaking complement one another and "augur a new period in the history of Germanic studies in America" (105). While the *Journal of Germanic Philology* takes English and German "in general" as the main goal and solicits contributions from Germany, *Americana Germanica* focuses on the literary, linguistic, and other cultural relations of Germany and America with special emphasis on contributions by American Germanists. Both academic journals aim at a "scientific" (i.e., objective) treatment of issues, publish in English or German, and have an international circulation" (106).

Noteworthy, moreover, is the fact that the journal was published with the generous financial support of German Americans in Indianapolis. Learned expressed the wish that "other Germans in America may well follow this most worthy example of aiding in the extension of German studies in the land of their adoption" (*AG* 1.3 [1897]: 106). Strikingly, the terms "Germanics" and "German studies" are the commonly used phrases to designate the efforts of the early Germanists to establish a native variant of the discipline.

In 1903 the *Americana Germanica* (1897–1902) changed its title to *German-American Annals* (1903–19) and added 15 contributing editors from North America, no doubt to help legitimize further the North American focus: H. C. G. Brandt (Hamilton); W. Carruth (Kansas); Hermann Collitz (Bryn Mawr); Starr W. Cutting (Chicago); Daniel K. Dodge (Illinois); A. B. Faust (Wesleyan); Kuno Francke (Harvard); Adolf Gerber (Earlham College); Julius Goebel (Stanford); George A. Hench (Michigan); W. T. Hewett (Cornell); A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin); H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (Chicago); Hermann Schoenfeld (Columbian University, Washington, D.C.); Calvin Thomas (Columbia); H. S. White (Cornell); Henry Wood (Johns Hopkins).

As noted, Learned also founded a monograph series, utilizing the abandoned journal title for it. The periodicals and the monograph series are valuable sources of information on the nature and contours of Germanics in the early part of this century prior to the founding of the American Association of German Teachers in 1926 with its journals. Equally significant is Learned's American ethnographical survey announced in 1897 in vol. 1, no. 4 of the *Americana Germanica.* It consisted of 25 detailed questions regarding every aspect of ethnographic identification used by Pennsylvanians to characterize themselves or others. The kinds of information requested ranged from dialect, festivals, common racial slurs, and preferred barn structures. Learned requested that the information be reported to him at the University of Pennsylvania. Six years later (*AG* 5) Learned reported on the formal

establishment of a group to carry out the "American Ethnographical Survey" in a scientifically rigorous fashion in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, notably Lancaster County, then in other German counties of Eastern Pennsylvania, and finally extending to the Western part of the state and into the eastern portion of Ohio (*AG* 1.4 [1897]: 111–12; *AG* 5.1 [1903]: 1–7). It had the support of the provost of the University, the governor of the state, the state superintendent of education, and the heads of various societies. Funding was secured and the project begun under Learned's directorship. While these efforts are worthy of closer scrutiny, let it suffice for present purposes to note the areas of inquiry: (1) German industries; (2) German occupations and trades before 1830; (3) German agriculture and rural architecture; (4) Old German domestic life; (5) the literary life of the Germans in colonial Pennsylvania; (6) the religious, social, and political life of the Germans; (7) the speech conditions; (8) old colonial roads; (9) and archeological collections (*AG* 5 [1903]: 3–6). The results of the survey as well as documents uncovered in the process were later published in the pages of the journal (e.g., *Benjamin Herr's Journal* 1830).

Learned was also instrumental in the founding of the Association of the Teachers of German in Pennsylvania, chairing the organizational meeting on 9 April 1898, in Houston Hall of the University of Pennsylvania. He was subsequently elected its first secretary. Learned delivered the introductory address, "The Teaching of German in Pennsylvania," which covered developments since the colonial period from the pioneer German schoolmaster, Francis Daniel Pastorius onward (*AG* 2.2 [1898]: 71–92). The meeting was attended by approximately 50 teachers of German from Penn and from various colleges and high schools in the state. It is with some embarrassment that Leaned notes here the fact that the new state of California established an Association of Teachers of German before Pennsylvania did (*AG* 2.2 [1898]: 75).[15]

Learned lauds in particular three papers presented at the recent meeting of the California Teachers' Association (held in San José, 28–31 Dec. 1897) which succinctly capture the range of concerns among Germanists in the early days of the profession: "The Educational Value of the Study of German" (by Julius Goebel at Stanford), "German in Secondary Education" (by David Starr Jordan of Stanford), and "Methods with German" (by Albin Putzker, California). Learned finds in these papers an innovative thesis and justification for the study of German at all levels of education. He delights in the shift away from the traditional argument of "speech representation" which states that German should be offered in the public schools because so many German speakers have immigrated to America and the needs of their families must be accommodated. Learned specifically objects to that stance when he writes: "If its [the speech-representation argument] cogency were recognized the public schools in our largest American cities would have to provide instruction in half a dozen foreign tongues" (*AG* 1.3 [1897]: 104).

The real argument for German is the centrality of German culture, not the presence (or absence) of speakers of German. Learning German is a value in its own

right, for it opens an avenue to higher learning and is "not merely a tool for business and professional purposes" (*AG* 1.3 [1897]: 104). Putzker's assertion that "Everybody, now-a-days, who claims higher education, must study German either to become acquainted with the great writings stored in that language, or to study its development" (104) is echoed by the other two speakers. Learned took a similar stance himself in July 1898, in an address entitled: "German as a Cultural Element in American Education." He begins his oration with the emphatic assertion: "The study of a foreign language is, in the last analysis, a question of culture and not of race" (3). Learned's conclusion is no less unambiguous, for he claims German culture as a "birthright" even for Anglo-Americans and sees the promise of extraordinary benefit for America from the wedding of this cultural "birthright" with one's own natural birthright as an American (23–24). Note, by the way, that these early Germanists and German teachers "resorted" to the use of English to carry on the business of the profession. The meeting of the California Teachers' Association concluded with the recommendation that German be placed on an equal footing with Latin in the high schools, its chief competitor.

It seemed to Learned that the study of German culture offered a way out of the cultural vacuum he sensed in his own country, which seemed obsessed with money and mass culture. The continuity of his concerns is demonstrated by an admonition from the year 1913 entitled "German in Public Schools." The whole tenor of the piece reveals a crisis mentality on his part. The incidence of German being taught in the schools and the quality of instruction when it is taught were clear causes for concern. While academics today might be inclined to dismiss his argument as reactionary, as deeply indebted to the college mentality of preserving the traditions of the past, his appeal might also be read as an historically revealing document whose significance still obtains. Learned calls upon his colleagues in German to raise the consciousness level of "our school boards and college administrations to the perilous conditions of the educational method, now running riot in American education" (*GAA* 2 [1913]: 100). Consequently, his intent is to sound a warning to educators across the country "against removing the foundations upon which our culture must always rest" (100). The first and fundamental principle of education is and must remain language: mastery of one's own native tongue, but also mastery of a foreign tongue, the language of international culture and research. That language at the turn of the century, to Learned's mind, was German. "German is the key," he wrote, "which unlocks the best sources of literary and scientific knowledge of our age" (102).

In a manner reminiscent of our own day, Learned argues in a two-pronged fashion for the inclusion of German in the school curricula. His first argument is aimed at the value of knowing a foreign language in an age which places increasingly greater demands upon educated individuals; life has become "far more complex" than ever before (101). Intellectual discipline and cultural diversification are necessary tools for success in the modern world. And the study of German provides both: "The first duty of the state is to give the pupil—every boy and girl—the fundamen-

tal training necessary to all vocations" (*GAA* 2 [1913]: 103). Foreign languages are part and parcel of this fundamental training. The cultural value of the foreign language should not be calculated according to the number of speakers of the tongue living in the United States—otherwise any number of ethnic groups could claim that their tongue be taught in the schools and a Tower of Babel would arise with German, French, Italian, Swedish, Russian, Polish, Yiddish, Hungarian, and Greek all vying for a place on the curriculum. Rather, the choice must be determined on the basis of which living language is the most essential at present and therefore has the greatest potential value to a vocation-minded public.

It seems clear to Learned that Americans must overcome their "fatal insularism and provincialism" which threatened the English Empire of his day (*GAA* 2 [1913]: 105). Americans are so "notoriously careless in their study of modern languages" that they cut a poor figure next to their European counterparts. The image of the ugly American who is linguistically and culturally limited is already starkly profiled here. Thus Learned recommends that German be taught in the elementary schools and that an "efficiency test" be applied to all language teachers; that is, they must demonstrate mastery of the "pronunciation or idiom" of the languages they teach. The course goal should be to enable pupils "to read and write German." In this way, he would use the primary and secondary schools to teach the fundamentals and allow colleges and universities to concentrate on oral/aural skills as an efficient way of preparing American youth for an increasingly international world. "The movement should be nation-wide and persistent, in order to secure our national prestige in the eyes of the civilized world" (106).

Learned shared the podium in Philadelphia on 8 April 1898 with H. M. Ferren, a teacher at Allegheny High School who spoke on "German in Our Public High Schools" (reprinted in *AG* 2 [1898]: 78–89). While deserving of detailed discussion, especially in light of Learned's praise of the California initiative, I will mention only certain facts bearing on the efforts to establish Germanics as a discipline in the United States around 1900 (and again around 2000). The old dichotomies of high school teacher versus college professor are noted here, as are the need to take the teaching of German seriously by offering it for four consecutive years, and the need for greater coordination between the high schools and the colleges. Especially noteworthy, however, are the statistics Ferren cites. Twice as many girls study German in the schools as do boys. Yet fewer than half of the girls are preparing to go to college: 13 percent of the boys are in college preparatory courses, while only 5.2 percent of the girls are (*AG* 2 [1898]: 82). From replies to 600 letters of inquiry Ferren mailed concerning the study of German in the United States, he learned that "fully one hundred reputable high schools distributed over seventy-four cities had four years of German. In Pennsylvania there are but five of these, Philadelphia being conspicuous for its absence" (83). Of the 250 high schools in Pennsylvania, 69 offered German, and 89 offered four years of another foreign language (84). In other words, 18.4 percent of high school pupils in Pennsylvania took German. This figure compares favorably to the 12 percent average for the nation as a whole, but

unfavorably to Maryland where 31 percent took German. By contrast, fully 58 percent of the high school students in Louisiana studied French (88). Ferren concluded his survey with seven proposals for action by the newly constituted Association of German Teachers in Pennsylvania: (1) improve pedagogical methods; (2) introduce German in as many high schools as possible; (3) insist on four years of German; (4) limit the number of subject areas assigned to each teacher; (5) encourage teachers to take postgraduate courses; (6) give German its proper place as an elective in the curriculum [i.e., either Latin or German]; (7) encourage coupling Latin and German [college entrance requirements dictated two languages]; and (8) found a National Association of Teachers of German (*AG* 2 [1898]: 88–89).[16] The latter did not occur until 1926, perhaps a mortal delay.

While he did not pen this report by Ferren, Learned's own work demonstrates that he concurred with Ferren's sense of urgency and frustration over the apathy, even hostility toward German, German accents, and German quirks long before the crisis induced by World War I. Learned utilized every professional (and personal) opportunity, even appearing as Pastorius in period costume, to proselytize for things German. He used the German Department at Penn between 1895 and 1915 as a bridge over the usual gap between town and gown, he orchestrated research topics endemic to a transplanted, nascent discipline, he trained Germanists who were capable of pursuing a wide variety of careers and who were not narrowly focused on higher education but were willing to make high school teaching a career (as advocated by Ferren). He did succeed in placing his academically minded students in institutions such as North Carolina, Illinois, Columbia, Smith, Muhlenberg, Grinnell, as well as in junior colleges and high schools. The German studies training these individuals received in Learned's "workshop" equipped them to be spokespersons for German American and German affairs (as advocated by Ferren). They were trained in the language, in the culture, in the mental habits of Germans. But they were trained from the outside in, not from the inside out. The "Tonangeber" at Penn in this phase were American-born with a deep and abiding, yet not uncritical passion for things German. German at Penn was not yet marked by a view of American culture as the "Negativerfüllung der eigenen [deutschen] Kultur" but rather as "Produkt und Ausdruck einer anderen Geographie, Geschichte und Werthaltung" (Trommler 1989: 254). The goal ultimately was to share in "the formation of a nobler and better type of American for the centuries to come" as Ferren put it (*AG* 2 [1898]: 89).

This line of argument is captured in Learned's exhortation to his audience of Germanists at Columbia University a year later to work toward the goal of establishing a national American literature by adapting the best methods and models of *Germanistik:*

> Es wäre nun die Aufgabe der Germanisten in Amerika nicht nur die Studierenden zu wissentschaftlichen [sic] Forschungen auf einem Spezialgebiet der Germanistik anzuspornen, sondern ihnen und durch sie dem Volke auch eine tiefere Kennt-

> nis der deutschen Litteratur und der Beziehungen zwischen der deutschen und amerikanischen Kultur beizubringen und so mit zu arbeiten an der Entwicklung einer wahrhaft nationalen Litteratur in Amerika. ("Germanistik" 13)

With that Learned provides a succinct explanation for his lifelong efforts as teacher and scholar. From the outset he advocated the study of Germanics in the broadest sense of the term as a way of promoting an American culture worthy of association with the great cultures of the world, past and present. His broad vision pierced through the nationalistic parochialism of the early twentieth century, pointing forward to the stance that marks the profession at century's end.

Notes

1 In trying to assess recent interdisciplinary, gendered, and theoretical developments in the profession since the 1980s in the general context of American higher education, Trommler asks whether Germanics functions more as a *Leuchtturm* or as an *Elfenbeinturm* (Trommler 1989: 27). I think we are justified in asking the question about developments around 1900.

2 On the question of American and German academics trained in Germany and their influence on Pennsylvania see Jarausch 1995: 195–211.

3 U.S. Bureau of Education, 1902, which Learned had read in advance sheets when part of Viereck's study was published in the Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1900–1901; that is, just about the time of Learned's Columbia lecture. Viereck details the impact of German culture and educational ideals on American schools and colleges, dividing the history of that influence into three phases: 1700–1825, 1825–76, and 1876–1900. A detailed review of the work (presumably by Learned) appeared in the *German American Annals*, n.s., 1.1 [old series 5.1] (January 1903): 64–67. See also the list of new publications (1.1: 69). A number of similarities exist in Learned's and Viereck's evaluation of developments in the nineteenth century.

4 Striking in this connection is Viereck's study. Meves traces the origins of Germanics as a discipline back to the early nineteenth century when stylistics, rhetoric, and the practical applications of German dominated. His discussion of the developments is differentiated, and he provides useful tables of various kinds of appointments (1994: 115–203, see esp. 148–50 and the tables 201–3). Hermand provides the following dates for the founding of "departments": 1873 in Heidelberg, Leipzig, Strasbourg, and Würzburg; 1874 in Freiburg; 1875 in Halle and Kiel; 1876 in Greifswald und Marburg; 1877 in Breslau, 1878 in Bonn and Jena; 1883 in Erlangen; 1886 in Gießen and Königsberg; 1887 in Berlin; 1889 in Göttingen; 1892 in München; 1895 in Münster (Hermand 1994: 57–58).

5 See the statistics provided in the introduction to the *Catalogue* of the University of Pennsylvania for the years 1843–63.

6 "Regulations of the Collegiate Department," *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, Feb. 1835, under the heading: "Faculty of Arts (1834–35)."

7 The reorganization of the University was not driven solely by idealism, that is, by a desire to achieve fundamental principles of higher education. Much of the impetus seems to have come from a general malaise in enrollments and in dismal enrollment prospects for the immediate future. Penn was one of 130 or so colleges in the United States at the time, all vying for a stagnant pool of college-bound youth. Recently installed higher standards for high school graduation, the movement at many elite colleges toward the elective system, and the fear that Penn could not compete successfully with the lower costs of colleges located in small towns all informed the Board of Trustees decision to reorganize Penn along the lines of a postcollegiate institution. The model for that reorganization was the German university (and this was 30 years before Gilman's argument). Of particular interest in this regard are two letters penned in response to the Trustees' recommendation. One by Bishop Alonzo Potter is dated 8 July 1852, a second by Professor of Literature Henry Vethake is dated 27 November 1852; these were published as "Miscellaneous Pamphlets of the University of Pennsylvania" (nos. 1: 1–6 and 3: 1–15) for the use of the Board of Trustees. Potter's letter represents a plea to innovate in radical fashion by establishing graduate programs for men in their twenties and to move away from competing with colleges for the 14- to 18-year-old age bracket. Among other suggestions we find one for establishing advanced studies in modern foreign literature. Vethake's letter is a rebuttal to Potter's proposal for establishing Penn as the first and only truly graduate institution in America (a move was underfoot to establish such a university at Albany, N.Y.). Vethake disagrees point by point with Potter, frequently referring to the differences between the German system of higher education and the American one. Central is Vethake's argument that the status of the German professor as a civil servant makes the German system possible because professors are not dependent upon student enrollment as is the case in the United States. Secondly, German universities are organized into four faculties (Theology, Medicine, Law, Philosophy), while U.S. institutions are arranged according to schools and departments. Finally, Vethake believes that American students are too intent upon establishing themselves in their careers during their twenties, not interested in pursuing advanced studies in the humanities, especially as the latter do not prepare one for acquiring wealth and fame. The Trustees went ahead with their plan to reorganize Penn as a graduate institution.

8 That position in Italian was filled in 1852–53, but was again vacant by the 1856–57 session (*Cat.* of University of Pennsylvania, Session 1856–57: 4–5).

9 *Bulletin of the University of Pennsylvania* 1.3 (June 1893) contains an accounting of enrollment figures from 1745–1891. A total attendance of 66,747 is noted in chart form and is accompanied by the notation that "the final total of 66,747 falls considerably below the real figures" since the catalogues prior to 1835 are incomplete "and the attendance in the College during that period is the number of the alumni for the period, and is therefore about one-half of the actual attendance." Of the total 66,747, over 15,000 youths attended the Charity Schools between 1740 and 1876 (5).

10 From 1740 to 1840 the Alumni List alone was used; no *Catalogues* of the college for this early period are at hand. *Bulletin* 1.3 (June 1893): 10.

11 *University of Pennsylvania: The History of a University and its Present Work 1740–1893* (n.p, n.d.), 3, 7. The College Department offered 329 courses grouped under 33 headings and falling roughly into seven divisions: the arts, the sciences, the Wharton School, School of American History, Biology, Architecture, Music.

12 A number of "Nachrufe" were included in the *German American Annals* 19.5/6 (1917): 147–63, detailing Learned's life and work. Here Shumway 1917: 153.

13 See "The German American Historical Society," *Americana Germanica* 7.2 (1902): 207–13, here 207. Notice of Penn's sponsorship is contained in the University of Pennsylvania *Bulletin* (1900). I have not yet been able to determine which two plays were performed.

14 Learned, in turn, was influenced by the early histories of German literature penned in the nineteenth century which followed the triadic scheme evident in Hosmer's *Short History* and Robertson's later *Outlines*. The most direct influence, however, on the conceptions of literary periodization was Francke's *Social Forces*, which was reviewed favorably in Learned's *Americana Germanica* in 1897. The book was reissued in 1897 and 1899. All these works reflected the German histories of German literature penned after midcentury.

15 Of note in this connection is Learned's report published just the preceding year in *Americana Germanica* (1897) on the teaching of German in the California public schools. He sounds a familiar note when he inveighs: "It is the Gold State again which attracts attention to the older States of the East to an important problem in American culture" (*AG* 1.3 [1897]: 104). The "important problem" is the incidence of German in the public schools in California where German was offered in only 35 of the 86 schools surveyed and to only 12 percent of the students in the 35 schools where is was an option (104).

16 Jedan unknowingly reformulates ideas, procedures, and goals formulated by Learned and Ferren around 1900.