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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines a segment of the history of American Germanistik (1870-1905), with particular attention to its assimilation of German Classicism. As a historical study of the profession, it has several significant antecedents within German scholarship; as a detailed inquiry into the history of Germanistik in America, it has few. For example, the Munich conference in October 1966 on the topic "Nationalismus in Germanistik und Dichtung" proved to be a watershed for extensive research into the history of Germanistik in Germany. Werner Ross remarked then: "Es wäre nützlich, auch über das Deutschlernen im Frankreich, England, Amerika des 19. Jahrhunderts etwas zu wissen." But American scholarship has largely failed to respond to the groundswell of investigation prompted by this conference (among others), the aftermath of which has been a substantially altered perception of Germanistik in Germany. The absence of an echo from across the Atlantic was perceived by Egon Schwarz, who commented in 1973: "Es wäre bedauerlich, wenn man das alte Modell gerade in den USA aufrecht erhielte, nachdem seine Grundlage sich als Fiktion entpuppte und in ihrem Ursprungsland aufgegeben wurde." In a similar vein, A. Peter Foulkes wrote in 1974: "Our practicing concept of German Studies was drawn largely from the models developed in the nineteenth century at German universities, but when these models began to collapse beneath the weight of Germanistik's complicity in the abominations of the Third Reich, we politely averted our eyes. We cultivated
the 'blaue Blume' in all its exotic varieties long after it had been declared dead in Berlin, and we preferred not to know that new institutions were being founded in Constance and Bielefeld without departments of German." While the pioneering volume German Studies in the United States: Assessment and Outlook (1976) gave direction to debate about the state of Germanistik in America, yet it shied from historical introspection on a broad scale, and therefore it was undertaken largely in vacuo. In 1976, Sol Gittleman argued that "at no other time in the history of our discipline in this country has there been a greater need for the definition of Germanistik in its American context," but his appeal nevertheless has not instigated the kind of inquiry requisite for such a definition. Most recently, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies presented in report (November 1979), which points to a rejuvenation of the discipline and makes the need for its definition, in my opinion, even more pressing than when voiced by Gittleman four years ago. "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security," warns the report. We can deduce: nothing less is at issue than the profession's viability.

Goethe once wrote that the history of science is science itself, which is to say that the discipline is the sum of its parts over time. He continued: "Man kann dasjenige, was man besitzt, nicht rein erkennen, bis man das, was andre vor uns besessen, zu erkennen weib." To draw an analogy: today's Germanistik succeeds yesterday's and is shaped in part by its accumulated heritage. But a historical survey of American Germanistik must not indulge in mere antiquarianism. An analysis of past scholarship, of earlier perceptions of the task of mediating German culture, of the role of the literary canon, can serve to broaden the contemporary
range of vision. In this sense, truly substantive planning for the future will depend on viewing strengths and weaknesses of Germanistik's heritage in its historical development. Thus the present dissertation attempts to initiate research into what I perceive to be a significant lacuna in professional self-assessment. George Santayana's historical maxim remains urgent—"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." To study the history of American Germanistik, then, is not to shirk or to beg the question; it is rather to help answer it.

Wolfgang Heinsohn has written that, in America, "By 1870, the idea of the superiority of German literature, scholarship, art, thought and philosophy had, indeed, become a myth. This myth survived largely from the cliché of 'Dichter und Denker,' which although maintained still in some groups, had lost its 'popular' appeal." To be sure, this sober commentary counteracts overstated claims of German influence on American life, especially those from apologists' camps of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but it skirts an issue central to the dissertation. Heinsohn would argue that popular appeal is the most accurate barometer of the Zeitgeist. Of course, he may be right; high-brow culture, as the name suggests, is a restricted social phenomenon. But, as his remarks indicate, groups or pockets (even institutional ones, like Germanistik) did exist in which the myth of "Dichter und Denker" lived on. These groups obviously do not represent the larger social strata, but that fact neither disproves their existence nor explains their presence. One can maintain with certainty that this is the case of Germanistik in America; it is at best a niche in the architecture of American social and intellectual affairs. Egon Schwarz has pricked any illusions we may have about
this. "Wenn die Germanistik von der Bildfläche verschwände," he quipped in 1973, "so ginge zwar eine interessante Erkenntnisfacette, aber nichts für das Weltverständnis Wesentliches verloren; schon gar nicht in Amerika, wo wir auch im günstigsten Fall—und im Augenblick sind wir weit von einem optimalen Arrangement entfernt—nur eine marginale Rolle spielen." Consequently, Heinsohn (and others) have dismissed Germanistik altogether as being of no consequence for American life and have turned instead to the reception of German literature in leading American newspapers and literary reviews. This avenue of investigation is valid and has yielded interesting information. But its implication is disturbing because it negates the historical role of Germanistik in America, discounting for example its currency in the late 19th century.

If we reconsider Goethe's proposition that science is its history and apply this notion to Germanistik in America, we see that we are in fact the heirs and patrons of a heritage, and that the questions to be asked are not first and foremost concerned with the magnitude of Germanistik's influence within the American setting, but with its own sense of function, with its inner constitution during a moment in its history. Robert Weimann has written that "the historical study of origins helps to assess the continuity of, or the degree of change in, its social function." In this sense, the past can be brought in touch with the present, and its "mythical" aura dispelled.

The First World War and the years of the Third Reich demand investigation, but given the lack of previous research, such an enterprise would mean beginning in medias res. I have chosen instead to study the earliest years of the discipline, because to date almost nothing has been
done in this area, and because I hope that further research may build on the findings of this dissertation. The choice of 1870 as the starting-point for the survey was not entirely arbitrary, for around this time Germanistik in America developed into an academic institution much as we know it today. Earlier, were one to speak of Germanistik per se, it would be largely as a pre-institutional and heterogeneous body, before the advent of a significant number of German departments at leading universities and the emergence of an academic discipline with its own organizations and journals, as well as a recognizable indigenous scholarship. All these factors converged during the last three decades of the 19th century. The conclusion of the survey with 1905 was suggested by the dissertation's focus on Schiller in assessing American Germanistik's assimilation of German Classicism.

Part I of the dissertation will provide a background for the analysis undertaken in Part II by outlining the characteristics and growth of Germanistik in Germany and America as it emerged during the 19th century and in its contemporary context. It will also explore the implications of research into the history of Germanistik, both in Germany and in America. Further, it will introduce questions and problems regarding the reception of German Classicism examined in Part II. The analysis in Part II forms the bulk of the dissertation. Here I shall try to determine how American Germanistik perceived itself as an arbiter of German culture.

The first chapter will focus on three topics: 1) the foundation of the Germanic Museum at Harvard in 1903; 2) the presidential address of the Nationaler Deutschamerikanischer Lehrerbund in 1900; and, 3) an article by a leading Germanist, in Monatshefte of 1901, on Germanistik's function
in America. Chapter II will seek to characterize the scholarship in the literary histories of 1870-1905. We shall then turn to the assimilation of German Classicism and examine as well the reception of Schiller in 1905. Finally, the reception of Wilhelm Tell in particular will provide an opportunity to study, in addition to aspects of literary analysis, key contextual references within (or perceived in) Tell which commanded the attention of American Germanists then and which, for our purposes, make the play a useful common denominator for analyzing the ideological subtexts of American Germanistik's Umfunktionierung of German Classicism.

Basically, the analysis within Part II will adopt two approaches used in Bernd Peschken's Versuch einer germanistischen Ideologiekritik. He calls them Innen- and Außenanalyse. The former denotes essentially an intrinsic interpretation of the primary texts (in this case, literary histories and other critical essays); the latter incorporates sociohistorical parameters. These two perspectives allow, according to Peschken, "das Falsche vom Wahren scheidcn zu sehen." For example, Peschken's external analysis tries to define the attitude toward literary history between roughly 1861-1868, a period when formative political tendencies were shaping the future German Reich. His aim is to determine to what extent the literary critic (Wilhelm Dilthey and Julian Schmidt) supported and legitimized these political currents, and to what extent the predominant political attitudes influenced or "carried" the critic and encouraged him to think and interpret literary history in accordance with emerging authority structures. Together with an internal analysis of Dilthey's and Schmidt's reception of (chiefly) Goethe and German Classicism, showing subtle but fundamental changes in their understanding of both,
Peschken can conclude, for example, that Dilthey's formulation of the classical canon resulted from what Peschken labels **Reichsideologie**, and that between 1850 and 1886 Schmidt's work modulated from a critique to an affirmation of Classicism.

A full appreciation of American **Germanistik** would have to account for its situation within an expansive sociohistorical context; it would need to consider, for example, its position within the American academic system, the relationship between American and German methods and schools. Further, it would need to examine the social environment, the pro- and anti-German sentiment in America, the social and political issues which engaged Germanists, the links between the Germanist as academician and nonacademic German immigrant culture. Clearly, these issues are complex, and they invite, as one observer has noted, the cooperation of cultural and political historians. In this sense, then, the present dissertation inclines toward a narrower but detailed **Innenanalyse**, "von den kritischen Ergebnissen" of which, writes Peschken, "die Außananalyse . . . in der Regel . . . ausgeht."

We must realize that it is all too easy to scoff at the turgid rhetoric of early American **Germanistik**, to chastise its overbearance, but there is no reason to joust with the phantoms of our past. Conditions have altered since then, and we cannot expect that this portion of American **Germanistik**'s history will repeat itself. Still, Ernst Bloch has suggested that "Werke des Überbaus"—and here one can include ideologies as well—"auch nach Wegfall ihrer gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen im Kulturbewusstsein sich fortschreitend reproduzieren." Perhaps other studies will investigate the viability of Bloch's proposition within the
parameters of American Germanistik after 1905. In any case, a polemical debate with the past is not the intention of this study; it is rather to detail the concerns of the early years of Germanistik in America. The focus on its "ideological" idiosyncrasies is intended, as Frederic Jameson has explained the term's connotations, "less to pass judgments than to reproblematize the entire . . . discourse or formal analysis thereby so designated."
NOTES: INTRODUCTION

2 Egon Schwarz, "Can Germanistik Be Taught?," Unterrichtspraxis, 7, no. 2 (1974), p. 47. (The paper was first read at the MLA convention in 1973.)
4 Eds. Walter F.W. Lohnes and Valters Nollendorfs (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1976),
9 Schwarz, "Can Germanistik Be Taught?," p. 53.
12 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1972). See pp. 7-9, 92-93, 128-29, et passim.
13 ibid., p. 8.

Versuch, p. 7.


At the start we must attempt a preliminary definition of *Germanistik* in America: briefly, it is a non-indigenous *Germanistik*, a "*Germanistik im Ausland*," partaking of and subject to its own milieu and necessarily differing from its German model-counterpart. It has multiple tags—*Germanistik*, Germanics, German Studies—with their own spectrum of connotations, highlighting either literary analysis, philology, or non-literary cultural studies. Curiously, some maintain that its scholarship has never really participated in the mainstream of German *Germanistik*, while some maintain the opposite. Just where do the specifically German traits leave off and the specifically American ones begin? And another perplexing question: what is, after all, *Germanistik per se*?

Walter Sokel has observed that "*Germanistik is a sub-branch of the study of literature. For over a century it was something else—a part of the 'German ideology' justifying reactionary nationalism."

Sokel's mention of the "German ideology" points to the philological evolution of *Germanistik* in the 19th century. Prior to 1850, *Germanist* was commonly, but not exclusively, used in analogy to *Romanist*, a historian of Roman law. In Wolfgang Menzel's *Die deutsche Literatur* of 1828, the term's conventional meaning lingered, but he took steps to politicize it by
viewing Germanistik basically "als wissenschaftliche und politische Re-aktualisierung germanischen Rechts in demokratischer Absicht, als eine Waffe des 'Liberalismus'." This attitude is surprising to find in the later Heine-Nimrod and Franzosenfresser, but it shows nevertheless that in the vanguard of the July Revolution, Germanistik became politically charged. Historians of the discipline have often overlooked this fact, even though one can still hear the political connotation in Jakob Grimm's later usage, where Germanistik was seen to stand "auf dem Boden des Vaterlandes" and to serve as a "nationale Wissenschaft." In 1846, the year of the first Germanistentag, Grimm suggested a new meaning, one of lasting consequence; for him, it was to embrace historians and philologians alike. According to Grimm, the Germanist should function as a

Band . . . zwischen drei Wissenschaften (law, history, and philology), denen so vieles und zumal der Begriff ihrer Deutschheit, worauf der Name hinweist, wesentlich gemeinsam ist. Dringt seine umfassendere Bedeutung durch, so müssen die Rechtsforscher, auf die es ungebührlich bisher beschränkt wurde, dabei verlieren, was sie auf der andern Seite an der größern Ehre, die dem Namen zuzuwachsen, wieder gewinnen. . . . Es wird also nur einige Gewöhnung kosten und, füge ich hinzu, von der Lebensdauer unserer künftigen Versammlungen abhängen, um die Ausdehnung des Namens Germanisten auf Forscher des Rechts, der Geschichte und Sprache Über allen Zweifel zu erheben. Er drückt dann gar nichts aus als einen, der sich deutscher Wissenschaft ergibt, und das ist wohl eine schöne Bedeutung. Ja, ein echter deutscher Dichter könnte sich gefallen lassen Germanist zu heißen.  

Grimm etymologizes to tap the wellspring of national patriotism. After 1848, political vigor gave way to conservatism, but with an interesting twist. The passionate rhetoric of democratic liberalism heard earlier faded away, only to reappear—this time set to a cadence in synchrony with Bismarck's stride. The old strain of liberation modulated,
while its words remained largely the same. By 1870, conservative and reactionary sympathizers had converted the forward-looking, nationalistic idiom into a legitimation of the Empire. The early anti-establishment rallying tenor of "deutscher Geist," for example, was subverted within Wilhelminian ideology to a rationalization of imperialism; much later, Nazi ideology transformed it completely into an instrument of propaganda for world dominion. This phenomenon illustrates what we can call the act of ideological assimilation. Because of historical conditions and conventions, an individual's vision alters, angles of interest change, societal perspectives shift. The result is, as with "deutscher Geist," that an original contextual bearing is lost from view, trumpeted unreasonably, or even maligned. On the surface, though (i.e., the "face-value" of the word and not its "meaning"), no change is visible. How this alteration in perception affected the reception of German Classicism will be discussed below.

Grimm had tried to locate the special nature and value of Germanistik in its vagueness as an "ungenaue Wissenschaft":

ich will auch laut werden lassen, worin sich unsere Wissenschaft erhebt und allem Zeitgeist zum Trotz einer tieferen Wirkung zu erfreuen hat. . . . Die genauen Wissenschaften reichen über die ganze Erde und kommen auch den auswärtigen Gelehrten zu gute, sie ergreifen aber nicht die Herzen. Die Poesie nun gar, die entweder keine Wissenschaft genannt werden darf oder aller Wissenschaften Wissenschaft heißen muß, weil sie gleich der leuchtenden Sonne in alle Verhältnisse des Menschen dringt, die Poesie führt nicht auf brausender Eisenbahn, sondern strömt in weichen Wellen durch die Länder, oder ertönt im Liede, wie ein dem Wiesenthal entlang klingender Bach; immer aber geht sie aus von der heimathlichen Sprache und will eigentlich nur in ihr verstanden sein.4
After 1848, Germanistik continued to be defined largely in Grimm's terminology—even into the early 1960s. The 1962 edition of Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß suggests: "Die Wissenschaft vom geistigen Leben des deutschen Volks—so darf man füglich die Germanistik interpretieren."

Such a definition today is untenable, not only because of the decade-long self-appraisal within Germanistik in Germany (discussed below), but more obviously because of the legacy of Nazism. More useful is Herbert Kolb's description of contemporary Germanistik in Germany showing the dialectic inherent in its practice and function:

Unter den philologischen Einzelwissenschaften nimmt die Germanistik in den deutsch sprechenden Ländern dadurch eine besondere Stellung ein, daß sie die Muttersprache der Lehrenden und Lernenden sowie die in ihr geschriebene Literatur zum Gegenstand hat. Sie steht damit zum geistigen Leben der Sprachgemeinschaft, dessen Ausdrucks- und Verständigungsmittel sie sich unter wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen zuwenden, in einem unmittelbaren Verhältnis, und dieses Verhältnis übt seine Rückwirkung auf die Germanistik aus. . . . Mehr als andere Philologien steht die germanistische Wissenschaft in dem Spannungsverhältnis zwischen interner und externer Relevanzsetzung, zwischen Eigenbestimmung und Fremdbestimmung darüber, was in ihr jeweils zu besonderer Wichtigkeit erhoben werden solle.  

By placing Germanistik in its social matrix, Kolb writes a more constructive definition than the vague and at times expressly nationalistic vocation imputed to Germanistik since the days of Grimm. His definition can also serve as a point of departure for discussing Germanistik in America, for apparently he has described the situation here as well—only ex negativo. In fact, Germanistik here does not work in the mother-tongue of most of its students, it is not directly related to America's "geistiges Leben," and it does not occupy "eine besondere Stellung" among philological disciplines. This does not mean that Germanistik in
America is necessarily qualitatively inferior, a mere handmaiden or, at best, a chargé d'affaires. At an international symposium on "Germanistik im Ausland" in 1977, Richard Brinkmann stated: "Germanistik im Ausland, in nichtdeutschen Ländern, war immer alles andere als eine Germanistik zweiter Garnitur." For the years 1870-1905 in America at least, one can refute Brinkmann's assumption, but the issue of relative quality is not of immediate concern here. More important for the moment are concise but substantive distinctions that we can draw between the meaning of Germanistik in Germany and the United States. Victor Lange has written that "In its broadest sense Germanistik has, in America, meant the transmission and presentation of German cultural attitudes and institutions, both social and literary, to a fairly disparate and heterogeneous, chiefly academic audience. . . . the contents as well as the critical procedures have, almost without exception, been determined by the principles and practices of the German academic establishment." Lange has also commented that early in the 20th century

Little . . . independence of judgment can be found in American academic studies of German; indeed, it was the more journalistic interest in contemporary and classical German literature with which men like James Huneker and H.L. Mencken proposed to nourish the growing American self-awareness. Academic Germanists, on the contrary, stubbornly asserted the preeminence of the methodology of their German peers. To examine the twenty volumes of the formidable set of German Classics (1913 ff.) is to recognize the undiminished respect of American teachers of German for the still powerful ideological model of German critical opinion and, altogether, of German Germanistik: the long Introduction was written not by an American scholar, but by R.M. Meyer, the most prolific among German academic critics. This sort of dependence is, of course, a complex issue which the political and cultural historians must analyze.
Lange is right, but his casual treatment of the relative isolation of the discipline ("chiefly academic audience") ignores the measures toward self-legitimization, both within and outside the academy, taken by the profession at different times in its history, measures that reflect its historically distinct sense of function. I prefer to emphasize, along with Jeffrey Sammons, that "Die amerikanische Germanistik steht gesellschaftlich gesehen gewissermaßen voraussetzungslos da; sie muß von vornherein ihre eigene Relevanz verschaffen." Its relative insularity sets off American Germanistik from its German counterpart like no single internal feature could. To be sure, the complexity of its relationship within American social and intellectual life does invite interdisciplinary investigations from political and cultural historians, but the more introspective study that this dissertation proposes is intended to furnish a basis for these larger investigations, should they be pursued.

"The question is," wrote Sammons when criticizing the profession's invisibility, "whether there really is an American Germanistik participating in the fullness of its strength in American scholarly life, whether some substantial portion of our scholarship has not become the province of the German university and therefore a great deal more visible there than here, as well as more preoccupied with its concerns than with ours." In addition, American dependence on German scholarship could implicate importation of the "German ideology" mentioned by Sokel. Again it was Sammons who imparted his suspicion, "daB dieser in die amerikanische Germanistik importierte Komplex der wilhelminischen Ideologie, sollte er einmal richtig erforscht werden, einige unerfreuliche Aspekte zutage bringen würde." But concern about American Germanistik's independence is not
exclusively a contemporary anxiety. In 1903, John F. Coar wrote:

The student or, if you prefer, the teacher of German literature in America has a distinctly different task from that of his colleague in Germany. It is one thing for a German to study the literature of his own country or for a teacher to present this literature to a body of students by birth and environment sympathetically in touch with its spirit, and it is quite another thing to study this literature as a foreigner or to present it to students more or less out of touch with the fundamental problems and characteristic elements of German life. American scholarship, so far as it concerns itself with any literature not indigenous, cannot disregard this distinction. It is a practical problem that confronts us here, and one that is not finally solved by the so-called historical method, at least not as we have come to interpret that term.  

This statement lends credence to David Bathrick's assertion that "In a certain sense American Germanistik has always been in a state of intellectual isolation." In Part II we shall see if Bathrick's further contention that "the history of American Germanistik is an ideological history of intellectual alienation" (p. 254) holds true, and to what extent it defines American Germanistik of 1870-1905.
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3 Quoted in Müller, p. 6.

4 Quoted in Müller, p. 8.


8 Lange, "Thoughts in Season," German Studies, pp. 7-8, 12-13. Lange, though, does acknowledge that "the superb quality of that scholarship [i.e., American] is beyond dispute" (p. 9). His evaluation strikes me as inconsistent. He writes later: "If we look at the history of the teaching of German literature in the United States, we cannot escape the fact of its almost total dependence upon the impulses and perspectives of German literary scholarship" (p. 9). The dependence referred to here is difficult to reconcile with the appraisal of "superb quality," especially when considered in the light of H.G. Gadamer's words: "Kein produktiver Forscher kann im Grunde darüber im Zweifel sein, daß zwar methodische Sauberkeit zur Wissenschaft unerläßlich ist, aber die bloße Anwendung gewohnter Methoden weit weniger als die Findung von neuem— und dahinter die schöpferische Phantasie des Forschers— das Wesen aller Forschung ausmacht." See H.G.G., Wahrheit und Methode, 3rd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1972), p. 513.
Also, Lange's reference to the journalistic interests of Huneker and Mencken could be applied to the American scene as far back as 100 years earlier. It should be mentioned, though, that the German Classics were conceived, initiated, and edited by Kuno Francke, who, although German by birth, had been Professor of German at Harvard since the mid-1880s and a highly respected figure among American as well as European academic circles.


10 Sammons, "Some Considerations on Our Invisibility," German Studies, p. 18


CHAPTER II:
THE CRISIS WITHIN GERMANISTIK

From the mid-1960s until the early 1970s, Germanistik in Germany was rocked by a maelstrom of crises. Many factors contributed to the now familiar mise-en-scène. In the winter semester of 1964/65, students pressured the University of Tübingen to organize a forum on the relation of the university as an institution to fascist ideology. Other universities followed suit. Attention focussed not only on the legacy of National Socialism within the institution "university," but within the "institution" Germanistik as well. In Munich of October 1966, the "Tagung des deutschen Germanistenverbandes" convened to discuss "Nationalismus in Germanistik und Dichtung." It precipitated an animated exchange within and outside the profession, prompting the editors to write in the foreword to the conference's proceedings:

Die Wissenschaft der Germanistik, das Wort im weitesten Sinne genommen, hat hier einen ernsthaften Anfang gemacht, sich mit der Vergangenheit des eigenen Faches und mit den "nationalen" oder auch "nationalistischen" Traditionen in der deutschen Sprach- und Dichtungsgeschichte auseinanderzusetzen. . . . Vertreter der Älteren, vor allem aber auch solche der jüngeren Generation, suchten sich dieser sehr komplexen Thematik von verschiedenen Seiten her zu nähern. . . . Vielleicht wird dieser Band mit dazu beitragen, die in München begonnenen Bemühungen zum Selbstverständnis und zur Selbstkritik der deutschen Germanistik weiter zu fördern und dadurch zu intensivieren.
The political atmosphere of the mid- to late 1960s was highly charged by events such as the formation of the Große Koalition and its antagonist, the außerparlamentarische Opposition, the Notstandsgesetze provoking criticism and protests against the government, and the turbulence in France of 1968, to cite only a few. In brief, volatile political and economic affairs galvanized German culture and society and a crisis-consciousness emerged.

In 1968, Helmut Heissenbüttel looked beyond the horizons of Germanistik and pronounced the death of literature. He, like others, observed that "crisis" was in fact a shibboleth not only for the state of Germanistik in the sixties and seventies, but for the humanities as well. With rhetoric typical of the polemical rather than analytical intent of the late 1960s, Michael Pehlke argued that "die Krise der Germanistik steht stellvertretend für die globale Krise jener Fächer, die aufgrund ihres Wissensverstandnisses in unpolitisch-affirmativer Harmonie mit der bestehenden Gesellschaft leben, das kritische Potential der Studenten von gesellschaftlicher Praxis fernhalten und zage Detailkritik allenfalls im Rahmen fachinterner Emigration deklamieren." Franz Greß's explanation in 1971 that the humanities lost their central role within the university structure in the course of industrial development is still socially defined but characteristically more subdued and well-grounded.

By the mid-1970s, the crisis had abated. Already in 1970 Volkmar Sander had diagnosed tongue-in-cheek: "Heute will jeder seine Krise haben. Ohne Krise ist man nicht mehr gesellschaftsfähig, ja geradezu deklassiert." In 1977, Herbert Kolb summed up the course of Germanistik during its previous stormy decade:

As the debate within and about Germanistik evolved from logomachy to inquiry, an Ideologiekritik of the discipline took shape. Regard for historicity, along with a desire for reform, motivated most investigations after Nationalismus in Germanistik und Dichtung. Haunted by its past, scholars re-examined their profession’s history with an eye toward curing its future. In 1967, Peter Demetz had excoriated among the profession’s most blatant shortcomings its failure to cultivate a critical
historical sensibility, His caveat did not fall upon deaf ears; ultimately, polemics resuscitated a historical consciousness, giving rise to penetrating research into the roots of Germanistik in Germany.
NOTES; CHAPTER II


Two volumes, *Ansichten einer künftigen Germanistik* (1969), and its sequel, *Neue Ansichten einer künftigen Germanistik* (1973), exemplify the transition from polemics to analysis. The first conjectured, "wie es in dieser vielgeschmähten Disziplin weitergehen soll"; the second proposed concrete suggestions for contemporary reform. Important works on the history of *Germanistik* include *Methodenkritik der Germanistik*, by Marie-Luise Gansberg and Paul Volker (1970), Franz Greß's *Germanistik und Politik: Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte einer nationalen Wissenschaft* (1971), and Peschken's *Versuch einer germanistischen Ideologiekritik* (1972). Progressively less polemical, they adduce significant trends and details of *Germanistik* in the second half of the 19th century in particular. Gunter Reiss' *Materialien zur Ideologiegeschichte der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft: Von Wilhelm Scherer bis 1945* (1973), and Das Rühebuch: *Die Rolle der Literaturwissenschaft in der Ideologie des deutschen Bürgertums am Beispiel von Schillers "Die Rüheber"* (1974), combine documentation and analysis in workbook form. These five works examine ideological tendencies of *Germanistik* and are instructive studies of the flux and constancy within German *Literaturwissenschaft* since the mid-19th century. *Germanistik und deutsche Nation: 1806-1848* (1974) looks at the emerging years of *Germanistik* in its larger sociohistorical context, roots out progressive and conservative forces of the time, and
thus documents another Ideologiekritik of the history of the profession. Martin Doehlemann's Germanisten in Schule und Hochschule: Geltungsanspruch und soziale Wirklichkeit (1975) assesses Germanistik's social function of mediating literature. Doehlemann consults the papers and records of the Deutscher Germanistenverband since its formation in 1912; his findings corroborate and define a gap between the real and the self-perceived social utility of Germanistik.

The fact that the organization of Germanistik in Germany is generally more centralized than it is in the United States facilitated the studies undertaken there in a way that would not be the case when investigating Germanistik in America. Research conditions there were further ameliorated with the establishment of an archive solely for the history of Germanistik, organized in 1972 at the Schiller national museum in Marbach.

The absence of such an archive here is, I think, telling. It reflects indifference regarding the history of our profession, a disinterest in the heritage that affects its practice and function today. It also reflects how little the "crisis-consciousness" and introspection within German Germanistik have penetrated American scholarship. Not that American Germanistik should ape German Germanistik; for obvious reasons it cannot. But I do think that German scholars today generally acknowledge the real contributions made to our understanding of Germanistik in Germany. In 1968, Johannes Hansel reported that "Eine modernen Ansprüchen genügende Gesamtdarstellung der Entwicklung der Germanistik steht noch aus."

As the pendulum swung from the polemics of the sixties to the more sober and analytical studies of the seventies, these demands were, collectively rather than individually, largely met. The dimensions of the task seem
to preclude any single comprehensive study being undertaken; aside from being impractical or impossible, it may even be undesirable—a broad survey of that kind would tend toward sweeping generalizations and would have to forgo requisite detailed analysis. Still, the historical treatises on Germanistik in Germany have given us, somewhat piecemeal and pell-mell, graphic insights into its machinery and ideology during certain moments in its history.

Despite American Germanistik's comparative youth (although as an academic institution it is not much younger than in Germany), the number of critical historical studies undertaken here are, I think, disproportionately few. And histories of German Germanistik are hardly a recent development. In 1865, for example, Wilhelm Scherer, in a eulogy for Jakob Grimm, sketched the history of German philology (in the general sense of the word) from the 16th century to the period of Romanticism and the beginning of Grimm's work. In 1870, commissioned by the academy of sciences in Munich, Rudolf von Raumer wrote an encyclopedic Geschichte der germanischen Philologie, vorzugsweise in Deutschland. Many other works preceded Josef Dünninger's "Geschichte der deutschen Philologie" (1957), one of the last such studies prior to the flurry of activity in the sixties.

Generally speaking, one will not find writings on American Germanistik until the 20th century, and none exceeds a vignette. I have grouped them as 1) Forschungsberichte; 2) statements concerning literary methodology; and, 3) brief histories of the teaching of the German language (and literature, but mostly only tangentially).
Among Forschungsberichte, the earliest I have discovered is Edwin
Zeydel's "Die germanistische Tätigkeit in America 1918-1926" (1928);
this essay appeared in Euphorion, not in one of the American journals,
like Germanic Review or German Quarterly. Zeydel's account begins ac-
rimoniously:

Einem Ueberblick Uber die Ergebnisse der letzten
neun Jahre amerikanischer Forschung auf dem Ge-
biete der neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte
müssen einige erklärende Bemerkungen zur Orien-
tierung derer, die mit den amerikanischen Verhältnis-
nissen nicht vertraut sind, vorausgeschickt werden.
Als Amerika auf Seiten der alliierten Mächte in den
Weltkrieg eintrat, verkündete es durch seinen Präsiden-
ten die hohen Ideale, die es angeblich vertrat, leitete aber gleichzeitig einen Propagandafeldzug ein, nicht nur gegen den deutschen Militarismus und das deutsche Kaisertum, ja selbst gegen die deutsche Literatur und Sprache. Dieser Feldzug, der unter dem Deckmantel der public information vor sich ging, wurde hübsch geschickt geführt. Insgeheim unterstützten die Behörden und Regierungsvertreter alle unfreundlichen Maßnahmen aufs nachhaltigste, amtlich allerdings überließen sie sie der Tagespresse und den vielen Patriotenvölkern... Der Feldzug gegen den Deutschen hatte schließlich das Er-
ggebnis, daß die deutsche Sprache nicht nur als Lehr-

In the next six pages, Zeydel registers American scholarly productivity
between 1918 and 1926 (see below for his comments on methodology).

In 1938, Walter Reichart reported on "Die Germanistik in Amerika," also in a German publication, the Germanisch-Romanische Monatshefte, also to introduce American Germanistik to his European colleagues. The gist of his article was to note the scholarly journals accessible to
American Germanists. Subsequent articles by Henry C. Hatfield and J. Merrick (1948), Ernst Rose (1952), and Clifford Bernd (1965) encompass the years 1939-1961. No compilation of scholarly literature exists for the earliest years of Germanistik in America.

In his article of 1928, Zeydel commented that the paucity of scholarship between 1918 and 1926 resulted from Germanists ("selbst diejenigen, die sich zur Forschung befähigt fühlen," p. 240) having to recruit and rebuild after the war. About methodology Zeydel had this to say: "Ist sie (i.e., American research) auch oft scharfsinnig und klarblickend in bezug auf literarische Einflüsse und Beziehungen, so ist sie doch noch unholfen und tastend in ihrer Methodik. Während sie dunkel ahnt, daß so etwas wie ein Umsturz in der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft vor sich geht [a probable reference to the ascendance of Geistesgeschichte], mangelt es ihr zuweilen an der erforderlichen Schulung und an philosophisch-wissenschaftlicher Vertiefung, um in jeder Hinsicht begreifen und folgen zu können" (p. 242). In 1945, Leo Spitzer responded to an article by Karl Vißtor of the same year. Spitzer's "Deutsche Literaturforschung in Amerika" sympathized with Vißtor's call for de-emphasizing the historical study of literature and viewing it once again as a sub specie aeternitatis. Horst Daemmrich's article of 1969 addressed literary criticism within American Germanistik after World War II and touched upon theoretical questions topical among German critics of the time, like Vißtor and Spitzer. Daemmrich wrote: "Unbegreiflicherweise ging man [in America] einer wirklich eingehenden theoretischen Erörterung versöhnlich aus dem Wege..... Sie sahen das Hauptanliegen der amerikanischen Germanistik darin, die deutsche Literatur einem kaum informierten amerikanischen
Leserkreis vorzustellen und näherzubringen. . . . Das hauptsächlichste Merkmal, das die amerikanische Germanistik in den letzten Jahrzehnten auszeichnete, war die Besinnung auf das sprachliche Kunstwerk."

Other occasional statements on literary methodology can be found here and there but, significantly, they remain scattered observations. No work has substantially characterized the literary scholarship of American Germanistik.

The history of the teaching of the German language (and literature) is more fully researched. An account from the turn of the century traces German language instruction from the colonial period to the close of the 19th century and describes its status at the beginning of the 20th. The survey is informative but not analytical. It is concerned neither with literary scholarship nor with the larger task of cultural mediation. The statistics give only a vague impression of internal concerns, such as a literary canon, and no impression of the contextual interpretation of important literary and cultural heritages, like German Classicism.

Two later studies (1913, 1930) report on the teaching of modern languages in the United States, yielding useful statistics. Camillo von Klenze's "The Teaching of German Literature and the Genteel Tradition" briefly treats the reception of German literature during the last half of the 19th century. Von Klenze admits that "we teachers of German have good reason to think with sincere gratitude of the men and women . . . who voiced the principles of the genteel tradition," but he goes on to disparage the jaundiced portrait of a romanticized Germany that this tradition left, and bemoan the "legacy of on the whole rather doubtful value and, we must add, one which American criticism of the last
two generations has done little or nothing (save for giving us a better Goethe) to correct or enlarge" (pp. 97, 101). Despite von Klenze's profit­itable discernment of a "genteel tradition," his article has neither the range nor the depth of a Forschungsbericht or a critical historical study.

An article by Zeydel in 1961 ("The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present") is the most comprehensive and 14 objective account to date. But like most of his predecessors, Zeydel focusses on language instruction and does not touch on the issues central to this dissertation.

The evidence suggests, then, that prior to the mid-1960s, when the crisis within German Germanistik changed the nature of inquiry into the history of the profession there, American Germanistik lacked an awareness of its own history. Before seeing how this has changed, I would like to consider briefly why a tradition within American Germanistik proves difficult to trace.

In 1928, Zeydel wrote of the World War I anti-German campaign against literature, language, science—in short, against German culture per se. In 1961, he wrote anew:

in the spring of 1917 . . . German was flourishing in the public and private high schools in many parts of the country, faring not too badly in the institutions of higher learning, and holding its own in the elementary schools of cities where it was firmly entrenched. The war in Europe which had been raging for over two and one-half years had had some repercussions upon German instruction, to be sure, but not of an alarming nature.

But in the spring of that year, when the United States declared war upon Germany, hell broke loose. The propaganda, which had concentrated upon the German emperor, his armies and submarines, with many allegations of atrocities, turned immediately, now that we were at war, against the language, its
literature as a whole, and in some cases even against its teachers, who were confronted with the sweeping accusation of being "pro-German." Groups of vigilantes visited the libraries and removed German books; others came to the departmental offices in the universities and confiscated textbooks containing pictures of Emperor William II or equally "subversive" material. The readers of Paul Bacon, for instance, who perhaps had gone too far in "selling" Germany to us, were the object of special vigilance and drastic condemnation.

State legislatures . . . and a score of cities vied with one another in forbidding the teaching of German in the public elementary and high schools, or even in prohibiting the speaking of German when more than a given number of persons were present in the gathering. Other bodies politic campaigned against it. Laws were passed, over the protest of the Commissioner of Education, such as no tyrant ancient or medieval had ever dreamed of. All of these laws were later held to be unconstitutional. . . . In short, it was an ugly period in the history of an America which had become known for its tolerance.

As a result of this hysteria the study of German was either propagandized or actually legislated out of existence. All this came suddenly, like a revolution, and necessitated lightning-like adjustments on the part of school administrators. German, still enjoying riches in 1916-17, was speedily reduced to rags (pp. 298-99).

Zeydel's account is eye-catching not only because it describes a deplorable scene from American history on which we should reflect occasionally; it is also significant in its description of a radical caesura between German tradition and American history. The two World Wars, in fact, have profoundly disrupted the flow of German culture into America. I would maintain that these two occasions are responsible for the frail and nebulous sense of tradition within American Germanistik, and that over the years they have contributed to a reluctance within the profession to examine its past.
Clearly, **Germanistik** in Germany had its reasons to shun the past; despite its crises, more likely because of them, it did not. To be sure, the context here differed from Germany's. The termination of NDEA support, the erosion of foreign language requirements, budget constrictions—that was the unique predicament of **Germanistik** here. An account from 1976 explains:

As the fat 1960's were turning into the lean 1970's, many members of the German-teaching profession in the United States started searching for theoretical and practical solutions to the problems that seemed to descend upon us with unexpected suddenness. The fact that our—primarily practical—problems coincided with the—primarily ideological—self-assessments of Germanistik in Germany and the developing trend toward a broader interdisciplinary concept of German culture studies both compounded and simplified our own attempts at problem-solving. It was difficult to separate the specifically American aspects of the crisis from those facing the profession in Germany and internationally. At the same time—the critical thinking processes elsewhere helped us avoid a sense of isolation and provided useful Denkmodelle for our own self-evaluation.  

Since the late sixties, the "primarily practical problems" of the German-teaching profession have in fact received widespread attention. At the same time, its "ideological problems," presumably secondary, have been obscured by an apparent indifference toward the profession's history. For the most part, these issues have been submerged beneath contemporary pragmatic concerns. Where they have surfaced, they are formulated largely as questions wanting answers.

In 1973, Egon Schwarz cautioned: "Es wäre bedauerlich, wenn man das alte Modell gerade in den USA aufrecht erhielte, nachdem seine Grundlage sich als Fiktion entpuppte und in ihrem Ursprungsland aufgegeben wurde."
In 1974, A. Peter Foulkes speculated on the future of German Departments in the United States. He reproved the profession's naïveté and opportunism in its model-building, as well as its persistent cultivation of "the 'blaue Blume' in all its exotic varieties long after it had been declared dead in Berlin" (p. 526). Foulkes concluded by suggesting that "Our first task, as more German scholars are beginning to perceive, is to question every aspect of every assumption which underlies the very process of teaching and researching literature" (p. 542). These remarks reveal—in 1974, after German Germanistik had several significant studies to its credit—only a nascent concern for American Germanistik in its historical contexts.

That a major work like German Studies in the United States: Assessment and Outlook (1976) does not explore the history of Germanistik in more detail is indicative of the profession's failure to promote a historical self-awareness. Its publication presupposes self-assessment, but almost all of the contributors take the part of either the trouble-shooter or the prognosticator, and only seldom that of the historian. Though regrettable, one can understand why so little emphasis was placed on history—the sparsity of research in this area confronts today's scholar with an unfamiliar (not to mention non-traditional) field of inquiry. A Germanist like Victor Lange can trust to his wide reading and considerable experience to make cogent observations about Germanistik in early 20th century America, observations which I think a detailed study would bear out. But the earliest date mentioned in Lange's brief essay (the title itself is suggestive and symptomatic: "Thoughts in Season") is 1909, and the emerging years of Germanistik in the last three decades of
the 19th century go unnoted.

David Bathrick's essay in *German Studies* raises questions of central concern to the present dissertation. He asks: "If, as Micheal Pehlke (19) tells us, the history of *Germanistik* in Germany is the ideological history of the German bourgeoisie in the nineteenth and twentieth century, what about *Germanistik im Ausland*? What about it in this country? What are the ideological premises which constitute the underpinnings and institutional functioning of American *Germanistik* and more generally of the whole oddball enclave known as foreign language departments?" (pp. 252-53). We are forced to conclude that American *Germanistik* has largely failed to address these questions, and it could be said that "the result has been a monumental failure to develop both a self-critical and socially critical field of study rooted in the needs and conflicts of American society" (p. 254). Despite this and other indictments, in this area of research American *Germanistik* appears to be thwarted. Jeffrey Sammons' participation in the *Germanistik im Ausland* symposium of 1977 brought into focus "Historische Betrachtungen zur gegenwärtigen Situation," but I think that Sammons' article reflects more accurately one individual's hobbyhorse than a grassroots interest within the profession. Suggestions for a historical study of the field we have; responses are woefully deficient.

This dissertation therefore intends to fill a portion of what I perceive to be a lacuna in scholarly research. Here I wish to emphasize, again along with Jeffrey Sammons, that "die Situation der amerikanischen *Germanistik* sich am besten historisch begreifen läßt, und zwar deswegen, weil diese Geschichte wohl einzigartig ist und weil sie unsere Situation in einer Weise bestimmt, die dem ausländischen Betrachter nicht immer
sichtbar wird." Knowingly or not, Sammons here has digested Robert Weimann's imperative to realize "one's own point of view as both distinct from, and shaped by, the past." Although the context of Weimann's statement results from his debate with American New Criticism, his words support our perspective on American Germanistik:

If, in the United States, the historical study of literature is to achieve a new sense of direction and purpose, it must first be prepared to face (with all that this implies) the full extent of the crisis of its discipline. The crisis is in many ways a symptom of the larger crisis of western society, in which the revolutionary idea of change, organic and dialectical concepts of evolution, and the liberal and humanist traditions of progress are all, in various degrees, affected. In recent years the consciousness of this wider background of crisis seems once more to be gaining ground, and perhaps the conjecture may be hazarded that a new interest in historical method can only benefit from an awareness of its present background. Such awareness may indeed facilitate the first steps towards re-opening, in the realm of literary history, the questions of method and purpose from an angle which defines itself, at the outset, beyond the assumptions of formalist criticism (p. 431).

When examining the history of Germanistik in America, however, its literary theory and criticism will be seen in great measure as contingents of a larger dimensionality, for as others have observed, Germanistik here must negotiate a foreign culture (ideally in the sense of some "totality," although this of course can only be approximated). This office distinguishes Germanistik here. How it was in fact discharged will interest us at different turns in Part II.
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CHAPTER IV:
THE ROLE OF GERMAN CLASSICISM

What is the significance of evaluating the assimilation of the German classical heritage as opposed to, say, contemporary literature of 1870-1905? In the last decade, German Classicism has been the object of revisionary debate and much scholarly activity. Moreover, because of its long-standing and formidable role and function within Germanistik, the study of German Classicism entails pivotal questions of literary canonization—for example, 1) what authors and what texts dominated literary discussion within American Germanistik between 1870 and 1905 and, more significant still, 2) how and why the authors and their works were read and interpreted. While the first question can be answered mostly by an internal analysis alone (for instance, what was the hierarchy of literary texts and authors within the curriculum, what aesthetic criteria legitimized a "classic"), the second question invites an external analysis and tempts us to consider the contextual aspects of German Classicism. A single statement dating from the centenary of Schiller's death can illustrate one kind of assimilation involved. "Hier in Amerika," exclaimed a Germanist in May, 1905, "hat die Schillerfeier keine literarische, sondern eine ethische Bedeutung." We shall see in Part II that different contextual emphases punctuate the assimilation of Wilhelm Tell.
Generally, German Classicism today is no longer the sanctum sanctorum it once was. Ironically, one argument against the unreflecting "consecration" (and thus ideological reception) of German Classicism came from Schiller. He admonished that "das lebendige Produkt einer individuellen, bestimmten Gegenwart einer ganz heterogenen Zeit zum Maßstab und Muster aufdringen, hieße, die Kunst, die immer dynamisch und lebendig entstehen und wirken muß, eher töten als beleben." Schiller's art-as-paradigm deduction describes one mode among others that could be called a "typology of classicism." Egidius Schmalzriedt has outlined five others:

1) canonical acceptability. Here a work is assigned to the canon because it is a "classic," and vice versa.

2) Klassik as the absolute realization of beauty, goodness, and truth, a fusion of aesthetics, ethics, and epistemology.

3) Klassik as the realization of ideal humanity, the embodiment of harmonia, a symbiosis of aesthetics, ethics, and anthropology. Goethe reduced this argument to its fundamental equation:klassisch = healthy, romantisch = sick.

4) Klassik as the artistic realization of harmony, proportion, balance, and style. Cultural evolutionism frequently accompanies this interpretation, with the realization of artistic perfection representing the attainment of cultural, quasi-organic maturity. It would view German Classicism as a necessary stage of development between the Sturm und Drang and Romanticism, or as the cultural prefiguration of political destiny.

5) Klassik simply as that which is "great," as in the "Great Books,"
Put into practice, any of these interpretations of classicism bowdlerizes what is seen (depending on the individual's or society's historical vista) as an "insufficiency"—this is the nature of ideological assimilation, discussed above (p. 13). To be truly meaningful, then, Schmalzriedt's typology must be fleshed out with particulars from the history of German Classicism's reception. Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand exhorted in 1970: "Es ist endlich an die Zeit, das Klassische wieder als etwas Historisch-Lebendiges und nicht als etwas Überzeitlich-Totes zu betrachten." Here two fundamental modes of viewing German Classicism are posited. Their duality points to a problem at the base of reception: the act of interpretation. We must outline this problem at the risk of oversimplifying. Two factors, the critic and the literary work, would seem to be all that is involved in this act. But actually another element comes into play: tradition, an aggregate often unrecognized (because it is so obvious), but always directing the act of interpretation. W.K. Wimsatt put it thus in The Verbal Icon (1954): "We are bound to have a point of view in literary criticism, and that point of view, though it may have been shaped by tradition, is bound to be our own. . . . Our judgments of the past cannot be discontinuous with our experience or insulated from it." The critic, then, operates within and upon traditional categories of knowledge and methodology that may appear as axiomatic givens but in reality are determined by historical forces and thus subject to change, as is his own criticism. The literary text is also affected by tradition, both in its genesis and its reception. When writing a novel, a drama, or a poem, the author works (consciously or unconsciously) with traditional categories or genres. The literary critic will work
similarly, but once the text's reception is established, later critics will find themselves working not only one-on-one with the literary work but with the tradition of its reception as well, be it uniform (unlikely) or variegated (more likely).

This process is complex, and of course not restricted to the reception of literary texts. I wish only to convey the notion that traditional concepts become suspect and appear as ideological statements when seen in this light. Especially problematic are notions steeped in connotation. "German Classicism" offers a prime example. Karl O. Conrady contends that "Der Titel 'Deutsche Klassik' schließt mehr noch als andere Bezeichnungen wertende Bedeutungselemente ein, die ihm schwerlich ausgetrieben werden können." Schmalzriedt would go further and write off Klassik as a bogus verbalism which "entpuppt sich bei genauem Zusehen als ein globaler Sammel- und Gummibegriff, in dem Feststellungen und Wertungen verschiedenster Provenienz und Struktur undifferenziert zusammenfließen und einander übertakteln, als ein Begriff, der in dieser Form ... erstens idealistisch-dogmatisch, zweitens ahistorisch, drittens deshalb unwissen-schaftlich und viertens politisch wie pädagogisch gefährlich ist."

"Die deutsche Klassik," then, poses a special problem—not in an ontological sense of "what is classical about German Classicism"—but in its concrete realizations, in the history of its reception. Grimm and Hermand have summarized its metamorphosis during the years when Bismarck was forging the German Reich: "Aus politisch denkenden Wegbereitern des Bismarck-Reiches wurden nach 1870 plötzlich zeitenthobene Olympier, die sich ausgezeichnet zur politischen Entmündigung des Bildungsbürgertums der wilhelminischen Ära mißbrauchen ließen." This describes the
ideological Umfunktionierung of Goethe and Schiller. Bernd Peschken details a specific instance of the reception of German Classicism that points in the direction of our study. In 1866, Wilhelm Dilthey's review of scholarly works on the "classische(s) Zeitalter unserer Dichtung" appeared in the popular journal Westermanns Monatshefte. Here Dilthey set about evaluating German Classicism and its literature and fashioning a canon of Klassiker. Moreover, he considered the effect of recent political developments on the image of Classicism, and in so doing sketched its ideological assimilation during the mid-1860s, as well as the focal point of his own writings on literary history, as he later developed and refined them.

Dilthey established four essential criteria for evaluating the literature of German Classicism: Beschaulichkeit, Wirkung, innerer und bleibender Wert, and Vorbildlichkeit. Particularly striking is what Dilthey does to earlier motives recurrent in the literary histories of Gervinus and Schmidt: he purges the representation of German Classicism of reproaches against its subjectivism and sociopolitical aloofness. His posture amounts to a decisive turnabout in the writing of literary history, and his essay reads, according to Peschken, like a digest of his later work. Peschken concludes:


The reception of German Classicism has therefore been chameleon. In Dilthey's writings of 1866 and later it took on political relevance,
but with conservative reichsideologische, not liberal, purport. His stance was the polar opposite of, say, Gervinus'. And naturally Gervinus' reputation suffered after 1870. Peschken's analysis provides a point of comparison for considering the motivations and ideological subtexts of American Germanistik's response to German Classicism, but these remain to be worked out later.
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CHAPTER V:

THE GROWTH OF THE PROFESSION IN THE 19th CENTURY

The influence of the German element in the United States has been pervasive. Between 1820 and 1860, more than one million Germans emigrated to America, among them (estimates vary) anywhere from 4,000 to 10,000 political refugees, known as "Forty-eighers." With the influx of German language publications burgeoned—by 1880, 641 of them circulated throughout much of the country, far more than in any other foreign language. American students helped import German ideas too; between 1820 and 1920 nearly 9,000 attended German universities (and matriculated). At the same time, the German education system, especially the Prussian, established itself as a paradigm among American educators.

The formative German element laid the groundwork for the study of German at colleges and universities. Zeydel calls the years 1826-1876 "an uphill struggle," but advances were anything but Sisyphean. In 1825, German was taught at the University of Virginia by Georg Blaettermann, a German scholar recruited from Europe, and in the same year at Harvard by Karl Follen, an important figure and political activist in Germany prior to his emigration. Since that time the teaching of German became more and more common; appointments followed at Columbia and Princeton in 1830, at Yale in 1831, and at Brown in 1846, to name but a few of the major schools. The ranks of the German-teaching profession ("a sort of tutorial sideline or extra-curricular activity") were at first modest...
and frequently dissimilar in background and training—Zeydel writes that "Theologians, lawyers, and men of many other professions could become Germanists overnight in those days" (p. 292)—but students of the language rapidly multiplied. Over half of the University of Virginia's class of 1825 studied German (Blaettermann claimed that the language stood "in line with that of the most learned nations in richness of conditions and advance of the sciences"). In 1831, Karl Follen boasted "of an average of fifty students per session, of many residents of Boston who could read German intelligently and of many German classics in private libraries."

The next twenty-five years brought continued growth. By 1854, students of German at the University of Virginia had more than tripled, and in 1869 the degree of Masters of Arts there required a knowledge of German and French. This was indicative of a pattern that soon developed. Such a requirement became standard fare at many universities and colleges by the turn of the century, and this reflects the growth of the profession at the same time.

Generally speaking, by 1870 German instruction was welded to the American education system. Shortly after 1870, American students of the liberal arts and the social sciences began going to Germany in large numbers; by 1878 they outnumbered the students of theology and law, and by the turn of the century they had more than doubled the volume of student traffic to Germany. This wave reflects the largely sympathetic view of Americans toward the emergence of the German Reich spearheaded by Prussia and Bismarck, and it tells as much about the indigenous growth of our universities and, indirectly, of the German-teaching profession, as it does about the growth of our cultural debt.
When German language instruction flourished, the knowledge of German literature mushroomed as well. Longfellow's Goethe-lectures at Harvard in the late 1830s generally attracted people who saw the study of German as fashionable, as an "extra-curricular activity." And until then, German literature was really known only in English translation. Significantly, though, "virtually every periodical of consequence participated in the dissemination of critical opinion of German literature," and by mid-century the exposure given German literature in American journals and magazines had swelled to the point where "everyone who had charge of . . . a literary department had to take note of German literature." Two scholars at the turn of the 20th century searched through American magazines from 1800 to 1880 for their reception of German literature. For the most part, these are positivistic reports with only a modicum of analysis, but they do distinguish six different phases. The first (1800-1816), in which comparatively little first-hand knowledge of German was the rule, was dominated by English critical opinion. The second (1817-1832) marked the return of the first generation of American students from Germany and their efforts to introduce German culture into American life. The third (1833-1845) showed relatively active public interest. The final three were labeled the "Classical Period" (1846-1853), the "Period of Decreased Interest" (1854-1868), and the "Period of the Novelists" (1869-1880). These accounts illustrate the change in American public taste, so far as it concerned itself with German literature, and bear out Heinsohn's assertion that the overriding authority of the German "Dichter und Denker" had generally diminished by 1870—diminished, that is, among the public at large. As we shall soon see, the German-teaching profession
in great measure cornered the market on German thinkers and poets.

"In America's continual rediscovery of her cultural inferiority," it has been maintained, "the German paradigm played a conspicuous part."

This assessment is especially true of American higher education, where its "Germanization" aided the emergence of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Its influence was felt most strongly, perhaps, at Johns Hopkins University, founded in 1876, "which, from the very beginning, has based its work upon German methods and given expression to the fact that the high educational value of the German language and literature is at present generally recognized." Johns Hopkins adapted the German paradigm:

the degree of doctor of philosophy was set up as the aim of the student. The seminar was installed as a method or means of securing this end, and research, scientific in method, was adopted as a condition and means for securing the highest scholastic education. The emphasis thus placed was new in American education. It was heralded . . . as a distinct advance. It came to possess great influence over graduate instruction in the American university.

Given its conspicuous role, it is interesting to see (at this point more or less on a statistical basis) how the curriculum at Johns Hopkins accommodated the "myth of 'Dichter und Denker'." Most of the study concerning German Classicism took place on the major and advanced levels, but readings from this period consistently, in fact almost exclusively, filled the minor courses as well. These tended to spend more time with individual works, probably because of the linguistic difficulty. The most frequently read was Egmont, with Tell second. On the major level, most of the attention focussed on Faust (mainly Part I only). One course dealt with the history of German literature and gave special consideration
to German Classicism. This course appeared first in 1881 and became a 20
mainstay of the curriculum. Both the major and minor levels had a
course titled simply "German Classics." It first appeared in the fall
of 1886. At that time, the works to be read were specified by title in
the catalogue. They included (number of semesters is indicated in paren-
thesis): Tell (8), Hermann und Dorothea (5), Faust (3), Egmont (3),
Tasso (2), and Minna von Barnhelm (1). A decade later, though, titles
are dropped, and one can infer that by this time (1896) they had been
sufficiently canonized as to be more or less synonymous with the term
"German Classics." Also in 1896 a course was taught on "The Beginnings
of Modern German Classicism," four times in all between 1896 and 1905.
Its antecedents included courses on Goethe and Schiller, the 18th cen-
tury, Faust, and other aspects of Classicism. Of course, the curricu-
lum had its share of philology courses and a handful of others, but it
was clearly structured around the study of German Classicism.

In 1901, Louis Viereck called the German Department at Johns Hopkins
"one of the best in the country." All of the major schools placed
their emphases similarly—fully one-fifth of the courses taught at Co-
lumbia at the turn of the century dealt with the classical era, at Cornell
a third, at Harvard nearly that many, as at Northwestern and the Univer-
sity of Wisconsin. This recurrent accent discloses a real concern of
the growing profession of Germanistik, and grow it continued to do.

In 1870, German teachers organized the Nationaler Deutschamerikanischer
Lehrerbund to promote "the introduction of German and educational ideals
and practice into our schools." It dealt mostly with primary and sec-
ondary education, but toward the close of the century it moved to
incorporate higher education as well. The Modern Language Association, founded in 1883, was the representative body for college language instruction. Other organizations, like the National German-American Alliance (1899) and the Germanistic Society of America (1904) generally sought, as the latter's constitution stated, "to promote the knowledge and study of German civilization in America and of American civilization in Germany by supporting university instruction on these subjects, by arranging public lectures, by publishing and distributing documents, and by other means adapted to the ends for which the society is established."

Along with these organizations of broader scope were groups of local color, "German Societies," Deutsche Vereine and the like. These exemplify most vividly what von Klenze described as the genteel tradition. The club at Harvard, for example, invited its members to practice the language, attend lectures in German, sing German songs, and generally to join in creating an atmosphere "so that one might believe himself transported to Heidelberg or Jena." Outside the academic sphere, of course, several German Turn- and Gesangvereine fostered German language, literature, culture, athletics, etc.

One of these organizations, the German Publication Fund of America, was the by-product of Americana Germanica, "A Quarterly Devoted to the Comparative Study of the Literary, Linguistic and Other Cultural Relations of Germany and America." Deluged by submissions only three years after its original issue in 1897, its editor, Marion D. Learned, sought relief by forming the Publication Fund. His move attests to considerable scholarly activity among Germanists. Generally, they could submit their work to five main journals: PMLA (1884), Modern Language Notes (1886), Americana Germanica (1897), Journal of Germanic Philology (1897), and Monatshefte
With professional journals to address the issues of language, literature, and literary criticism, the treatment of German literature in the journals that had played a formative role in earlier years declined in the last three decades of the 19th century. These new publications were intended to meet the specialized needs of the growing profession, "A pressing need," as the editors of Modern Language Notes wrote in 1886, "for some special organ of communication [to] express ... opinions and have the benefit of frank and unbiased criticism with reference both to personal views on literary or scientific subjects, and to the numerous textbooks and other works that are constantly appearing in this branch of learning." For more than a decade, PMLA and Modern Language Notes were the main avenues of publication for Germanists (before that they usually turned to the American Journal of Philology and the Proceedings of the American Philological Association). With the appearance in 1897 of Americana Germanica and the Journal of Germanic Philology, scholars found "a reasonable cause of surprise and at the same time an adequate reply to those who have been wont to complain that the Germanists in America are not keeping pace in productive activity with their colleagues in the domains of Romanic and English philology." A glance at the tables of content of these journals reveals that articles on Goethe, Schiller, and German Classicism predominated.

Around 1870, publications of German literary histories by American scholars surged: one in 1869, one in 1873, another in 1874, two in 1878, three in 1879, and so on. The pace soon relaxed, but compared to the years before 1870 the output was significant. I suspect that the market was
temporarily glutted around 1880, since I have noted between then and 1905 only seven additional works that could be called histories. Some of these have had long lives: Kuno Francke's *Social Forces in German Literature* (1896) ran through twelve printings before his death in 1930, and Calvin Thomas' *The Life and Works of Friedrich Schiller* has gone to the presses periodically since its publication in 1901. But most of the works have dropped into obscurity, for reasons that we shall discuss in Part II.

Between 1870 and the turn of the century, then, *Germanistik* developed into a full-fledged academic discipline. It formed its own organizations, established its own journals, and produced its own scholarship. Most of the journals (few of the organizations) have survived to the present. And the scholarship? Of course its substance has changed, but we have first to characterize it as it was then. We must attend to the principles and methodologies of the works and the motives behind them, to their underlying sense of function, and engage analysis on this basis.
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PART II: ANALYSIS

CHAPTER I:

THE MEDIATION OF GERMAN CULTURE

On 10 November 1903, the anniversary of the births of both Martin Luther and Friedrich Schiller, a significant event took place within the field of German Studies, one of particular importance for our understanding of the profession's perception of its role as a mediator of German culture in America: the founding of the Germanic Museum at Harvard University.

A prime initiator of the movement for a German Museum at the institution where he taught was Kuno Francke. Already in March 1897, Francke and his colleagues at Harvard had sent out a general appeal for such a foundation. Its plea was based on the premise that there existed at that time "an ever-increasing disposition on the part of Americans to approach the study of German as a study leading to an insight into a great national civilization." The growth of the German department at Harvard since the 1870s was cited to support their argument. Members of the profession then believed that the modern languages, especially German, were rivaling the status of Greek and Latin within the traditional curriculum. But whereas the student of antiquity had access to documents and monuments from Greek and Roman culture, nowhere, so it was argued, did such an opportunity exist for the student of German civilization.
A museum, then, was considered a desideratum for the furthering of German Studies in America. Initial overtures, however, met with only limited success. Although its authors had estimated in 1897 the minimum sum of $10,000 for the project even to get off the ground, not more than $4,000 were raised over the next four years, despite the personal support and urging of the German ambassador, Dr. von Holleben, in March of 1899. He spoke to a gathering at Harvard (by invitation of the noted sociologist, Hugo Münsterberg), and, after having acknowledged the attention given the study of German in America, pressed on: "Yea! resting upon the public spirit and on the prosperity of the American people, German ideals are well harbored. But, gentlemen, is it for us to fold our hands in idleness? Is not standing still equivalent to sliding backwards?" The presiding dignitaries, Münsterberg, Francke, and Hugo Schilling, also of the German department at Harvard, responded in like fashion. Francke, for instance, rejoined: "We Germans in the North must look upon ourselves as champions of German stamp in America; we must consider it out foremost duty to open the eyes of our American fellow-citizens to all that German thought has aspired to and produced in the course of centuries in industry, art, philosophy, literature, and music, and what has led to the commanding position which the German Empire, thanks be to God, occupies at the present day. The very isolation of our position simply makes an undertaking like the museum in question a patriotic duty."

Even granting a portion of Francke's patriotic verve to the presence of the German ambassador, one is struck by the intensity ("thanks be to God") of his approbation of the Wilhelminian Empire. This adulation of the body politic extended to the body academic as well—Harvard occupied,
as Francke stressed, a similarly "commanding position" in the field of German Studies as did the German Empire in world politics. He continued:

We know that if not the attention of the world, at least the eyes of one thousand and one American colleges and universities are bent upon us. All that is done in Harvard is echoed and imitated by all the institutions in the country. This may be said of all other branches as of the study of the German language and literature; nowhere else is the history of literature, of art, and of thought studied as extensively and scientifically. . . . If we succeed in forming an institution that will bear the proper relation to teachers, there is no doubt but that in a few years Harvard will be the chief seat and central point of Germanic studies in America. That is what we have in mind.

Francke, to be sure, was sincerely concerned for the well-being and prosperity of his and his colleagues' and university's reputation, interests, and affairs. But his rhetoric is conspicuous because of its base-metaphor, which remains throughout, in a subtle fashion, that of the German Empire. His panegyric, advocating the attainment of a "commanding position," contains muted allusions to a feature which later texts we shall examine display in much bolder relief: the notion of political aggrandizement, a core concept of doctrinal imperialism. What takes place in Francke's discourse is an Umfunktionsierung of the German context to fit the American one. It is clear in this instance that, as another speaker on the rostrum proudly proclaimed, "Germany is our first home, England the second, and America the third."

Despite efforts dating back to the mid-1890s, the formal opening did not take place until 1903. In attendance were Hans Carl Günther von Jagemann and Francke of the German department, President Eliot of Harvard University, Carl Schurz, Hugo Münsterberg, and a handful of other
political and scholarly dignitaries. In his introductory address, von Jagemann voiced his motives, and those of his colleagues, which first set them to contemplating the possibility of such a museum. His remarks describe in nuce the self-perceived role of the German culture mediators: "The project of a German Museum had its inception in the growing conviction on the part of the instructors in the Department of German, that their function was not merely to teach the German language, or even German literature, however important these might be, but to give our students a true conception of what Germany stands for in modern civilization, what her ideals have been, what she has contributed to the world's best intellectual possessions." It is telling that von Jagemann speaks of Germany's cultural contributions as "intellectual possessions," a phrase which is particularly appropriate in light of the advent of the museum as a storehouse for these "objects," and which also suggests the "Bildung und Besitz" attitude at that time toward the assimilation of cultural tradition.

What enabled the museum to open was the "imperial gift" of Emperor Wilhelm II. He sent a collection of reproductions of German sculptural monuments, "hoping," in the words of his representative, Baron von dem Bussche-Haddenhausen, "that they will kindle the interest and encourage in the United States the study of the sculpture of our ancestors, who, to a great extent, are your ancestors as well." While the new curators were not in a position to be selective about the materials displayed, it is important to note which monuments they considered representative, or, perhaps more accurately stated, how the founders of the museum made a virtue of necessity and acknowledged the works which they received as
being significant. Holdings consisted almost exclusively of sculptural artifacts of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Karl Detlev Jessen, of Bryn Mawr, found in these works symbolic import: "Vor allem die deutsche Kunst des Mittelalters und der Renaissance mit ihren intimen Beziehungen zum Geistes- und Seelenleben der Nation, spiegelt die Religion und Weltanschauung in unverkennbarer Weise und gibt einen Schlüssel zum wahren Wesen des Deutschtums, zum Verständnisse deutscher Art und deutschen Wesens, wie kein zweites Gebiet deutscher Tätigkeit." Other monuments included a model of a Germanic boat found in the Nydam moor; two warrior figures, one of a Frankish soldier from around 600 B.C., and one Swiss Landsknecht; also a photographic history of German architecture. From the 11th century were the bronze doors of the Cathedral at Hildesheim, from the 13th an array of plastic figures from the Naumberg Cathedral. Placed at the entrance to the museum was a facsimile of the Golden Gate of the Cathedral of Freiburg. These, wrote Francke, "cannot help being a revelation to American students." A committee formed in Berlin, including the likes of Virchow, Mommsen, Harnack, Paulsen, Schöne, Lessing, and Wildenbruch, donated fifty-five reproductions of works of German gold and silver from the 15th through the 18th century. A gift of 10,000 books on the history of Germany and German civilization was made by Professor Archibald C. Coolidge as a memorial to the visit of Prince Henry of Prussia to Harvard in 1902. The contributions of Adolphus Busch of St. Louis and Hugo Reisinger of New York provided funds for a building. (The museum is in fact known today not as the Germanic but as the Busch-Reisinger Museum.)
Both President Eliot and Edward Robinson, the director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, greeted the museum as a deterrent to the material degeneration of the times, as a bastion of "spiritual progress." Kuno Francke saw one of its functions as counteracting the narrow specialization of modern scholarship, and hoped that it might ultimately embody the spirit of St. Martin, Luther, and "Schiller, the prophet of the society of the future."

Among the festivities in celebration of the museum were musical and theatrical interludes under the direction of Heinrich Conried, the well-known director of the German theater in New York. Selections by Mozart, Gluck, Schubert, and Brahms were performed, as well as Hans Sachs' "Der fahrende Schüler aus dem Paradies," and a comedy by Ludwig Fulda, "Unter vier Augen." "Die Zeit der klassischen Vollendung," as the account of the evening in the German American Annals reads, was represented by Goethe's "Geschwister." Also among the entertainment was Hedwig von Ostermann's reading of a poem composed by Kuno Francke for the occasion, "Die Deutsche Muse." (The Muse, "eine Jungfrau in mittelalterlicher Tracht, an die Elisabeth des 'Tannhäuser' erinnernd, sitzt trumend da. Sie erwacht, steht auf, sieht staunend um sich, und spricht, den Blick seherhaft in die Ferne gerichtet):

Wo bin ich? Wie! Aus Deutschlands Wäldern
Bin Übers Weltmeer ich entrückt?
Statt Rebenehügeln, Roggenfeldern,
Seh' ich die Flur mit Mais geschmückt?
Und welche Laute mich umgeben!
Wie fremd, verwirrend, fieberhaft!
Ich fühle schaudernd mich erbeben!
Mir schwindet Sicherheit und Kraft!–
Und doch! seh' ich nicht heimische Zeichen?
Seh' ich nicht in die Wolken reichen
Den Turm von Strassburgs Münsterbau?
Seh' ich nicht Nürnberg's Dächermassen,
Sankt Lorenz' mächtigen Doppelkulm?
Und schimmert nicht durch enge Gassen
Die Wunderpracht des Doms von Ulm?
Und blicken nicht von ernsten Wänden,
In Ritterrüstung, steinern schwer,
Das deutsche Schwert in starken Händen,
Mir Naumbergs Heldenbilder her?
Und dort, der Mann im Panzerkoller,
Auf stolzem Klepper, siegsbewusst,
Ist's nicht der grosse Hohenzoller,
Die Zukunft Deutschlands in der Brust?
Ist's möglich? Hier, an fremder Welle,
Erblüht aufs neu der Väter Ruhm?
Hier steigt empor mit Geisterschnelle
Ein allgermanisches Heiligtum?
Heil dir, o Heil, du fremde Erde,
Du neue Welt, Heil dir und Macht!
Dein Genius ruft dir zu: "Es werde"
Und sieh: es wird! es ist vollbracht!
Du stürmst dahin mit Riesenschritten,
Es weht ums Haupt dir Sternenglanz,
Um Freiheit hast du je gestritten,
Stolz flattert dir der Siegeskranz!
O lass mich schweben dir zu Seite!
Ich bringe dir des Herzens Glück!
Aus Sturm und Drang, aus Thatenweite,
Ruf' zu dir selbst ich dich zurück!
Ich bringe, was im Stillen blühet,
Den keuschen Sinn, der Treue Hort;
Ich pfluge, was zum Mann erziehet,
Des Wahrheitsforschers furchtlos Wort.
O Neue Welt, Urvätersegens,
Sei deines Volkes kostlich Teil!
Dann spriesst empor auf deinen Wegen
Das schönste Reis: der Menschheit Heil!

Francke's poem provides a unique opportunity to consider the sentiments and motivations behind the celebration of the museum. It is exceptional in two ways: first, it comes from the hand of a preeminent Germanist of the time, a significant representative of the profession; second, the circumstances of this poem suggest a serious and deliberate authorial intent. The potential for spontaneous interjections, as in commemorative addresses of the sort delivered at the opening of the museum, remains relatively limited. We can consider it the well-meaning
product of earnest reflection, and thus an accurate statement of its subject matter. This is not to say, however, that an element of spontaneity is altogether missing from the poem. On the contrary, we are made to feel its presence first through its invocation of classical Goethean and Schillerian tone, and second through its repeated exclamations, a stylistic feature rivaled only by the frequency of questions. Francke applies these devices—arousing initial uncertainty and anxiety on the one hand (toward the end of the poem receding altogether) and, on the other, fear and desperation, culminating in patriotic euphoria—to incite a sense of emotionalism. This demeanor, while fixed ultimately on the object of its adulation, namely Deutschland, allows for a curious metaphorical progression within the poem, ranging from the mundane-pedestrian ("Statt Rebenhügeln, Roggenfeldern, / Seh' ich die Flur mit Mais geschmückt?"), to the potpourri of architecture, heroic weaponry, and political ancestry (a reference no doubt to the acquisitions of the museum), including a communal resurrection ("Hier steigt empor mit Geisterschnelle / Ein allgermanisches Heiligtum?") and Faustian allusions ("es ist vollbracht!"), coming to rest then finally amidst symptoms of Faustian exhilaration, recalling his pronouncement: "Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast, erwirb es, um es zu besitzen!" Francke's German Muse is also reminiscent of Iphigenie (initially in a foreign country)—the hortative conclusion to the poem recalls the trials, tribulations, and assuagement of Goethe's dramatic figure, and above all her ultimatum: "Rettet mich und rettet euer Bild in meiner Seele!" The poem wants to be at once eschatological in fervor and apocalyptic in vision: "O Neue Welt, Urvätersegen / Sei deines Volkes köstlich Teil! / Dann spriesst empor auf
deinen Wegen / Das schönste Reis: der Menschheit Heil!" The incongruence of its internal parts is held together only by the line of irrepressible passion which runs throughout and which is orchestrated in the end into a fanfare of missionary zeal. The message which Francke celebrates is unequivocal: Germany serves as the source of America's inspiration, as its mentor, even as its "salvation."

It would be hasty to conclude from this single example that the "missionary zeal" evident here can be considered representative of all of American German Studies of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. But the tenor of this particular celebration is in fact not unique. According to Victor Lange,

If we cast a glance at the volumes of Monatshefte prior to the First World War, we shall be struck by the curious mixture in almost every issue, of labored pedantry and the unquestioned assumption that the teaching of German should be motivated by a passionate and unswerving attachment to the values—political, philosophical and literary—that were then held in Germany: pride in the German imperial power, reverence for the idealism which German artists and thinkers appeared to defend against all corrosion of public and private life by the alien forces of materialism and, most emphatically, the example which this sum of superior aspiration offered for the missionary work of American teachers of German.18

I wish to stress, however, the importance of discerning the specific nature of the profession's self-perceived "mission" at various historical stages and contexts: In this connection we can elaborate on an additional point, the contact between the Germanist and the German-speaking public, for here the ideological subtexts are even more obvious than in the material already examined. Two texts will be cited in this instance. The first, by Karl Detlev Jessen, was addressed to the German-speaking
populace in America and printed in the *Neu Yorker Staatszeitung* and the *Mississippi Blättern*; the second, by Kuno Francke, was published in the 19 *Deutsche Rundschau*.

For Jessen, the museum embodies German culture. More than that, he would have it function as a hallowed object and a somewhat intimidating admonition: "Uns Deutschen legt die Existenz dieses Museums erneut die Verpflichtungen auf, uns selber getreu zu bleiben, unserer Sprache und den heiligen Überlieferungen unseres Volkes, uns und unseren Nachkommen."

Jessen's justifications for the museum frequently turn chauvinistic: "dass es (i.e., the German Volk) nicht ohne Rest sang- und klanglos in den Brei eines englischredenden Allangelsachtsentums untertauchen darf" (p. 47). Jessen's aggressive rhetoric suggests an adversary. Elsewhere his remarks clearly define his position in terms of social and ideological conflict, and thus the position of his antagonist. Speaking of Schiller, he maintained: "Ein jeglicher Versuch, des naturwissenschaftlichen wie des historischen Materialismus, seitens jener philosophischen Barbiergesellen vom Schlage [Ludwig] Büchners oder der Marxisten (Schopenhauer ist für diese Bezeichnung verantwortlich), Schiller als den ihrrigen zu reklamieren, prallt an den nackten Tatsachen ab."

Factual references, however, were infrequent in Jessen's discourse; instead it appealed to emotionalism and patriotism. In sum, Jessen's dialogue abounded in appellations to "die deutsche Seele" and "das deutsche Wesen," and his posture was one of ardent genuflection before the altar of German Geist.

The notion of Lebensraum dominates Francke's report: "Der deutsche Kaiser wird also, das ist nicht zu viel gesagt, der eigentliche Begründer eines amerikanischen Universitätsinstitutes werden, welches in
hervorragender Weise dazu angethan ist, deutsche und amerikanische Cultur [sic] zu verschmelzen, und so zu der Verwirklichung des großen pangermanischen Bündnisses beizutragen, auf dem die Gewähr dauernder Leistungsfähigkeit der teutonischen Rasse in dem Kampf um die Weltherrschaft beruht."

As with Jessen, the dialogue is expressly chauvinistic and racial and, although in less excited prose, Francke likewise enshrines the German past and the sense of tradition in pseudo-religiosity: "Ich sprach nun vorher davon, daß es zu wünschen sei, daß die Deutsch-Amerikaner auch noch bessere Deutsche würden. Wie ist dies zu verstehen? In welcher Beziehung ist das Deutschtum in den Deutsch-Amerikanern der Steigerung bedürftig? Um es mit einem Worte auszudrücken: in der Pietät für die deutsche Vergangenheit" (p. 138). The touted "germanische GröBe" is at once spiritualized—an act that allows its arbiter to distort the unique historicity of every literary, cultural, and artistic document—and given symbolic form in the monuments and artifacts gathered within the halls of the Germanic Museum. The transformation, as Francke underscores more than once, is nothing less than the fulfillment of a spiritual calling. He speaks of "die gemeinsamen Aufgaben des Culturlebens . . ., die aber doch besonders der germanischen Rasse durch ihre ganze Vergangenheit als heiligster Beruf vorgezeichnet sind: die Arbeit für echte Humanität, Geistesfreiheit, sociale Gerechtigkeit und friedlichen Fortschritt" (p. 145).

In his concluding paragraph, Francke admitted: "Ich gebe mich nun nicht der kindlichen Illusion hin, als ob ein solches Museum etwa dazu dienen könnte, die Gemüther zu versöhnen, wenn (was ja glücklicher Weise kaum zu befürchten ist) es zu wirtschaftlichen oder politischen
Conflicts between the United States and Europe should come to (p. 145). Obviously, it would be foolish to harp on Francke's blindness toward the course of history. I see it instead as a metaphor—in the texts surrounding the institution of the Germanic Museum we have witnessed a blindness resulting in a specific, historically determined rhetorical ambience, what we can call the events' ideological subtexts. These essays exhibited missionary zeal and nationalistic spirit. But the celebration was somewhat atypical: the ties to Germany, in particular to the Kaiser, was unusually strong, and one must continue to ask if this attitude was indeed the overriding one and what, if any, were its variants. I wish to pursue this issue now in a different medium, by looking at a lecture delivered at a professional meeting in 1900.

Marion Dexter Learned delivered the presidential address, "Volks-
erziehung und Weltpolitik," at the 30th congress of the Nationaler Deutsch-
amerikanischer Lehrerbund. Learned opened his speech by broaching the topic of world literature and national enmity. He referred to Goethe's remarks made to Eckermann about his indifference toward the German uprising against the French, 1812-1815, which Goethe justified by noting his inability to hate the nation which had contributed so much to his education, and further by acknowledging his sense of cosmopolitanism. Goethe's correspondence with Thomas Carlyle in 1827, Learned pointed out, described Weltliteratur as the best means for eliminating national antipathy. Learned found in Goethe's disposition "die Lösung des grossen Weltproblems, des Weltfriedens und des Fortschritts, und es ist die Aufgabe der Volkserziehung, zur Lösung dieser Aufgabe beizutragen" (p. 2). He saw pedagogues entrusted with a tremendous responsibility: to educate
their students toward achieving the salvation of world peace. As Learned phrased it: "Mit einem Worte, der Schulmeister—sei er Volksschullehrer oder Universitätsprofessor—is zu berufen, die Jugend nicht nur für das Alltagsleben des Bürgers, sondern auch für die richtige Auffassung seiner Pflicht als Weltbürger heranzubilden" (p. 2). In the cosmopolitan spirit espoused by Goethe, Learned advanced what he saw as a fundamental pedagogical maxim. (A larger context for Learned's—typical—position is given by national educators of the time. In the 1890s, the N.E.A.'s Committee of Ten recommended a rigorous academic program for schools aimed at solid intellectual training, with considerable attention awarded to the study of history. In 1911, the N.E.A.'s Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College urged instead the fostering of good citizenship and vocational training, while the subject of history received short shrift. Learned's address, in 1900, anticipated the later position.)

Learned took the notion of Weltbürgertum as his premise and then proceeded to contradict it repeatedly. His introduction and the remainder of the speech are so unequivocally at odds that the whole must attest to a good, if unfortunately perverted, faith, and the antinomy suggests a subtext which reconciles, in Learned's mind and in that of his contemporaries, the ambivalence apparent to today's reader. We can summarize the essential arguments of Learned's speech. He maintains that in the course of history peoples sustain themselves "durch Kämpfe und Verträge." Some conflicts of interest, however, can only be solved by war (such as between France and Prussia in 1870). The causes of war are cultural differences and economic interests. Every nation strives
to maintain and expand its national character as well as its trade and industry in foreign countries. Change (implied is a shift of power) is equated with progress: individuals may not stand still but must be strong or succumb to the maelstrom of history. America's position among the world powers at the end of the 19th century exemplifies its successful participation in world-historical progress: "So waren wir ein grosses Volk, eine grosse Nation geworden, ohne dessen völlig bewusst zu sein." The Spanish-American War and the Manila conflict gave America an unexpected role in world politics. Accusations of imperialism and militarism could be heard (Learned hears them as the voices of conservatives, not liberals), but calls this a misunderstanding and in fact approves of this description of America's growth. Volkserziehung and German-Americans in general must perceive their task in this historic role in world culture. In the future, all nations must work toward the common goal of civilization.

When discussing Francke's poem about the German Muse, I spoke of his appropriation of rhetoric from the political sphere. Here the well-spring is military strategy. Learned begins his address with an appeal to a Goethean cosmopolitanism, but the discussion soon turns to the nature and substance of war, and Learned shows himself ultimately in favor of this "inevitable" phenomenon. His assessment that the United States "suddenly met with war" against Spain disguises rather than clarifies the causes of war. Similarly, he credits "fate" with the responsibility for leading America into world politics: "Das Schicksal hatte uns ganz unerwartet in die Weltpolitik eingeführt, und wir standen plötzlich ein Elementarvolk, eine Riesenmacht vor den staunenden Grossmächten der Welt.
Das Schicksal (sage man vielleicht besser unsere Kulturbestrebungen) hat uns geleitet, wir müssen gehorsam folgen" (pp. 4, 5). Here Learned's address sounds like an anticipation of the notorious German General Friedrich von Bernhardi's _Germany and the Next War_ (1912), where he wrote for example that "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization." Linguistically, it is telling that Learned uses America not as the subject of the sentence, but frequently as the object ("Das Schicksal hatte uns . . .", "Der Maischuss vor Manila gab uns die Philippinen in die Hand," p. 4). This usage typifies a mentality which refuses to admit of personal responsibility. Transgressions are authorless, and war is seen more as the agency of the Weltgeist than of real social and economic interests.

Learned could justify the policy of cultural expansionism because, within his purview, conflicts were seen as inevitable; more than that, they presented an opportunity to prove one's mettle. To call the "change of fortunes" in war by the neutral term _Wechsel_ displaces the agency of such maneuvers. Battle becomes a brand of cultural Darwinism, a survival of the fittest, with its equation of rationalization being the adage "might makes right." It was, Learned maintained, a question of yielding to the Weltgeist. This legitimized the hunger for conquest. At this point, Learned's prosody grows apocalyptic: "Schon dieser Tage gewährt uns das Schicksal einen Blick in die dunkle Zukunft, für die es uns vorbereitet. Die altmongolische Halbkultur muss erobert werden und vor dem
heranschwellenden Strom der höheren Zivilisation weichen" (p. 5). Bernhardi echoed: "Without war, inferior or decaying races would easily choke the growth of healthy budding elements, and a universal decadence would follow."

In this distorted and hyperbolic scheme of world relations, the educator takes on messianic dimensions. Learned's argumentation makes the German teacher the proprietor of a monumental Weltrolle: "Als Volks-erzieher und besonders als Deutschamerikaner und deutschamerikanischer Lehrer erblicken wir in dieser neuen Rolle in der Weltkultur eine neue, höhere Aufgabe. Der Schulmeister darf sich nicht länger begnügen damit, im alten Wirkungskreis sein tägliches Brot zu verdienen und seine Schüler lehren, das Gleiche zu thun" (p. 5). We see, then, how the function--more appropriately, the "duty"--of the mediators of German culture in America was viewed as seminal, as uncompromisingly urgent. And I find it telling that, as if in response to Learned's hyperbole, the next issue of Monatshefte (1900) follows this presidential address with a clarification of "Die nationale Aufgabe des Deutschamerikanischen Lehrerbundes."

It is clearly intended to pique moribund educators out of lethargy:

Warum spielt unser Bund eine so klägliche Rolle im Vergleich zu dem, was er leisten sollte und könnte? Weil wir unsere Aufgabe nie zu Ende gedacht, und weil es uns an Überlegenen Führern gebricht, denen die Erreichung unserer Ziele mehr als Nebensache wäre. Was entbehren wir am meisten? Das philosophische Bewusstsein und den Willen zur That. ... Was jetzt im Volke nur ein Scheinleben führt, wird erst dann in Fleisch und Blut übergehen, wenn am allerorten den Anfang des deutschen Unterrichts ins zarteste Kindesalter verlegt. Wer dieses leugnet, gehört nicht zu uns, mag er immerhin der gefeiertste Professor der deutschen Sprache sein. ... Zur Büherrschung des amerikanischen Schulwesens ist jedoch
die Sicherstellung des Seminars nur der erste Schritt. ... Nicht im Gründen neuer Schulen besteht unsere fernere Aufgabe, sondern im Er­
obern der schon vorhandenen. 28

Commentary at this juncture is superfluous.

In two instances thus far we have witnessed Germanists' self­
perception in terms of cultural missionary work. The Germanic Museum
belonged really more to the realm of diplomacy than to the realm of pedagogy. Learned’s address, "Volkserziehung und Weltpolitik," combined aspects of both external political concern and internal, or pedagogical, concern. We shall focus now more distinctly on this latter point.

In the first issue of Die Pädagogischen Monatshefte in 1899, the publication outlined its intent: "Alles, was dem deutschamerikanischen Lehrer als solchem am Herzen liegen muss, soll in diesem Blatte Berücksichtigung finden. An der ebenso grossen als schönen Aufgabe, die deutsche Sprache und Litteratur und mit diesen den deutschen Geist nicht nur denen zu erhalten, die sie von ihren Eltern ererbt haben, sondern ihnen ein immer grösseres Gebiet zu erobern wollen wir unentwegt festhalten, in der Ueberzeugung, dass sie fruchtbringend auf die Entwicklung unserer grossen Nation und auf die Bildung ihres Volkscharakters wirken müssen" (p. 2). Importance is given to the development of a fit and cultivated citizenry. In 1899, M.D. Learned wrote of pedagogues as ambassadors: "It is, after all, the teachers of America who are the medium of cultural intercourse and friendly feeling between Germany and America." Learned’s formulation is relatively tepid. Less timorous was Carl Beck, who maintained that "die junge Studentenschaft ist auch in Amerika für das Ideale viel empfänglicher als man im alten Vaterlande glauben will. Es hängt alles nur von denen ab, welche das hohe Evangelium predigen." This
phraseology points to a common attitude, which Julius Goebel extended to its logical conclusion: "Ich habe schon vorher bemerkt, daß sich der Erhaltung der Sprache und der idealen Güter unseres Volkstums nicht spielend erreichen läßt in fremder Umgebung, sie bedeutet Arbeit, Hingebung, Opfer. Und diese ihrem Volkstum zu leisten, fällt den Berufenen—es gibt auch unberufen—Vertretern der deutschen Sprache und Literatur an unsern amerikanischen Universitäten, fällt den gebildeten Lehrern des Deutschen in den niederen Schulen, fällt den deutschen Predigern aller Konfessionen, ja allen gebildeten Deutschen zu." That Goebel's description should begin with an elitist conception of the professor or instructor of German and end with the image of the minister is, given our previous experience, not surprising. The presentation approaches the pitch of the Germanic Museum celebration. But its implications affect more directly the teacher of the German language and literature. As Goebel later stated: "den unbestechlichen Wahrheitssinn des deutschen Geistes, seine sittlichen Kräfte und seine Liebe zum Schönen der werdenden Nation einzupflanzen ist unser höchster deutscher Beruf in Amerika. Ihm aber bleiben wir am treusten, wenn wir die heilige Quelle hüten, aus der uns diese Güter zugeflossen sind, die Muttersprache:"

\[
Pflegt die deutsche Sprache, 
Hegt das deutsche Wort, 
Denn der Gunst der Väter 
Lebt darinnen fort.\]

Goebel's attitude is indicative of the stance toward cultural tradition: it was, as we have seen elsewhere, uniformly deified, and it reflected a "Bildung und Besitz" mentality. The pedagogical consequence of this view is a rigorously authoritarian role for the teacher of German. Adolf Spaeth wrote in 1900:
Wodurch hat Deutschland in diesem Jahrhundert seine Weltstellung wieder gewonnen? Vor allem durch Einordnung aller individuellen Kräfte in das allgemeine Beste durch die strenge Disziplin, die den Einzelnen Gehorsam lehrt, nicht bloss als ein hartes unvermeidliches Muss, sondern auf Grund seiner eigenen innersten Überzeugung: Das Wohl des Vaterlandes, und wenn es das Opfer fordert von jedem Einzelnen, ich bin willens und bereit es zu bringen. Wenn wir Männer haben wollen, die das Leisten verstehen, müssen wir eine Jugend haben, die sich leiten läßt, die in den Jahren ihrer Unmündigkeit einer liebevollen verständigen Autorität eine vertrauensvolle Pietät entgegenbringt.\textsuperscript{35}

But was there indeed another justification for "the study of the traditions of this sturdy race," other than "The presence in our population of 19,000,000 Americans in whose veins German blood flows."

The rise of America's world-historical star, as Learned outlined it, worked as a feeder for the German ideology: the success of America's future would seem to depend on its assimilation of the German Geist. Goebel knew that behind his office "steht die Ahnung oder die bewußte Erkenntnis, daß nur der deutsche Geist dem zum Höchsten aufstrebenden amerikanischen Volke Befreiung bringen und den rechten Weg zur Weiterentwicklung zeigen kann."

An important question remains: can one discern behind the rhetorical veneer what interests American Germanistik sought to serve? Was it perhaps as simple as Calvin Thomas expressed it: "And is it not rather a comforting thought that in simply living the larger social life, in recognizing its obligations and responding loyally and cheerfully to their call, we are working steadily in our own interest?" I do not think so. An answer, I believe, can be found in M.D. Learned's "Germanistik und schöne Litteratur in Amerika" of 1901. Learned was interested, like
many of his colleagues, in cultivating a knowledge of the relationship of German and English-speaking literatures. He sought to establish a connection between German influence in the field of scholarship and American belles lettres. Despite the vast and influential German element in the United States, Learned was constrained to state that there existed "eine erstaunlich weite Kluft zwischen den Philologen und den zeitgenossischen Schriftstellern, ich will nicht sagen Dichtern, in Amerika." He complained of "verderbliche Tendenzen" in American literature, blaming rapid industrial development, neglect of the liberal arts, the sensationalism and provincial perspective of the newspaper business, an insatiable hunger for the short story, and the lack of high ideals and critical perception such that "die litterarische Kritik der Gegenwart bei uns hinter der ersten Häfte des Jahrhunderts zurücksteht" (p. 105). (We shall want to keep this last statement in mind for the following chapter.) History teaches, according to Learned, that the most fruitful epochs of literary activity have their origin in foreign literature, for the contact with the life and culture of a foreign people stimulates literary production by widening perspective and providing native poets with new themes and forms. At this juncture Learned specifies how Germanistik is to serve as a model for American literature, chiefly since America had not had a classical period.

Learned stresses five points: 1) that classical exempla like Goethe and Schiller combined the best of antiquity and the modern spirit; 2) that Germanistik has "eine wissenschaftliche Methode und litterarhistorische Kritik, was bekanntlich den Engländern wie den Amerikanern in den letzten Jahrzehnten beinahe gänzlich gefehlt"; 3) "die Germanistik
führt zu einer kulturgeschichtlichen Auffassung des einheitlichen Stoffes, der litterarischen Momente der Nationalgeschichte und des Volkslebens; 4) Germanistik, German literature in particular, leads to an understanding and appreciation of classical forms; 5) Germanistik lays the groundwork for an "Ästhetische Volkserziehung" reminiscent of Schiller's work on the aesthetic education of mankind. In sum, Germanists in America were not only to motivate students to pursue research within Germanistik, but to impart to them, and through them to the American people, a deeper knowledge of German literature and the relations of German and American culture, "und so mit zu arbeiten an der Entwicklung einer wahrhaft nationalen Litteratur in Amerika."

Learned's comments are of interest not so much because he interprets Germanistik as a kind of cure-all for the malaise of American literature as he saw it, but because of its claim to scientific and methodological soundness, because of its concern for the national element of both literatures, because of the pedagogical implications of Germanistik as a format for "Ästhetische Erziehung," and finally because of his repeated emphasis on the central role of German Classicism within Germanistik. In yet another sense, then, we find Germanistik in America of the later 19th and early 20th centuries impelled by an intrepid sense of mission, be it in the mediation of German culture or in the rehabilitation of one aspect of America's.
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CHAPTER II:
LITERARY HISTORY AND ANALYSIS

The chief German literary histories of the 19th century, the works of Gervinus, Julian Schmidt, Hettner, Scherer, and others, are substantial and imposing books, grounded in the conventions of German scholarship with its ideals of thoroughness and comprehensiveness. By externalities alone they seem to command authority. Traditionally, Scherer has marked the advent of serious academic Germanistik, but recently, in light of renewed historical interest, the works of earlier historians have garnered attention. American histories of German literature from this period, meanwhile, have mostly fallen into oblivion. Many of them were small and unscholarly volumes, quite unlike their German counterparts. They sacrificed thoroughness and comprehensiveness to pragmatic utility and leisurely appreciation. If the tomes of German scholarship can be called treatises, then the works of American Germanistik largely resemble lectures. The minor works of these years generally aimed "at nothing more ambitious than to give an outline of the growth of German literature." Consequently, they consisted mostly of a tally of names, dates, and titles, along with occasional excerpts in translation.

Among the significant accomplishments, Bayard Taylor's Studies in German Literature is pithy compared to the oratorical and at times bombastic flair exhibited elsewhere. By the end of the 1870s, the studies
had lengthened, but generally lacked substance. This condition is particularly true of James K. Hosmer's *A Short History of German Literature* (1879), a work of over 600 pages. Hosmer disliked the often pedantic and tedious work of German scholars, and despite the length of his own volume he did not want to write his subject "to its dregs" (p. v), but preferred to outline and to sketch it. His product is an unusual hybrid of prolixity and cursoriness, an unfortunate genus which makes for unrewarding reading. Why is this so, what other features contributed to this effect, and to what extent are they characteristic?

Hosmer hinted in his preface at the impressionistic landscape he intended to provide: "In a tour in Germany, in which the pilgrim (Hosmer refers to himself here) followed, perhaps, no unusual track, but proceeded with the somewhat unusual purpose of visiting the spots famous through connection with great writers, much was seen possessing interest." The operative word here is interest. It suggests a point of view which defines its vista in terms of attraction rather than elucidation. For our understanding of his work as literary history, this feature is important. We can infer that Hosmer wanted to sustain interest not by expository rigor but by dramatic presentation. Hosmer's work in fact bears out this supposition: since there is more natural drama in the biographical mode, he assumed the pose of the pilgrim and recorded his own progress through the annals of German literature.

The histories of 1870-1905 in fact often indulged in anecdotes. In degree Hosmer's work is unique, for it resembles more a travelogue than a literary history. His narration frequently begins with an "I spent the night at . . .," or "So I followed his footsteps . . .," or "In one of
the old towns on the Rhine, I went to see . . . ." The anecdotes re­
volved around important figures, elevated to legendary status, and this had to do in part with the central role assigned to the biography of the poet-author. Taylor maintained that "the life of every author, who has shared in shaping the development of his generation, always reflects, in an individual form, the influences which affect the class to which he speaks, since he must admit them and take them into account, although he himself may remain comparatively independent. I hope, therefore, that an account of the men who have created the modern literature of Germany will, at the same time, enable us to estimate the character of that literature, and its importance as an element of human development."

When discussing Goethe, for example, Taylor insisted that he "can best represent his achievements by connecting them with the events of his life; and must therefore give an outline of his biography" (p. 305). And so a pattern soon crystallized—biographical sketch followed by plot summary interspersed with commentary. A direct relation between the author's life and his work was implied but not always clarified. Combined with a strict sense of moralism (we shall discuss this feature shortly), the tone could become vituperative. Wilkinson spoke of "heroic fortitude under suffering" and snidely compared Robert Hall to Goethe: "Robert Hall, after a paroxysm of exquisite anguish from spinal disease, says, 'O, I suffered terribly, but I did not complain while I was suffering, did I? Did I complain?' Goethe, in sickness, cried out so with violent pain that the guard at the gate of the city heard him. And Goethe is praised for remarkable self-control."
At least one reviewer of the time complained of the occasional
gossip-mongering of these works. We are concerned with its implica-
tions. This quotidian approach to literary history, biography-summary-
catch-as-catch-can-analysis, structured literary interpretation. The
chronology of the author's life provided a means for ostensibly objec-
tive analysis, but at the expense of historical perspective. Literary
history appeared as a parade of great (and less great) personnages.
Biographical data were not arrayed according to their historical signi-
ficance but placed arbitrarily side by side. This arbitrary arrangement
points to the underlying norms, both aesthetic and otherwise, which
guided the critic. For one, it affected the view of literary genesis.

Thomas explained how Die RHuber came about:

It has usually been assumed by Schiller's bio-
ographers that in his intense longing for liberty
he was embittered by this disappointment (the dis-
missing of his thesis on "The Philosophy of Phys-
ilogy" in 1779), and that in his mood of wrath he
now took up his neglected play and poured into it,
hissing hot, the whole fury of his quarrel with
the world. . . .

. . . in the intervals of his professional occu-
pation he worked with devilish energy upon "The
Robbers." To gain time for writing he would often
feign illness, and when the duke or an inspector
surprised him would hide his manuscript in a big
medical treatise kept at hand for the purpose. A
few comrades who were in the secret eagerly watched
the progress of his work and vociferously applauded
the scenes which he now and then read to them. One
of these comrades has left it on record that in the
excitement of composition Schiller would often stamp
and snort and roar,—And thus it was, in the stolen
hours of the night and driven by the demon that
possessed him, that he bodied forth his titanic
drama of revolt. It was virtually finished during
the year 1780. In aftertime Schiller reasoned him-
self into the conviction that art must be "cheer-
ful," but very little of cheerfulness went to the
composition of "The Robbers." It was the disbur-
thening of an oppressed soul that suffered horribly
at times from morbid melancholy—the chicken-pox of youthful genius.\textsuperscript{7}

Thomas concentrated on personal anecdotes and excluded formative historical parameters. The precise cause of Schiller's "quarrel with the world" is captured only in the diagnosis of "chicken-pox of youthful genius." To be sure, the biographical account does contribute to the understanding of the play's genesis, but, when applied exclusively, it neglects the larger contexts of the Storm and Stress and its radical critique of the Enlightenment, both in its dynamic humanitarianism (Lessing) as well as its bureaucratized rationality (the totalitarian structure of the state). Thomas' "chicken-pox of youthful genius" is witty and descriptive, but also an instance of suprahistorical psychologizing.

The bifurcation of description and analysis moved literary criticism toward literary appreciation. "A scientific analysis or synthesis," wrote one critic, "is profitable and useful in literature; but when it is exhaustive it is apt to be exhausting, and when it affects to despise the study of literature for aesthetic enjoyment it becomes injurious to the development of popular culture. Surely it is right and helpful to pluck the flowers of literature without grubbing for their roots." This premise invited a number of consequences. For one, citation often stood without commentary; quotations simply formed a part of the narrative flow as a first-hand account of the plot. For another, appreciation meant cultivating an emotive response within the reader. It resulted in a form of presentation I will call "vitalization," because it sought to render the literary text "consumable" to the reader, a feature indicative again of a "Bildung und Besitz" mentality. Third, conventional details of scholarship became "superfluous and impertinent." The
reason, I think, is not hard to see. Gunter Hess has shown that the most influential German literary histories between 1870 and the turn of the century, influential in terms of sales and readership, stemmed not so much from academic Literaturwissenschaft as they did from widely read "popular" works with a largely anti-academic character. American Germanistik, particularly of the 1870s and 1880s, the years of its academic infancy, directed its scholarship not immediately to students and colleagues but, in the tradition of public exposure given German literature in the first half of the 19th century, to an audience outside its professional domain. Reviews of the time suggest that these works were successful and, relatively speaking, well read. But this issue, for our purposes, is not as important as another common denominator of these works: the fact that all of them sought to introduce the uninitiated to German literature. This end dictated certain means. The language, for example, presented an immediate obstacle. And of course scholarly paraphernalia was needless ballast. Thus the titles—Abriß, Grundriß, A Primer, A Short History—indicating summary. Logistics fostered a style that tended to run against the academic grain: virtually devoid of jargon (but not of nonsense), it relied extensively on translation and insisted on a light, at times pedestrian, tone. It was carried far more by description than by analysis and in this sense was "popularized." Writers heeded the public sense of propriety—as late as 1906 Calvin Thomas hesitated, and finally refrained from, including Walther von der Vogelweide's "Under der Linden" in his Anthology of German poetry.

A combination of the anecdotal, the discursive, and the judicial made for occasional empty statements, formulated as adjudicated opinions:
"Genius is the one thing that mediocrity can never forgive"; "To have coupled this Shakespearean realism with such classic purity of diction is surely an achievement worthy of the severe labor and the expenditure of precious vitality which it cost." These remarks were handed down from the judge's bench, but they will not suffer analytical scrutiny. Again, description desisted from analysis. One typical discussion of *Emilia Galotti* began by mentioning the play's reference to the Roman legend of Virginius:

The catastrophe is borrowed from the story of a Roman conqueror who slays his daughter to save her from the clutches of a licentious noble. But here the resemblance ends. All the circumstances are different; in this case the father but follows the suggestion and executes the will of his victim.

Analysis ends just at the point where one expects it to press on; it ends really where it begins—with an analogy (more on this characteristic below). Five pages of plot summary and citation (in translation) without further commentary follow. The selection of quotations is impressionistic and centers on "the best drawn characters." These are seen in isolation, viewed within the context of a single scene and not within the play as a whole. As a result, they may be construed as moral exempla, but at the same time they are made over into mere stick figures.

What remains from these texts, lacking the demeanor and trappings of authority, is often a collage of vague perceptions, impressions, tones—in a word, an atmosphere. The format of the literary histories was basically disjunctive: transitions from scene to scene, from one work to another, from one author to the next, or between literary movements are often abrupt, with little thought to the whys and wherefores of change. The slighting of analysis made literary history rely desperately
on chronology. From birth to death of the poet, from his first work to his last, literary history was turned into something convenient and simple; it was, in fact, just one thing after another. One work marks a notable exception to this rule. Kuno Francke’s *Social Forces in German Literature* (1896) proposed a new direction for literary study:

... while there is no lack of works dealing with the history of German literature from the linguistic or the literary point of view, there seems to be a decided need of a book which, based upon an original study of the sources, should give a coherent account of the great intellectual movements of German life as expressed in literature; which should point out the mutual relation of action and reaction between these movements and the social and political condition of the masses from which they sprang or which they affected; which, in short, should trace the history of the German people in the works of its thinkers and poets.\(^6\)

Francke sought to apply two fundamental principles throughout his work:

It seems to me that all literary development is determined by the incessant conflict of two elemental human tendencies: the tendency toward personal freedom and the tendency toward collective organization. The former leads to the observation and representation of whatever is striking, genuine, individual; in short, to realism. The latter leads to the observation and representation of whatever is beautiful, significant, universal; in short, to idealism. The individualistic tendency, if unchecked, may lead either to a vulgar naturalism or to a fantastic mysticism. The collectivistic tendency, if unchecked, may lead to an empty conventionalism. Those ages and those men in whom the individualistic and the collectivistic tendencies are evenly balanced, produce the works of literature which are truly great (p. vi).

As one reviewer noted at the time, "the author turns energetically once for all against the slavish imitation of German literary historians" and makes "a tacit condemnation of the meagerness and poverty of contemporaneous literary German scholarship which prevails in this country in
spite of a great activity in more or less elementary text-book editions, made up without any special original effort from the convenient commentaries of German scholars." Francke saw literature as a social and cultural phenomenon. But his thesis, the two elemental human tendencies, proved to be the work's shortcomings, for social forces became mechanistic and unilateral. They affected literature but not vice versa, and where Francke saw weakness in the social forces he found it reflected in the literature as well. At bottom, Francke calibrated German literary history according to signs of social, cultural, and moral progress. This approach leads in two directions, one temporally back into American criticism, the other spatially over into German criticism. We shall briefly pursue the first path now, the second toward the end of this chapter.

For Francke, the moral integrity of the work, moral in the sense of individual originality working within and toward a collective goal, became pivotal, while the work's aesthetic qualities drifted to the periphery. This brand of criticism within American history goes back to the early 19th century. It was commonly held then that literature must not condone rebellion of any kind against the existing social and economic order, that it must avoid derogatory statements and immoral innuendos, that art itself was suspect, "for amusement was considered a loosener of moral fiber in that it made men forget duty." It was acknowledged that literature should be optimistic—gloom could only be allowed as a pose, that "literature should deal with the intelligible, not the mystical or the obscure," that it should be socially oriented, not egocentric, and finally that it must avoid sentimentality, which "spoiled man for participation in everyday life." The literary critic
of the first third of the century "felt it a duty to repress any writer who tended to disrupt the political, economic, and moral status quo."

The genteel tradition accommodated this outlook. In 1907, one scholar wrote of the time around 1870, when Germanistik in America was coming into its own, that "The subjects that attract the American critic are of another kind (i.e., not aesthetic). The moral character of the author and of the incidents portrayed, the question of whether the philosophy inspiring the production is a healthy one, and the effect that the study of the work will have on the mind of the reader—in other words, the good that is to be gained from the knowledge of the literature—these are the matters of prime importance." In brief, literary history was articulated as moral example. The critic was thus blinded to the historicity of the work. The abbreviated vista resulted in equally curtailed interpretations, especially where the work was viewed within its "social context." One writer marveled that "The interdependence of literature and politics in Germany is very curious and suggestive." And that was that.

We can summarize the criticism as essentially judicial, prescriptive, impressionistic, and not generally interpretive. One critic professed his belief that for the interests of literature, quite apart from the interests of life, nothing is more fatal than to attempt the divorce, in thought and in judgment, of character from genius, of morality from literary production. (I have) criticised constantly in view of this principle. (My) ethical judgments may thus properly be regarded as pronounced less in the behoof of ethics than in the behoof of letters. Bad men have sometimes been good writers, and, alas, on the other hand, too, good men have sometimes been bad writers; there is no certain inference possible in either
direction—from character to production or from production to character. Still, for ourselves, we freely confess, we consider it—and this purely as a matter of literary criticism (!)—of the two courses, safer to infer from a man's known evil life and character that there must be flaw in his literary performance than, inversely, to infer from the apparent excellence of his literary work that his life and character, though apparently evil, must really be good. That which is in character will generally come out in production, whether the production be of art or of literature. Such correspondence—often latent, but seldom lacking, especially where the question is of poetry—between what an author is and what that author does, it is, in each case, within the just province of literary criticism to divine and discover.  

Wilhelm Meister (one can choose almost at random) came off "as a tissue of smoothly, suavely, harmoniously woven German prose, constituting a dull, slow, prolix, low, groveling, fleshy, ill-schemed, loose-jointed, invertebrate, dim, beclouded, enigmatical, self-complacently autobiographical 'novel'—with episodes, or at least passages in it, worthy of the fame of its author."

What one sought then among the works of German literature were paradigms and maxims, shining examples, works fit to be canonized. Inevitably, Heine drew the short straw in this lot; he was "in general a poor authority to quote in appreciation of any thing pure, any thing lovely, any thing of good report." Of importance was "a greater man behind" the "genuine poet," "in whom, among others these virtues predominate,—courage, generosity, truth." Goethe's conduct was questionable. Jean Paul on the other hand "was eminent in all the qualities which command respect and attract good-will." And so he was portrayed in a sympathetic light.
"Manliness" was a positive attribute. "The stormy vehemence of The Robbers," for example, "contrasts with the effeminate intensity of Werther about as the moral vigor of Schiller's character contrasted with the emasculated softness of Goethe's." Manliness often implied practicality, a sense of utility. Amidst the "tropic of exuberance of characters and situations" in Jean Paul's works, Kuno Francke missed "a simple, brave, clear-minded, self-possessed man, engaged in useful public activity ... and surrounded by a free and sturdy people."

In the face of overriding moral strictures, the aesthetic element of literature was underplayed. Jean Paul was felt to be "a disorganizing element" in literary art, "while his moral power and influence have been wholly pure and beneficent." Where aesthetic criteria were applied, the epic was generally given the nod among genres, because "the broad and massive character of epic poetry, the deeper elements with which it deals, give it an intrinsic dignity and authority which cannot belong to the short flights of lyric song." As to drama, the standards were generally held to be "the simplicity of its plot, the close connection of all its parts, its apt characterizations, and the onward sweep and cumulative force of its action." Characteristically, literature was understood as a national genus, and the emergence of all three genres was linked with the notion of cultural-political efflorescence. As one history explained: "Mit der Entwicklung der drei Hauptgattungen, der epischen, lyrischen und dramatischen Poesie, aus der ungeschiedenen, chaotischen Einheit des Volksliedes ist, genau genommen, die Ausbildung der Dichtkunst abgeschlossen; doch kann sie im Laufe der Zeit in der- selben Nation wieder erwacht werden." The fundamental aesthetic
principle was clarity of expression. "From the obligation of a clear presentation," wrote Hosmer, "no one who has ideas to express is exempt. Unqualified as this doctrine is, we may take it as the only one to be accepted by honest men." But the aesthetic nature of the work was often described in imprecise terms like "sublime," "beautiful," and the like. Because a Platonic notion of the text hovered before the mind's eye of the critic at the time of his reading, works were seen not so much as literary art as bearers of value.

One history from 1878 announced that "Als neu, wenigstens hier zu Lande neu, wird der Versuch gelten müssen, aus den besten Dramen der classischen Periode 'Sentenzen und geflügelte Worte' auszuziehen." By the turn of the century the practice of distilling wisdoms from their context was commonplace; Tell-editions, for example, included from thirty to fifty such quotables. Where this sampling was done, literary history became a kind of catechism, the "Sentenzen und geflügelte Worte" the basis for rote exercise. But the consequences went deeper. Catechismic aura suggested obeisance. It was in fact as a pilgrim, we recall, that Hosmer set off for his tour through A Short History of German Literature (1879). Obeisance before the author was expressed as hero-worship; characteristically the poet was seen as a man with a mission, as a poetas vates. Hochdoerfer's comment was typical: "The sufferings of mankind and its tears, its smiles, and its laughter are revealed in the poet's works. A type of his nation, he becomes in his masterpieces a type of humanity. Thus the real poet is (as implied in the word) a maker, a creator, not merely a seer and a prophet, but a ruler of destiny." But this mien was not worn only by poets. One enthusiastic
disciple of Bayard Taylor claimed that his mentor "touched nothing that he did not beautify; fresh truth was born of every old truth which he disclosed; and so great was his reverence for intellectual superiority, that the heroes of his theme rose into demigods through his mere companionship. . . . let the pupils stand before his unfinished work in the stillness of reverence." To keep company with the great classics was accordingly a ceremonious and sacred affair. At one level it accommodated capricious selectivity. One writer admitted that "Of these and other contemporary writings I care not to speak at length, but pass at once over an interval of more than three centuries to the period of the full efflorescence of ancient German classic poetry,—the period of the Nibelungen and the Minnesingers." On another level, this vision of the poet as prophet made the literary critic a distinguished proxy. The most significant Schiller-scholar of the time, Calvin Thomas, wrote that "The creative achievement is far more precious and important than any possible criticism of it." As curator and guardian of what is good and what is bad in literature, the literary critic served a social purpose. "Literary criticism," wrote Hochdoerfer,

is the indispensable concomitant of literary production, supplying the reader as well as writer with a standard of judgment. However wide the range of the poet's license, there are some fixed principles governing artistic creation which he cannot pass by unheeded. Writers, as a rule, are also good critics, and the literary critic, if not taking first rank as a poet, must have poetic feeling and power. Literature and life are linked by the poet, the interpreter of life; the worth of the genuine critic depends upon the same faculty of interpretation, the lack of which disqualifies him even as a judge in aesthetics.

And so a hierarchy was established. For the German context, Gunter Reiss
has shown that "Das Bild vom Dichterfürsten . . . verrät bereits im Wortgebrauch unverkennbar den 'Prozeß der Feudalisierung,' der für die bürgerliche Gesellschaft im letzten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts mit raschem Tempo sich vollzog." The vocabulary betrays elitism in its commingling of the poet and the poet-once-removed, the critic.

Typically, authors were compared to the likes of Homer and Shakespeare and judged accordingly. This procedure did not entail serious comparison but did call forth either positive or negative associations, depending on how the verdict fell out. For literary analysis, the use of parallelisms and analogies is interesting, for by itself the analogy does not really explain; it seeks instead to disclose similarities, often disregarding important and real differences. It paints in black and white with little feel for chiaroscuro, dualistically rather than dialectically. Accordingly, the particular was made subordinate to the general. This practice led, in literary periodization for example, to over-simplification. The Enlightenment, the Storm and Stress, Classicism, and Romanticism were not seen as overlapping and diachronic phenomena, but as discontinuous and antithetical categories. Taylor wrote that "The 'Storm and Stress' period, which was simply a fermentation of the conflicting elements—a struggle by means of which the new era of literature grew into existence—commenced about the year 1770, and continued for twenty years. During its existence the Romantic School was developed, separating itself from the classic school, by its freedom of form, its unrestrained sentiment, and its seeking after startling effects. It was a natural retaliation, that France, forty years later, should have borrowed this school from Germany."

Sometimes the literary period was defined not by leading author, a characteristic work,
or a movement as such, but by other factors—in the 18th century frequently Frederick the Great. Wells wrote that "here on the threshold of Frederic's reign (1740-1786) it is fitting to close this brief sketch of the origins of Modern German Literature. For the first-fruits are already blossoming, and Frederic lived to see the sure promise of the literary glories in which he had an essential though a silent part." Francke viewed Frederick as the progenitor of the classical age and lamented that "the great German thinkers and poets" did not sympathize "with his methods of government. As in the time of the Reformation, there was again a chance for the kindling of a mighty flame of popular freedom, which, nourished and propagated by the best and noblest of the educated classes, might have swept from one end of Germany to the other, burying the hundreds of petty tyrants in a gigantic conflagration, and welding the hundreds of lifeless embryonic states into one free, united people." These statements contrast strongly with Franz Merling's epoch-making demythologizing of the Lessing-legend, in which his analysis of Frederick the Great figured prominently. The attitude reflected in these interpretations is in fact the German Empire mentality which super-imposed the Gründerzeit on the 18th century.

The notion of literary periodization begs the question of historical understanding. Within American Germanistik, Herder's thesis of literary and cultural evolution as an expression of the national identity played a role. Taylor's work of 1879 opened:

... the literature of a race... has its pedigree, its birth and childhood, its uncertain youth, and its varying fortunes through the ages, before it reaches a mature and permanent character. Although it grows in grace and variety of expression, and
With Wells in 1895 the influence of Scherer's Wellentheorie is unmistakable: "Like the political life of a nation and often in connection with it, the literary life ebbs and flows, rises and falls." Francke on the other hand was partial to the Hegelian concept of historical development:

Hegel sees in history a continual progress toward freedom, and he distinguishes three great epochs in this development: the Oriental, the Graeco-Roman, and the Germanic. In the first epoch only one was free, in the second some were free, in the third all are free. But it is clear that by freedom Hegel understands, not individual independence, but rather universal responsibility; that the climax of human development is to him, not highest individual culture, but rather the most fully organized and the widest reaching collective consciousness. The individuals are sacrificed, the idea of the whole lives on; and only by living in and for this idea may the individual be admitted to a share in its immortality. Whatever may be said about the technical foundations of this system of thought, it is impossible to resist the inspiring breath that emanates from it. Even as a mere dream of the world it is one of the most consistent views of the world ever conceived. It seems to open the whole universe, to solve every riddle, to shed a light of eternity even upon the most fleeting, to hallow even the most humble life by connecting it with the life of the infinite spirit. It makes the world an evolution of the divine; it sees in human society an organism whose principal function is the living out of the universal idea; it finds the goal of human progress in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. It is Christianity secularized."

These attitudes toward history and the development of literary and cultural (and political) growth bear the seeds of an ideological strategy: a historical-philosophical perspective which sees the development of all nation-states first in a religious community, second in the attainment
of a literary and artistic culture, and ultimately in its specifically
Germanic realization.

In this scheme of things the idea of a national literature predomi-
nated. This argument buttressed Wells' thesis that "It is not military
success, but active, unrestrained, political life, or a glorious and
successful struggle for national existence and reformation that nurses
the literary spirit; and therefore the age of Frederic is greater than
that of Louis, because thought is more free." Minna von Barnhelm,
for example, was praised for being "National to the core." National
class, deutsch, was a positive attribute. It pervades Kuno Francke's
work. With a Rousseauistic touch he described the Teutons before the
migration as "the most purely aboriginal and unadulterated nation of
Europe"—they "conquered the world at the expense of themselves."
Like man after the fall of Adam, Francke wanted to see this original
harmony regained. It became a leitmotif within his Social Forces.
"Under the guidance of Christian ideas," he wrote, "the priceless heri-
tage of the German race" went on "to develop a better and nobler state
of national existence" (p. 33). When discussing the 17th century,
Francke was wont to stress the literature's "native independence and
sturdiness, how it gradually wrenched itself out of the deadly enclo-
sure of corruption and depravity, and ultimately became the freest and
most enlightened spiritual force of the world" (p. 187). The direction
of Francke's argumentation is unambiguous and irreversible.

Esteem for German scholarship precluded debate with German critics.
American Germanists were generally informed of their work but tended to
digest it as an indisputable authority. In some cases the reliance was
a matter of convenience; in others the openness toward German literary scholarship and its larger implications suggests a coincidence of interests. Both attitudes accommodated a facile assimilation of the latent ideology within German scholarship, which Sokel adumbrated earlier as a justification of reactionary nationalism. In the literary histories of American Germanistik of the 1870s and 1880s, this note was sounded, but only piano; it crescendoed with the growth of the German Empire and by the 1890s it was fortissimo. Writing about Freiligrath's poem, "Deutschland ist Hamlet," one history explained in 1879:

Freiligrath, in his poem, has in mind the political, not the literary, history of his country; but the characteristics he so finely sketches will explain the shortcomings in both fields. "Germany is Hamlet,"--the explanation is sufficient. Our time however has seen a change. The poet wrote before the events of 1870. As if the nation had heeded his summons, it has taken care that, after four acts,

---the parallel
Appear not in the fifth and last.

The nation is not, indeed, free in the American sense, but the despotism that oppressed it for ages is utterly swept away; if a master still rules, he is, at any rate, one beloved by his subjects, ruling with their consent. In politics, it is Hamlet no longer; perhaps it will be so in literature.53

By 1895 similar remarks had become more vigorous:

But soon the progress of politics gave a new impulse to German energies. War with Denmark was followed close by the great victory over Austria in 1866 and the dazzling triumphs of 1870. The German empire was once more a reality, not the simulacrum that Napoleon had laid forever to rest in 1806, but such as it was in Barbarossa's day, a great, perhaps the greatest power in Europe.54

In Kuno Francke's Social Forces in German Literature (1896), moments in Germany's history turning on the issue of unity and independence took
on unprecedented importance and were reported in a way that reveals the partisanship of their observer. Francke wrote:

Joyness, exultant, jubilant joyness—this is perhaps the word which best characterizes the whole German rising against Napoleon. There is hardly a trace in it of that dark desperate hatred which gave a sinister aspect to Heinrich von Kleist's patriotic effusions. Its dominant note is a feeling of unspeakable delight that at last all the little provincial rivalries have been forgotten, that for once the differences of class, of religion, of education have been swept away; that for once there is nothing but one grand common cause, one heaven and one earth for all who speak and think and dream German. It is as though the whole past of the nation were crowded into one supreme moment, as though old Barbarossa had risen from the sleep of centuries and brought back the splendour of the ancient empire, as though the Nibelungen heroes were striding by the side of the Black Hussars, as though the pillars and vaults of Gothic cathedrals were once more embracing a united people, as though a new "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott" were bursting forth from every German heart. Wonderful, divine year! ample reward for all the sufferings and humiliations of a long servitude, glorious climax of more than half a century of unremitting intellectual effort, signals of light for all future ages! (p. 495).

The political unification of 1871 occasioned similar exuberance (less conspicuous in Francke's literary history than in his other writings, such as Glimpses of Modern German Culture, 1898, and German Ideals of To-Day, 1907). In Francke's history, telling evaluative leitmotifs appeared. He drew attention for example to Walther von der Vogelweide's national feeling, to the national importance of the religious song in the 17th century, to Klopstock's efforts to nationalize German literature, to his patriotism and cosmopolitanism, to Wieland's liberalism, to Lessing's patriotism, to Goethe as a prophet of national greatness, to Bürne's democratic feeling. . . . These formed the scaffolding of German national literature. Francke wrote literary-cultural history
analogous to the Prussian school of history, which made the Hohenzollern
and Frederick the Great the progenitors of the Kaiserreich. For Francke,
German Classicism would have been unthinkable without Frederick the
Great, and the Kaiserreich impossible without German Classicism, as we
shall investigate in the following chapter.

With respect to the "preußisch gesinnte Schule," it is interesting
to note the parallels between Francke's work, at the time "unhesitatingly
ranked among the best Histories of German Literature," and Scherer's
history, which "war das bekannteste Werk, das ein Gesamtbild der deutschen
Literatur gab, und galt als die bedeutendste Leistung dieser Wissen-
schaft überhaupt." Both books emphasized Kulturgeschichte. But more
important, underlying both of them was the objective, in Scherer's words,
"ein System der nationalen Ethik aufzustellen." This objective was
similar to that described by M.D. Learned's treatise on "Germanistik
und schöne Litteratur" noted above. All three of these men were con-
cerned about the function of the discipline. For Scherer, it comprised
den innersten aufquellenden Lebenskern unserer neuesten Geschichte . . . , welche zugleich ganz uni-
versell und ganz momentan, ganz umfassend theoretisch und zugleich praktisch, das kühne Unternehmen
wagte, ein System der nationalen Ethik aufzustellen, welches alle Ideale der Gegenwart in sich beschlussse,
und, indem es sie lüftete, indem es ihre Berech-
tigung und Möglichkeit untersuchte, und ein herz-
erhebendes Gemälde der Zukunft mit vielfältigem
Trost für manche Unvollkommenheit der Gegenwart und
manchen lastenden Schaden der Vergangenheit als un-
trüglichen Wegweiser des edelsten Wollens in der
Seele pflanzte.

In our following discussion of the reception of German Classicism by
American Germanistik we will see how, in the vein of German Idealism,
supra-individual, ethical norms were postulated. However, as with
Scherer, and in American Germanistik's interpretation of Tell as well, "ist der revolutionäre Stachel entfernt."

Along with this "preußisch gesinnte Schule," Francke's work also incorporates an American perspective: he makes democratic principles the yardstick of cultural progress. He championed Lessing the "destroyer of despotism and the master builder of lawful freedom" and derided "the capricious lawlessness of chance" in Schiller's Fiesco (pp. 265, 339). And similarly John Coar made it the object of his Studies in German Literature of the Nineteenth Century (1903) "To measure the development of the German nation by ideals of American democracy, though not by standards of American living" (p. vii). These notions give a distinct character to American Germanistik of these years, and with them a new note is sounded in the German ideology.
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CHAPTER III:
AMERICAN GERMANISTIK AND GERMAN CLASSICISM

Discussion of German Classicism necessarily centers around Goethe and Schiller. Georg Gottfried Gervinus was the first to suggest a connection between the two poets and the notion of German Classicism, an association later to become the formative element of the heritage of Germanistik. "Goethe und Schiller führten zu einem Kunstideal zurück, das seit den Griechen niemand mehr als geahnt hatte," he wrote in the introduction to his Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Deutschen (1835). Thus he not only placed the problematic "und" between Goethe and Schiller, making German Classicism synonymous with Weimar Classicism; he also drew the parallel to antiquity, giving the German epoch the dignity of a genuine classicism.

Gervinus elaborated on the relationship between Goethe and Schiller:

Und so durchkreuzen sich die Linien des doppel- seitigen Wesens in Beiden so vielfach, daß sie uns gleichsam erst in dieser verschlungenen Gestalt ein gemeinsames Ganzes darstellen an dem wir uns ungetrennt freuen und aufbauen sollen wie es in der Absicht der Männer selbst lag. Wer wollte zwischen Beiden wählen! Wer die Grundlehre Beider, die wir so wiederholt, so nachdrücklich, wie sie sich in ihren Schriften selbst findet, auch in unserer Darstellung wieder und wieder bringen müßten, die Lehre von der vereinten totalen Menschennatur, so blind aus dem Auge lassen! Wer müßte das Eine als das Ausschließliche preisen, da sie selbst uns auf ein drittes weisen, das größer ist als Beide.
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Although Gervinus did not yet use the term Klassik in this context, his statements constitute "das Gründungsmanifest eines wirkungsgeschichtlichen Klassikbegriffs." In his five-volume work, German national literature was seen to culminate in Classicism. To be sure, his strategy, like the term's appropriation during the Wilhelminian age, was political. Of course, his political intent is characterized by pre-1848 idealism, as his disrepute within Wilhelminian Germany bears out. But his invocation of German Classicism remained epoch-making.

The focus on the diumvirate of Goethe and Schiller, and on Weimar Classicism as such, tended to minimize the early work—and in Goethe's case, the later work as well—of both poets. But this was not the only manner in which Goethe and Schiller were misappropriated. Max Baeumer has shown that the terms klassisch and Klassizismus have "Weder für Schiller noch für Goethe . . . aber jemals etwas mit dem späteren Begriff einer 'deutschen Klassik' zu tun gehabt." In the 1860s, the celebration of Goethe and Schiller in Germany meant precisely the exhaltation of "das Deutschtum, das eben im Begriff war, sich unter Preussens Fahnen zu sammeln." Only after 10 November 1867 did both poets fully become the property of the German people, for on this day copyright laws were lifted for all authors having died prior to 9 November 1837. Klassikerausgaben became the fashion. As Berghahn puts it, "Jetzt hatte man endlich ein deutsches Reich, einen Kaiser in Berlin und die dazugehörigen Klassiker im Bücherschrank" (p. 72). The German ideology of the later 19th century transformed Goethe and Schiller, in the sardonic phraseology of Grimm and Hermand, "in ein innig verbundenes Dioskurenpaar, das man in Form von Gipsbüsten, umrahmt von dekorativen MakartstrHüBen, aufs
altdeutsche Vertiko stellte."

In 1869, the American Germanist E.P. Evans considered the two Dich-

terheroen an outgrowth of the "Gährung in Kunst und Politik," and called
them "die höchste Vollendung der Aufklärung." In 1874, Loderman de-
scribed them as "zwei sich ergänzende Naturen," and Conant's Primer of
German Literature (1873) also drew from Gervinus' symbiosis. In these
works Goethe and Schiller were not regarded as forerunners of national
unity. Instead, they were described as heroes "larger than life." Hos-
mer, in 1879, likened Goethe to Apollo and Jove, Schiller to a visionary
prophet. In the same year, Boyesen felt it "safe to assert that (Goethe)
was the most complete man in modern history." This Olympian rhetoric
was so entrenched as to be virtually without exception. Klassik as such,
however, was not a common designator, as was, for example, Romantik.
The term is absent from Evans' work and Conant's, and mentioned only
parenthetically in Loderman's as "die zweite klassische Periode" (p. 3).
Taylor called it "the great age of German literature," and Hosmer's
assessment was similar.

This tendency is typical of Anglo-American scholarship (exclusive
of Germanistik), which commonly views Goethe and Schiller within the
larger parameters of European Romanticism. For the reception of German
literature in 19th century America, English criticism provided a sub-
stantial model, especially during the first half of the century. Men
like Thomas Carlyle and George Lewes, along with the many translators
and reviewers who often published later in American journals and maga-
zines, helped foster this relationship. As we noted in Part I, however,
the later 19th century saw a growing disinterest in German literature
within the American general public, while at the same time **Germanistik** developed into an American academic institution. As the last three decades progressed and **Germanistik** grew and consolidated, both in America as well as in Germany, there occurred a parting of the ways. As an institution based in no small measure on the German paradigm, American **Germanistik** superseded the function of free-lance intellectuals of the earlier 19th century, who largely drew upon English criticism, and directed its attention more and more to German scholarship. The shift of perspective regarding German Classicism corroborates this observation, as Peter Boerner has noted:

Nachdem noch die in den siebziger Jahren wirkenden englischen und amerikanischen Hochschulgermanisten, darunter Bayard Taylor und James K. Hosmer, die deutsche Literatur von Lessing bis Novalis zusammenfassend als "the glorious period of German literature" (Hosmer, p. 474) beschrieben hatten, stellten sich einige ihrer Nachfolger bewusst unter den Einfluß der inzwischen in Deutschland erfolgten Kanonisation der "deutschen Klassik." Zwei hervorragende Vertreter dieser Richtung waren George Madison Priest und Kuno Francke. In ihren zwischen 1896 und 1931 in mehreren Auflagen erschienenen Darstellungen der deutschen Literatur sprachen sie unmissverständlich von Goethe und Schiller als den "German Classics."  

Boerner's description of this trend is accurate, but the scope of his essay did not allow him to investigate the American context further. If it had, he would have noted that modulations in the direction he perceives can already be seen in Taylor's work of 1879, where the literature leading up to Classicism was viewed as "strong foundations of . . . the superstructure," as "the basis of the later development." Taylor voiced the germ of a thought which Francke developed fully in 1896: the thought that German Classicism was the apogee of German literature and culture, all previous history being only a prefiguration of its destiny—"that perfect
intellectual freedom and equipose, that universality of human interest and endeavor which was to be the signal feature of cultivated German society toward the end of the eighteenth century."

Another prefiguration of Classicism, that of the political destiny of Germany unity, was a hallmark of Wilhelminian ideology. Its assimilation is already elaborately evident in 1886, in Frederick H. Hedge's interpretation of Goethe's Das Märchen. Hedge relied uncompromisingly on the commentary of Dr. Hermann Baumgart, "Goethes Märchen, ein politisch-nationales Glaubensbekenntnis des Dichters" (1875). In brief, Hedge's allegorical exegesis viewed Goethe's work as "a prophetic vision of the destinies of Germany,—an allegorical foreshadowing at the close of the eighteenth century of what Germany was yet to become, and has in great part already become." Hedge's lengthy discussion of the work concluded: "The prophecy is accomplished. What Genius predicted ninety years ago has become fact. The Temple stands by the River, the bridge is firm and wide. The Genius of Germany is no longer a sighing, sickly youth, pining after the unattainable, but having married his ideal, is now embodied in the mighty Chancellor whose state-craft founded the new Empire, and whose word is a power among nations" (p. 340).

The terminology current in the 1890s betrays a complete assimilation of canonized Classicism. Benjamin Well's Modern German Literature (1895) continued to speak of "the German classic authors of whom we read and hear most to-day, and shall for some time to come" (p. vii), and emphasized the works of Goethe and Schiller as "universal literature." Kuno Francke, in Social Forces (1896), insisted that German Classicism was the immediate forerunner to national unity ("But it nevertheless remains true that
without the exalted creations of their thought and fancy there would be today no German nation," p. 350). Francke made certain that Goethe and Schiller were understood as patriots:

No more futile accusation has ever been raised than the assertion not infrequent in critical estimates of the classic period of German literature, that the great German thinkers and poets were lacking in patriotism, that they were one-sided cosmopolitans and individualists, that they were forgetful of their public tasks and obligations. All that has been said on the foregoing pages would have been said in vain, if it had not imbued the reader with the conviction that the very reverse of these charges is true. At a time when the last remnants of the old Empire were being brushed away in the shameful treaties of Basel (1795) and Pressburg (1805); when the military honour of the nation was being trampled into the mud on the battlefields of Ulm and Austerlitz (1804); when German princes and statesmen were to be seen in the anterooms of French generals haggling for little private advantages in the midst of the universal ruin;--at this time the true representatives of public life in Germany were the men whose works we have been considering. They were the true upholders of national honour; they were the true leaders from the exaggerated individualism of the eighteenth to the collectivism of the nineteenth century; they are the true founders of German unity. For they have created the soul which in our own day on the bloody fields of Gravelotte and Sedan has at last wrought for itself a body (pp. 397-98).

Moreover, Goethe and Schiller were said to have performed a "mission" for modern humanity. Francke asserted for the two an unequivocal freedom from all pretension and prejudice, and spoke of them in terms of sweeping universality: "they reared a structure of poetic symbols embodying the fundamental demands of all religion and bringing out the common ideals of all society and of every race" (p. 335). Mentors for mankind, of course became mentors for America, directional forces in American intellectual history. In 1900, Julius Goebel claimed that "Ja, wir Deutschen
in Amerika duerfen es wohl eine wunderbare Fuegung preisen, dass es der Geist Goethes und Schillers war, der, als man in Amerika begann, ein unabhängiges Geistesleben zu schaffen, Weg und Ziel wies." Their stature became monumental, suprahistorical, an admonition to posterity. During the celebration of Schiller's centenary, Oscar Burckhardt was moved to exclaim that "der Band der beiden Geistesheroen geht weit hinaus ueber ihre Erdenjahre; der Klang des einen Namen erweckt alsbald den Widerklang des anderen, und so stehen die beiden Dichter in unserer Anschauung da, wie sie im Standbild vor dem Weimarer Theater stehen, Arm in Arm, Jahrhundert auf Jahrhundert in die Schranken fordernd."

The reception of Schiller in 1905 provides, in fact, a good opportunity to examine further the details of American Germanistik's assimilation of the classical heritage. Understandably, one could scarcely read a word about or of Schiller in America prior to 1800, and his reception remained on the whole rather negative until around the years 1815-1817, when George Ticknor and Edward Everett returned from their studies in Göttingen and began influencing America's perception of German letters. In 1814, Mme. de Staël's De l'Allemagne appeared in translation, with extensive reviews in influential literary magazines. Gradually, Americans became acquainted with Schiller's works, and from 1833 on practically all commentary was laudatory. Karl Follen, a yeoman of German literature in America, "liked to play up the 'moral' Schiller against the 'licentious' Goethe." This sort of comparison, which inevitably fell out in favor of Schiller, held sway through the first half of the century. Margaret Fuller's staccato objections to Goethe were typical: "He is not a Christian; he is not an Idealist; he is not a
Democrat; he is not a Schiller."

Having "won the hearts," as Henry Pochmann has stated, "of Americans in every section and of every philosophic persuasion, (the) centennial of his birth in 1859 was an occasion for elaborate festivals in his honor." In Germany, meanwhile, the response to Schiller on the centenary of his birth was resounding. He was called the national poet of freedom, a standard-bearer of patriotism. The danger that Schiller posed for the reactionaries of post-1848 can be seen from the Stielsch Regulations of 1854, in which "die sogenannte klassische Literatur" was proscribed in Prussian Lehrerseminare. Doubtless the classicist in mind was Schiller, for since Metternich's time the cultural-political thumbscrews, the efforts either to prohibit Schiller's dramas of national liberation and unification or to ravage them by censorship, were commonplace. Thus Schiller's 100th birthday served patriots as a welcome front for a national proclamation. But the liberal-democratic tendencies of the Vormärz gave way to national Prussian interests: the spectacular celebrations marked another significant step toward the establishment of a "nationale Klassiklegende."

Both centenaries instigated further study of Schiller. In America in 1860, for example, F.W. Thomas issued Schiller's Sämtliche Werke in Zwei Bänden, and 1861 saw the first edition in English of Schiller's Complete Works. Four years later, E.C.F. Krauss, an instructor of German at Harvard, began his series of simple school texts, Klassikerausgaben, of Wilhelm Tell, Maria Stuart, and Wallenstein. In the scholarly field, reprints or translations of important foreign Germanists encouraged a number of American scholars to focus their attention on Schiller too.
In 1890, Kuno Francke thought it "evident that at present we are standing at the threshold of a new epoch in Schiller literature." Francke's comment is revealing about the years prior to 1890 and the state of Schiller-scholarship then. Albert Ludwig, whose lengthy study of Schiller's reception in 19th century Germany appeared in 1909, offers an explanation. Schiller had never counted for so little "im geistigen Leben seines Volkes," claimed Ludwig, as in the years between 1884-94. Ludwig fails to explain the disinterest as a result of unification, of the Bürgertum having ostensibly attained its goal of political unity wherein Schiller was no longer useful as an ideological tool. But Ludwig does note—and the relationship can hardly be viewed as simply coincidental—that following Bismarck's release in 1890, the Schiller "cult" revived. The Chancellor's vacancy "wirkte f"ürmlich aufrüttelnd auf weite Kreise. Bis dahin hatte man sich fast unmündig gefühlt: in wessen Hand lagen die Geschicke der Deutschen besser als bei ihm, der ihnen das Reich zuerst geschmiedet hatte?" (p. 612). In this connection it is instructive to note Kuno Francke's assessment of Bismarck. In 1898 he wrote that "In all these respects—socially, intellectually, religiously—Bismarck was the very incarnation of German character," that "If ever there was a man in whom Fate revealed its moral sovereignty, that man was Bismarck," that "it can truly be said that Bismarck, with all his natural aggressiveness and ferocity, has in the main been a defender, not a conqueror." The resurgence of Schiller's popularity within American Germanistik is, consequently, not surprising. Its wave swelled in 1901 with the publication of Calvin Thomas' The Life and Works
of Friedrich Schiller. The momentum of interest assured that Schiller's induction into Germanistik's literary canon was a fait accompli. Germanists rode the crest of the wave in 1905: E.C. Parry wrote then that "Friedrich Schiller is studied to an extent to-day that was certainly not the case fifty years ago; he is everywhere loved and revered."

The centenary of Schiller's death in 1905 was grandiose. In the Monatshefte of 1906 Edwin Roedder reported that the Schiller-year in Germany was not a repeat of 1859: "Und wer . . . vor einer gedankenlosen Wiederholung des rauschenden Festjubels von 1859 gewarnt hatte, dem wurde es bald klar, dass es der Warnung nicht brauchte. Denn wenn es auch manchem besser gewesen ware, den Tag in stiller Betrachtung zu begehen und sich eine ehrliche Antwort abzuringen auf die Frage, was ihm Schiller sei, das Volk- als ganzes fühlte, dass es dem Andenken seines Dichters öffentlich huldigen müsse, dass es aber ein ernstes Fest feiere."

Roedder supported the ceremonious affair "nach dem Beispiele und Vor­bilde der jungen christlichen Kirche, die auch zur Gedächtnisfeier ihrer Heiligen deren Todestag einsetzte." The highlights of the occasion, according to Roedder, were the formal addresses. It was here, "wo der Unterschied zwischen 1859 und 1905 am deutlichsten zu Tage trat. Damals eine verzehrende Glut der Begeisterung, unwiderstehlich alles erraffend und verschlingend; heut eine Flamme, die strahlt und erwärmt; dereinst wohl ein einziges stilles grosses Leuchten" (p. 140). Roedder's reasoning of the change is significant: "die politischen und nationalen Forderungen, als deren glänzendster Anwalt ihn das Deutschland nach 1848 zu betrachten liebte, sind längst erfüllt" (p. 166). The addresses urged instead "Den ganzen Schiller, den Dichter der persönlichen Befreiung, den Erzieher zum
harmonischen Menschentum, zur grossen Persönlichkeit, den Weisen und Weiser, zu suchen und zu feiern" (p. 166). As an exponent of American Germanistik, Roedder conformed entirely to the assimilation of the Deutsche Klassik within Germany of the later 19th century: a depolitization on the one hand, and on the other an accentuation of the "innig verbundenes Dioskurenpaar."

The June issue of German American Annals for 1905 printed an account of the various celebrations in America. Thirty-six ceremonies had been announced in cities throughout the nation. Among the festivities were five complete performances of Tell and three presentations of scenes from the play (more than any other of Schiller's works). Prominent Germanists figured among the speakers. Using five representative texts, we shall attempt to isolate features characteristic of American Germanistik's assimilation of the classical heritage in 1905:

1) Karl Detlev Jessen's address appeared, along with others, in volume three of the German American Annals (1905). Throughout, Jessen was determined to elevate Schiller to a station transcending time, to cast him as a "König im Reiche der Gedanken und Gesinnung" (p. 177). Schiller's "apotheosis" was exemplary because, so Jessen argued, he had wedded the German people to the German nation. He projected Schiller's zeal for freedom onto the battles of Böhmen and Alsace-Lorraine, understood his idealism as an agent of thousands of German warriors, and urged emulation of Prussia's harsh, militaristic discipline. He saw in the Prussian state "die hohe, wenn auch rigoröse Sittlichkeit" (p. 179), which, he claimed, was not so distant from the Schillerian spirit as one might think.
Much of the rhetorical force of Jessen's delivery was based on intimidation: "Heute dürfen nur die vollständig Trottelhaften, die bemitleidenswert Geistigarmen sich aus Gewissensnot oder Parteigeist der Schillerfeier fernhalten" (p. 180). He sermonized in the vein of Chaucer's Pardoner, who saw in failure to offer coin an open admission of secret guilt. We recall his censure of the "philosophischen Barbiergesellen vom Schlage (Ludwig) Büchners" and the "Marxisten" (p. 185), which defined Jessen's own conservative Parteigeist and social allegiance.

For the German people, Schiller stood as the favorite among heroes. He had not only endowed and strengthened moral rigor, but had made the Germans geadelt (a favorite word of Jessen's). He assigned the task of understanding the poet and philosopher to Berufene, thus underscoring his appeal to elitism. And he did not hesitate to associate the social sphere with the divine, proclaiming: "Es liegt in der Natur des Menschen, grosse Menschen zu verehren, an sie zu glauben. Die grossen Helden und Führer erscheinen uns als begnadete Heilige und Abgesandte, durch welche die Gottheit sich offenbart und ihr Werk verrichtet" (p. 180). Jessen's fascination with feudalistic subservience is striking, as is his penchant for mythical, political, and religious metaphors (Helden, Führer, Heilige, Gottheit). This configuration became particularly conspicuous when Jessen lamented the brevity of Schiller's life: "Als ein ewig Junger, als ein Mann ist er von uns gegangen, als ein Kämpfer wird er allezeit vor uns stehen, ein deutscher Streiter, und sein Geist wird uns, des sind wir gewiss, in allen Kämpfen, die die Zukunft für uns im Schosse birgt, begleiten in der hehren Geisterschaar derer die wir unsere Helden heissen, und er wird uns durch Kampf zum Siege führen" (p. 189). Schiller
as the eternal aristocrat, as the embodiment of national spirit, as a cultural warrior having suffered and overcome his earthly existence "in Übermenschlicher Weise"—this is Jessen's portrait of Schiller.

2) Less strident was D.B. Shumway, who spoke on "Schiller's Message to the Twentieth Century." Nevertheless, he shared with Jessen an outspoken deference, bordering on reverence, for Schiller. He appreciated "the honor and privilege" of laying his "tribute of admiration at the feet of our beloved Schiller" (p. 192). He interpreted Schiller ahistorically, as did Jessen (who accentuated Schiller's phrase, "Vielmehr kann das Niedrige des Zustandes, mit Hoheit der Gesinnung verbunden, ins Erhabene Übergiehen"), with the result that the potentially progressive qualities of Schiller were rendered harmless: "The poet's inspiring words are no longer necessary to rouse men to fight for the most sacred rights of humanity. But has Schiller then no message for us to-day? Must we number him among the poets of a past age, in whom our interest is mainly of an antiquarian character? I am convinced that he has a message for us to-day. This great audience tells me that the interest in him has not waned but that he still means something to busy men and women" (p. 194). For the "busy men and women" of his day, Shumway urged that Schiller be esteemed as the paragon of the work ethic, as the "great apostle of work" (p. 198). He created a context meaningful to Americans by calling Schiller the popular poet, "the great apostle of democracy" (p. 200). Accordingly, he spoke nostalgically of German boys "thrilled by the patriotic fervor of Wilhelm Tell" (p. 195). Shumway encouraged German-Americans to heed the words of Rudenz: "Ans Vaterland, ans theure, schliess Dich an, / Das halte fest mit Deinem ganzen Herzen, /
Hier sind die starken Wurzeln Deiner Kraft," and he extolled "the political freedom of a true democracy as depicted in Wilhelm Tell" (p. 200; italics added). Ultimately, Shumway's appraisal of Schiller contrasts with the nationalistic call in Germany of 1859 and supports the status quo: "in Germany the fondest dreams of the patriots of the War of Liberation and of the time of revolution have been realized" (p. 193).

3) Kuno Francke delivered his address, "Schiller als Held," on 9 May 1905 to the Academy of Music in Philadelphia. He held Schiller forth "als Held der modernen Weltanschauung, als Held der Moral des Weltbürgerturns, als Held der idealen Kunst freier Menschlichkeit" (p. 207). Francke stressed the normative function of Schiller's Weltanschauung. He transposed what he viewed as Schiller's doctrine to the contemporary situation. "Das Schoene allein," "die vollkommene Verbindung von Geist und Stoff, von Sinnlichkeit und Vernunft" (p. 213), was his central topic. Man's striving to overcome the "zwei Seelen in seiner Brust" leads, according to Francke, to the creation of "das Schoene" and to the revelation of "das Goettliche im Menschen" (p. 213). Whereas Jessen leavened his interpretation of Schiller with a call "zum hoeheren nationalen Geistesleben," Francke promulgated Schiller's message as a classical doctrine on moral integrity. His discourse is less explication than pontification. This posture allowed him to stress "die sittliche Mission des deutschen Volkes" (p. 214). But Francke did not ignore nationalistic contours. He juxtaposed the political capitulations of Schiller's time against his own contemporary situation, "wo deutsches Reich und deutsche Nation nicht mehr zweierlei Dinge sind, wo die kriegerische Grosstaten von 1870 die politische Stellung Deutschlands
machtvoller gestaltet haben als je zuvor, wo die deutsche Flagge stolz auf allen Meeren weht" (p. 216). He asked how Schiller could still function as a national hero, given the fact that Germany was now politically united as was German Classicism spiritually and intellectually. He responded affirmatively in a chain of rhetorical questions geared to rechannel the politically explosive potential of Schiller into an affair of the individual and his own "inneres Leben": "Ist es gewagt, wenn wir in diesem Vertrauen auf den inneren Wert, auf den geistigen Adel, einen spezifisch deutschen Zug Schillers Wesen erblicken? Und ist es unangemessen, die Hoffnung auszusprechen, dass das deutsche Volk der Gegenwart ueber all seinen politischen Errungenschaften und industriellen Triumphen das Vermaechtnis nicht vergessen moege, welches sein deutschester Dichter nur wenige Jahre vor seinem Tode in diesen aus dem Elend politischer Erniedrigung hervorgegangenen Zeilen (reference to Schiller's poem, "Die Künstler") ihm hat ans Herz legen wollen?" (p. 216). Once again Schiller's character, this vaguely all-inclusive German Wesen, aroused sentiments of nationalism, no longer now of indignation in the face of political impotence, but of inspiration and pride as the result of political success and ambition. Francke's essay evidences, as do the others, the stylization of the personnage "Schiller"--he was drawn into the circle of dramatic figures which he created in his works and subsequently made over into a "hero."

4) M.D. Learned treated Schiller ("The Evolution of Schiller's Idea of Freedom") as a freedom-fighter par excellence:

The great theme of Schiller's writings, lyric, dramatic, and philosophic, is freedom, political freedom, social freedom, moral freedom,
religious freedom, aesthetic freedom, freedom in theory and freedom in practice, in a word, the philosophy of freedom. He more than any other poet compasses the whole range of freedom in the life of the people. He began with the crude forms of license and revolt, as he had deduced them from the writings of Rousseau, and incorporated them in his early dramas and more through his classical and philosophical studies to the sublime conception of the reconciliation of freedom and law in the individual and the state, as illustrated in his aesthetical essay and Wilhelm Tell.35

Learned was quick to make Schiller into a philosopher by passing over the "desperate terrorist" Karl Moor, who "represents the struggle of the poet himself with the conflicting impulses of his nature, and shows the first hopeful signs of the philosophy of reconciliation, which Schiller developed in his later works" (pp. 222, 223; italics added). As we saw in Thomas' interpretation of Die Räuber, the cause and effect of biography and work tended to make the larger "conflicting impulses" negligible.

Learned accentuated the "philosophy of reconciliation" to the point, in fact, where he was forced to revise Schiller himself to support his argument:

The close of this play (Räuber) brings Schiller back to the doctrine of Hippocrates quoted only, in part, on the title-page, as the motto of Die Räuber: Quae Medicamenta non sanant, ferrum sanat, quae ferum non sanat, ignis sanat (What medicine does not cure, iron cures; what iron does not cure, fire cures). Here Schiller might have finished with logical propriety and consistency: "Quae vero ignis non sanat, ea insanabilia existimare oportet," for Schiller recognizes at this stage of his philosophy of freedom that "what cannot be cured must be endured." But Schiller did not give up the hope of solving the problem of freedom, he found the solution in his later works (p. 223).

In this instance Learned judged the younger Schiller by standards of the
older, the philosophically more mature, the "classical" Schiller, and found the former wanting in his underdeveloped philosophy of freedom. He did not consider that the absence of the final portion of Hippocrates' axiom from Schiller's drama might have been intentional, all the "logical propriety and consistency" notwithstanding. Instead, his interpretation called for development toward a "saner philosophy" (Learned's words). Schiller, too, is said to have "found the solution in his later works." His later response, stemming from the more "mature" man and interpreted by Learned as a "philosophy of reconciliation," was elevated to the status of "der Weisheit letzter Schluß," as if Schiller's struggle with the problems of freedom in all its variants was carried out only on a metaphysical level, in vacuo.

To distill these eternal truths, Learned had to minimize the features which made Schiller's epoch historically distinct. In speaking of Tell, Schiller's "last imperishable appeal for freedom and unison," he claimed that "Here we have not a return to the Rousseauian 'Urzustand' of human society, but two fundamental doctrines in social and political ethics plainly set forth: death to tyrants, union of burghers" (pp. 232-33). That which is seen as remarkable in the play and thus, one might assume, as distinct, individual, and unique, is expressed in vague generalizations. Such simplification rendered Schiller tractable, for dissociated from his historical context he could become a fount of eternal wisdoms, and it lay at the disposal of the critic to pick and to choose, as the occasion dictated. Learned recalled "the eternal truths of this gospel of personal power; 'Ein jeder zahlt nur sicher auf sich selbst.'
"Es kann der Froemmste nicht in Frieden bleiben.'

of civic union:
'Verbunden werden auch die Schwachen maechtig.'
'Seid einig--einiz--einzig.'
'Wir wollen sein ein einzig Volk von Bruedern.'

of patriotism:
'O maechtig ist der Trieb des Vaterlands.'
'Ans Vaterland, ans theure, schliess dich an.' (p. 233)."

Why did Learned cite precisely these "eternal truths" from Tell and not others? Why did he not speak of compassion for fellow man ("Greif an mit Gott! Dem Naechsten muB man helfen," or "Der brave Mann denkt an sich selbst zuletzt"), instead of "personal power"; of the revolutionary force of civic union ("Was Hände bauten, kÖnnen Hände stürzen") rather than only its patriotic force; of an appeal for change and justice ("Es bringt die Zeit ein anders Gesetz," "Unbilliges ertrügt kein edles Herz") instead of a call for patriotism. And finally, why preach the gospel of patriotism at all? The familiar answer: so that Schiller could be made "the great forerunner and prophet of the rejuvenated enlightened German Empire, the champion of civil freedom and constitutional government" (p. 233). Learned's ideological Umfunktionierung of Schiller places him "aufs altdeutsche Vertiko."

5) Learned had spoken in Baltimore earlier that same week, 7 May 1905, on "Schiller's Aesthetic Idealism and American Literature and Art."36 Here he was concerned with Schiller the aesthetician rather than Schiller the patriot. He disparaged the "superficial cultural basis" of American education, claiming "the cardinal fault in our civilization lies in our indifference to questions of form in literature, art, and philosophy--in a word, in our lack, not so much of idealism, as of idealization" (pp. 182-83). He chided the Puritan tradition, which "subordinated all forms
of art to the severe religious and moral ideal" (p. 183), and he rapidly disposed of "the epidemic of formless realism, which swept over Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, and which has veiled itself under the more aesthetic name of 'Naturalism'" (p. 184). Schiller and Goethe accounted for "the greatest period in German literature . . . the poets who follow are but poetasters in comparison" (p. 190). Learned then applied insights of this epoch and its masters to his own day, for disturbed by the changes which an altered social reality had wrought on the demands of art and literature, he sought in history a sanctifying refuge:

Schiller's early purpose was to become a preacher, and the preacher ideal was joined to that of the poet in his later years. His poetry is a gospel of order, harmony, beauty in the highest sense of the word, and it sounds a note of warning into the ears of the "Juengstdeutschen," both in the old Fatherland and in our strongly Germanized America, calling us back from the morbid discontent and misery of our life to love, duty and beauty (p. 191).

Learned in fact interpreted the classical aesthetic as the surmounting of socially undesirable currents, that is to say of social change per se. By accepting uncritically the tenets of classical aesthetics and applying them as normative standards, even though denouncing all the while "the morbid discontent and misery" of the times, he could be said to have acquiesced to the forces which maintained and enforced the status quo, the discontent, and the misery. And a final point: "Our strongly Germanized America" is an unmitigated valuation, and illustrates to what extent Germanists in America, and American Germanistik, felt drawn to "the old Fatherland," with all that this attraction implies.

In discussing the reception of Schiller in 1905, our focal point has not been the individual Schiller himself, but the response of American
critics to him and his works. More important than what actually makes (or made) Schiller "venerable" was the manner of veneration displayed. The responses examined did not stem from an organized Schiller-Society, whose express purpose would be to foster the memory and reputation of Schiller, but they did share the common denominator of Germanistik. In this sense they represent a collective; the absence of polyvalent receptions suggests a homogeneous constitution within the profession.

In 1968, Axel Gehring wrote a sociological study on Genie und Verehrergemeinde. He remarked that such societies exhibit "emotionale Vergemeinschaftung." What draws individuals together is "eine subjektiv gefühlte Zusammengehörigkeit." At the same time, one cannot ignore the underlying interests, or Erkenntnisinteressen, which cohere at a subtextual level. We have attempted to lay bare some of these ideological subtexts and to distill from the occasionally distended rhetoric their predominant orientation. Gehring's analysis of the Leipziger Schillerverein and the celebrations of 1859, for example, show "daß der wesentliche gruppenintegrierende Faktor und somit der Wert dieser Verehrergemeinden der Kampf für die gemeinsame Überzeugung ist, daß das Vaterland 'einig, stark und frei' werden muß" (p. 76). Our analysis has tried to illustrate the underlying Wilhelminian ideology after political unification. Gehring also maintained that "rein literarische oder ästhetische Motivationen spielen als gruppenintegrierende Faktoren überhaupt keine oder nur eine untergeordnete Rolle" (p. 79). We found too that Schiller the individual was ennobled and mythologized --he became the vessel of personified virtues, void of all baseness. His reception is paradigmatic of the assimilation of German Classicism.
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CHAPTER IV:

THE RECEPTION OF WILHELM TELL

To this day, Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* remains a popular and often performed work in the repertoire of German-language theaters. As the play became an increasingly common and important component in school curricula during the second half of the 19th century, it also secured a place within the German notion of "Bildung und Kultur" emanating from that time; "Eine grosse Zahl von Versen aus dem 'Tell' wurden 'Geflügelte Worte'." In 1973, Heinz Tischer commented that the decade-long reading of *Tell* as a canonized classic has done more harm than good: the work has long been used to demonstrate and to "drill" basic concepts of dramaturgy in a relatively superficial manner. Beyond that, the reception of *Tell* established certain interpretations of the play which derived less from the work itself than from pedagogical and, more important still, ideological objectives. With *Tell* one can trace the formation of a literary canon, the institutionalization and enshrining of a few core works to the exclusion of others, particularly evident in the reception of German Classicism within Wilhelminian Germany. As we noted in Part I, Classicism formed the hub of American Germanistik's curricula as well. The sixteen different American editions of *Wilhelm Tell* prior to 1905 are symptomatic of this larger assimilation. In this connection, another aspect of literary canonization needs to be
addressed: it may involve pedagogical considerations. For the American student, reading 18th century German literature was problematic, both in terms of linguistic comprehension and historical acculturation. Noted Germanists of the time complained of the misuse of these works by subjecting them to "grammatical formalism." In 1905, W.W. Florer assured that "The progressive teachers of the country are mostly convinced of the fact that the use of German in the classroom must displace translation. The use of German is conceded to be good by many teachers who, however, give up this work in the study of the classics, and with sufficient cause. For the transition from the average first or second yearbook to the classic is very sudden. The pupils are not equipped to cope with the language, not to mention the Weltanschauung of the classical poets." Discussion of this issue continued to indicate dissatisfaction with this aspect of the role of German classics within the American curriculum. By 1911, Starr W. Cutting admitted that "We have all been distressed at the signal failure attendant upon the use of eighteenth century classics as an introduction of American learners to German literature." This kind of pedagogical practice was perhaps at its worst in Robert Pierce's edition of Wilhelm Tell in 1900, in which the first act of the play was printed as an "ideo-phononic text" using the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, so that students might acquire facility in reading and speaking German. (As far as I can determine, only the first of the proposed four parts ever appeared, which may indicated the impracticality of such an enterprise.)
In 1902, Camillo von Klenze addressed the problem of student acculturation:

It is a fact that the study of German texts chosen even from the masterpieces of German literature only in rare cases quickens the literary insight of students. The fault lies only partially with the student himself. Often teachers have not attempted to train themselves in literary appreciation, and do little to interpret the text as a work of art. In order to remedy such difficulty it is imperative that all those whose province it is to teach literature, no matter in how simple a form should acquaint themselves with some of the best literary work of the world. But it is not enough to appreciate the literary value of the text in hand in order to convey to the student its full significance. Even simple texts, as for instance certain Lyrics (sic) of Goethe, particularly however some of the dramas of the classical German period, cannot be understood with all the thoroughness which may be expected in modern times without some appreciation of the background, of the times which produced them. Schiller's "Wilhelm Tell" becomes more intelligible and more interesting when the student becomes aware of Schiller's intellectual development, when the desire for liberty which pervaded the times, when the American Revolution and the French Revolution are brought into relations with the play.

The average teacher, over-worked as he is, finds little time for studies of this kind, carried on on a large scale. But it is possible for everyone to do something in order to prevent the text from remaining a mere collection of examples to illustrate grammatical rules.

Von Klenze's concern for the "full significance" of the literary work directs our attention to another feature of literary canonization: the fact that a canon tends to codify works as exemplary, to invoke from them aesthetic and ethical norms. Von Klenze's recommendations are uncharacteristically benign for his time. More typical was the statement by Julius Goebel, who wrote in 1887, that "the study of the German classics has to be made the means of a 'higher education,'
as Goethe expresses it, and fortunately German classicial literature contains the material necessary for this purpose. It furthermore represents in its historical development a gradual realization of the modern human ideal which finally culminates in the maturest productions of Goethe and Schiller. We learn from Goebel's statement, and from the other citations as well, that "German classics" and "German classical literature" were not entirely synonymous, but it is clear that the latter's contribution to the canon was dominant.

As a paradigm of German Classicism (we shall discuss this point further below), Tell was presented piecemeal, particularly in the textbook editions of the play. This presentation took the form of sanctioned "Sentenzen und geflügelte Worte." The practice reflects a consumption of the play's axiomatic statements, rather than an understanding of the work in the sense of totality or as a literary-historical document. Such compartmentalization was intended as a pedagogical device to vitalize the work and facilitate its consumption, but precisely in this sense it reduced the canonized text to a montage of vaguely related citations and discouraged an assimilation and critical understanding of the work or its broader implications, its "full significance" (von Klenze).

Prior to 1870 in America, one investigator has assessed that "Tell was the favorite of all the plays, not only because it celebrated the theme of political liberty but also because it retold a story long popular in America." The preface to an edition of Tell in 1854 claimed that "Of all the German literary productions there is perhaps not one, with which Americans sympathize so completely as
with Schiller's great Drama (sic) of Wilhelm Tell; the unity of action, the spirit of liberty which pervades every line, the simplicity of the scenes, the few difficulties which its language presents, when compared with other works of equal worth, all combine to make this a general favorite with those who study the German language." In general, the play appears to have accommodated the American reader; Tell was the most frequently edited of Schiller's works. Deering's edition from 1895 acknowledged that "There is, perhaps, no German play better suited to the needs of students than Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Its noble theme, its simple style, lofty poetic tone and wonderful dramatic power make it in every way an admirable text for class use." Tell, "so often the first classical German drama to be read in our schools," was given preferential treatment, as Maria Dürst explained in 1899:

Weil es für das vortrefflichste, vollendetste Schauspiel Schillers gilt; weil es sich auszeichnet durch seine kraft- und glanzvolle, geistreiche, klassisch schöne Sprache; weil der Inhalt ein solcher ist, der sich ganz besonders eignet für unsere Schüler, indem es ein unvergängliches, aus der reinen Tiefe der menschlichen Seele geschöpfetes Lied ist von der Macht edler, durch keine Gewalt zu unterdrückender Kraft eines mannschaften, sittlich ungebrochenen Volkes, das die ewigen Rechte der Freiheit mit unerschütterlichem Mute sich wieder erstreitet.

And from Palmer's edition in 1906 we can infer that Tell had been acclaimed as the paradigmatic "classical" work: "Wilhelm Tell is not only in the best sense the most popular of German dramas, but also a work of art characteristic of the classical age of German literature and a monument of the cooperation of Goethe and Schiller" (p. xxv).
Selecting *Tell* as a model of German Classicism, then, and as the sounding-board for questions of literary interpretation and cultural assimilation, rests not on a definition of the play as eminently "classical" (whatever that might mean), but on its reception as such during the years occupying our analysis.

What standards of evaluation did critics apply? How did they form judgments as literary critics; or, as teachers of the play, how did they encourage student response? When discussing literary histories we spoke of the technique of "vitalization." This method was more pronounced in textbook editions of the play and, by inference, in the teaching of *Tell*. Friedrick Steuber, for instance, aimed at "getting pupils in the right attitude to enjoy 'Tell'," and assured readers that "An earnest teacher, thoroughly familiar not only with the drama as a whole, but also with the content of every scene, as well as with the very language in which it is expressed; a teacher who is moved by the sentiments of liberty and patriotism in the drama, and can visualize the scenes with their setting in the Forest Cantons, can not help passing on to his pupil that appreciative spirit which will never cease to glow and illuminate." Steuber proposed fundamentally characteristic attitudes with respect to the treatment of *Tell*. One concerns the notion of instilling an empathetic response in the reader of *Tell*. Minckwitz's edition of 1905 advised seeking a "heightened" "interest and appreciation," and suggested "that the student in approaching a masterpiece of literature should have some acquaintance with the estimation in which it is held by the most eminent critics." It is probably neither correct nor fair to maintain that
independent reading of the work was altogether discouraged. More precise would be to suggest that individual analysis was attenuated and rechanneled so that the student was encouraged to respond to the work above all in an "emotional" manner, empathetically rather than critically. Minckwitz appears to argue for a knowledge of the reception of the work, of the "secondary literature," in order to assist in and form a corrective to the individual's potential understanding of the play. But this claim is true only in part. Nowhere did he speak of a discriminating purview of the literature on Tell, only of a familiarity with, an assimilation of, "the most eminent critics." The priorities of his ideal reception ("heightened interest and appreciation") and that of Steuber ("appreciative spirit") suggest a curtailment of discriminating and differentiated analysis. This attitude is summed up in Bayard Taylor's claim that Tell "has that exquisite beauty and vitality which defy criticism."

Steuber's proposed disposition for the reading of Tell ("that appreciative spirit which will never cease to glow and illuminate") points to another aspect: part of creating an empathetic environment for the play's reception involved evaluating the play within a context meaningful to the American student. Concepts of freedom and patriotism formed the locus of these evaluations. Tell became a suitable instrument for fostering not only a sense of German nationality, but also of American patriotism. According to Calvin Thomas, patriotism was "worthy of a lasting reverence, it is that one which attaches men to the motherland and leads them to stand together against an alien oppressor." D.B. Shumway, we recall, spoke of being "thrilled
by the patriotic fervor of Wilhelm Tell," and noted that "Schiller is popular because he is so intensely patriotic at large." And W.H. Carruth knew that "Despite all technical faults, Wilhelm Tell has remained one of the most popular pieces on the German stage, and has had an incalculable effect on the cultivation of national feeling. Its popularity has always been greatest in periods of national consciousness, as in 1813-15, 1848, and 1870." The larger implications of the play's functionality were not lost on Carruth, who predicted that Tell would replace the Aeneid in school and university curricula—"And who can compare the two with reference to their suitability to the rearing of American youth without admitting that the change will be a gain?"

These responses to Tell, stemming from the 1890s and the early 1900s, are noticeably different from Bayard Taylor's enraptured awe before the play in 1879 ("that exquisite beauty and vitality which defy criticism"), and, also in 1879, Hosmer's subjective myth-making (he narrated his thoughts while wandering through the Forest Cantons: "My mind was full of thoughts of Tell; I obstinately rejected the mythical explanation of the story; I insisted upon believing it in all its length and breadth"). To be sure, as the 19th century came to a close, a current of nationalism ran through America, instigated by a series of imperialistic ventures. We saw earlier how M. D. Learned was swayed by these. Following the Spanish-American War in 1898, the United States took control of the Spanish islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico, and of the Philippines. In the same year the Pacific islands of Hawaii were annexed, and in 1903 the United
States government supported revolution in Panama to assure control of the Panama Canal. The administration of Theodore Roosevelt from 1901 until 1909 spearheaded these territorial acquisitions. And one cannot ignore the fact that these were the years, throughout the Western world, of surging nationalism and empire ideologies:

It was the consolidated national state which provided the primary base in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries from which a nation could reach out towards the rest of the world. The psychic disposition to a *ne plus ultra* attitude was reached only when pride in former political and cultural achievements, in the excellence of the national character and the inherent genius of the nation itself, had developed to a high degree; when national self-confidence dominated all public pronouncements, and national traditions were raised to the level of cultural standards. People began to cherish the idea of having a mission to fulfill, they tried to solve world problems and lend the mantle of considered thought to the phenomena of political and economic expansion which had hitherto had an overwhelmingly pragmatic character. They sought to endow the latter with a more elevated meaning—in a word, to turn them into an ideology. 24

Within this nexus, it became common to view *Tell* in terms of an "American analogy." Richard Hochdoerfer wrote in 1905 that "To an American college student it (*Tell*) is usually a source of inspiration. Witnessing the revolt of a brave people against foreign oppression, he is reminded of the great conflict of his own country." Those who espoused the drama's intent of national unity found in *Tell* a "drama of liberty" particularly adapted to the American audience. Most critics recognized in *Tell* "not a revolution, but an insistence upon constitutional rights within the empire." 27 It was not uncommon to view this "message" of the play as the realization of a development
in Schiller's dramas which culminated in his "classical" works: "the effort of individual fanatics or revolutionaries to overthrow all law and order in attaining an imaginary freedom (i.e., Schiller's early dramas) has become in Tell the uprising of a whole brave and patient people to defend and preserve their real liberty from the attacks of foreign tyrants." The distaste for fanatical revolutionaries be­tokens a conservative view of social change. But the specific historical causes of the "development" noted above generally were not treated. Eventually, then, even notions of liberty and national union, as concretely as they may be manifested in given political and economic institutions, became, "abstractly stated the theme of Schiller's Wilhelm Tell." Attention did not focus on the unique concretizations of polity suggested by the play, whether they be the conservative charter of the Forest Cantons urging "unmittelbare Reichsangehörigkeit," or the patriarchal bureaucracy of Schiller's Weimar, or the Kleinstaaterei of larger Germany during Schiller's time. Instead, the play's individuality became secondary to its per­ceived "universality." Its "message" was instrumentalized: "Here is heard the outcry of a whole century battling for the restitution (!) of popular freedom and lawful government. And with it there mingle the voices of other ages and other countries, the voices of the old Germanic freeholders, of mediaeval burghers, of Luther, of Hampden, and of the minute-men of Lexington."

The play was criticized for failing to meet the standards of the classical unities. Occasionally its characterization was considered weak, and almost always the final act was viewed as superfluous. But
as Kuno Francke suggested, "who would not rather silence these and
similar objections, and give himself up with undivided heart to rever-
32ent delight in this immortal apotheosis of lawful freedom?"
"Lawful freedom" is representative of an attitude toward democracy that
occurred again and again in discussions of Tell and the Klassik within
American Germanistik. It reflects a conservative assimilation of the
"revolutionary" Tell, an assimilation which in fact played down the
revolutionary aspects of the work while trumpeting the patriotic sen-
timent behind it. Tell was viewed not as a revolutionary at all, but
as a patriot. It was only logical that there should follow, as we
saw in the reception of Schiller in 1905, an association of Tell
with the American Revolution. Revolution per se was not prized;
it was qualified to conform to the prevailing reverence of the status
quo. The assimilation of Tell in this context was expressed as well
by W.W. Florer, who saw the "essential theme" of the play as "no
longer the greatest possible freedom of the individual within the
state, but the capability of the people to defend itself, yea to
govern itself within certain bounds. The history of the United
States certainly must have made a definite impression upon Schiller."

This "American analogy," paramount in Tell-interpretations be-
tween 1895-1905, represents a significant shift from the earlier
view of Tell within American Germanistik. The Oehlschlager edition
of Tell in 1854 noted that "In truth there are but few productions
of genius which give so faithful a picture of what they pretend to
delineate: for whether on the mountain top, on the stormy lake, or
in the narrow defile, not a word is uttered, not a sound is heard,
that could destroy the illusion; whoever has seen a good performance of Schiller's Wilhelm Tell has been in Switzerland" (p. iv). In 1879 Boyesen experienced the play much as a mountain idyll: "it is like a breath of fresh Alpine air blowing into our faces." Boyesen also praised its embodiment of the artistic ideals of classical antiquity, noting the "Heroditian simplicity and singleness of character in the dramatis personae," and the "local idioms and Homeric phrases," exclaiming then: "It is all so vivid, so real, so marvelously convincing" (p. 418). And Hosmer spoke of being "charmed back into the age and country." What these remarks reveal is the idealistic tradition which made the play "real" for critics of much of the 19th century. Regarded largely as a mountain idyll, "genteel" critics were able to visualize in the play a utopia which corresponded to what they perceived as "reality." This "drawing-room" perspective of the play considered "local idioms and Homeric phrases" to be qualities of mimetic verisimilitude. While this attitude is still discernable around 1900, it is uncontestably overshadowed by sentiments of American patriotism, instilled by an era of widespread maneuvers toward colonization, which formed a tangible but differently motivated link to Tell.

At the same time, it should be noted that the association of Tell with the American context was only an analogous one. The immediate connection was of course to Germany. Minckwitz's edition of 1905 made the following claim: "And now that the prophecy of Attinghausen is fulfilled for Germany also, now that the pledge on the Rütli has been carried out we, in Germany, shall honor Schiller's 'Tell' as he was long ago and as he is still honored in Switzerland" (pp. 26-27). Schiller
and Tell were made the heralds of German unification, and this rendition typifies the "nationales Wunschdenken" predominant in Germany between roughly 1835 and 1883. A politicized view of literary history created this national myth to prepare the way, both culturally and politically, for Germany's unification. The closer the goal came, the more blurred became the true contours of the epoch. Minckwitz in fact quoted directly from Palleske's work on Schiller (1858-59). In this case there appears to be a kind of double-optic at work: Minckwitz's citing of Palleske's work, written prior to Germany's unification but clearly with that in mind, betrays an ideological assimilation of the second order.

The need to mythologize Schiller as a national hero began to dissipate after unification. Calvin Thomas, a more thorough scholar than Minckwitz, considered Palleske's work "outdated." He explained why:

A new epoch may be dated from about 1871,--the epoch of the historical critics and philologers. With the realization of national unity the vista of the past cleared up and new points of view were gained. It was as if a height had been won from which it was possible to see over the dust and smoke of the past three decades. The pride of the new-born nation now looked back with quickened interest to the great writers of the eighteenth century, but with the feeling that they had done enough for the glory of the fatherland in simply being great writers. It was time to see them as they were, without writing them up or down, according to their supposed attitude toward questions which were not their questions (p. 460). In essence, Thomas welcomed the depolitization of Goethe and Schiller as it took hold during the last three decades of the 19th century. He defused the political implications of Tell altogether: "the effect of
the play does not, after all, depend mainly upon its vindication of any political doctrine. We are nowhere in the region of abstraction. The sympathy that one feels for the insurgents is in no sort political, but purely human; it is of the same kind that one might feel for a community of Hindu ryots in their efforts to rid themselves of a man-eating tiger. Only in the play this sympathy is very much intensified by the picturesque lovableness of the afflicted population" (p. 413). Curiously, Thomas insisted on using the term "insurgents" even while denying all polity within the play. His response to the work was empathetic. This liaison to the work bridged the historical gulf between past and present and, in its search for "the effect of the play," subordinated historical considerations. Since politics were banned from the play, there could be no real treatment of history, no solution as such to the problems which the play does indeed pose. The work became instead a vehicle for cathartic relief. In this connection, Thomas' sources are worth noting. He deferred to Vilmar's work to dispell "the unreason that men could once be guilty of through their habit of regarding Schiller as a political poet" (p.458). Vilmar, "whose history of German literature enjoyed popularity half a century ago" (Thomas), wrote about German national literature for the middle-classes in a popularized manner. His *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur* (1843) was reissued repeatedly in the following seventy-odd years. A Protestant theologian, Vilmar portrayed German language and literature in its historical development in order to disclose the essence of the German Volksseele. He explained that his basic approach—and the similarity to Thomas' views is evident—was, "die Sachen selbst in ihrer
Wahrheit und Einfachheit zu den Gemütern Unbefangener reden zu laßen.

The direction of Thomas' argument can be seen to lead to John F. Coar's claim, in 1903, that Schiller was not conscious of phrasing in Tell a specifically German desire for national unity and national greatness. Nothing could have been farther from Schiller's mind than to make actual contemporary conditions the object of his artistic musings or the content of his poetic productions. . . . The classical ideal meant, for Schiller, a breaking with all such attempts. Tell was the poetic articulation of a philosophic theory of personal and political freedom. Had not Shakespeare's Julius Caesar galvanized this theory into poetic vitality, Schiller's drama would not have been written. Schiller was not inspired by any prophetic insight into German striving which promised enfranchisement of his people from the principle of exclusive individuality. 40

Coar made a number of interesting assumptions. First, he concluded that since Schiller was not conscious of writing a "political" play, the play was in fact not political, q.e.d. This argument suffers from intentional fallacy. In this regard it becomes critical to consider, as a scholar has recently suggested, "Schiller's view, conscious or not, of the logic, origins, and polity of freedom, manifested in fictional characters." Second, Coar equated his concept of classical idealism with Schiller's. He unequivocally segregated form and context, theory and practice, "poetic articulation" and "contemporary conditions." Politics appeared to him as one thing, philosophy as another, and poetry as something else altogether different. Of course, Coar did not want to make Schiller a prophet of German unity, and as such he did not fall victim to the ideological interpretation which saw German Classicism as the prelude to and legitimation of the Bismarck years. Still, he
went so far in the opposite direction that he disregarded his contemporary audience as well. The only contiguity admitted Schiller was that of literary tradition, a fact which accounts for making Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* the existential prerequisite for *Tell*.

One of these tangential points concerns the death of a political figure. An examination of the responses to this scene in *Tell* will allow for further elaboration on the specific nature of its reception by American Germanistik.

Preoccupied with the *genius loci* of the play, most American commentary on *Tell* prior to the 1890s failed to see Gessler’s death as problematic; the sequence of events were simply narrated. Boyesen’s remarks (1879) were atypical:

As far as the conspirators of the Rüti are concerned, it is purely an accident that Tell kills Gessler, thereby freeing his country from its oppressor. Tell was not present at the Rüti, and in his soliloquy before the slaying repeatedly emphasizes the idea that it is the necessity of protecting himself, his wife, and his children which forces him to take the law into his own hands. The fact that Tell has knowledge of the conspiracy, and is in sympathy with it, is hardly an adequate solution of the problem; it indicates an identity of interests, but not a logical sequence of coherent events.42

Underlying Boyesen’s interpretation is the notion of *Selbsthilfe*, which dissociates Tell, as Boyesen observed, from the Rüti "conspiracy."

The nuances of his observation place him at a turning point in *Tell*-commentary. On the one hand, the differentiation of Tell and the Rüti group harkens back to a criticism of the "illogical sequence" of these "coherent events." The liberalism of the *Vormärz*, exemplified by Ludwig Börne, reacted strongly against this segregation of "political"
action from personal revenge. For Börne, Tell's aloofness and "Philosophie der Schwäche" (Börne's interpretation of Tell's statement: "Der Starke ist am mächtigsten allein") make him not a hero, but a philistine. In the fourth edition of his Geschichte der deutschen Literatur seit Lessing (1858), where he remained critical of German Classicism's Weltfremdheit, Julian Schmidt responded similarly: "was nutzt der nur aus individuellen Verhältnissen hervorgegangenen That des Tell, das sie nebenbei auch im allgemeinen Interesse geschieht? Sittlich wird dadurch nichts geändert, und außerdem kann im Drama dies Interesse nicht deutlich gemacht werden." For the still liberally-minded Schmidt, Tell's killing of Gessler remained "immer ein Mord" (p. 506), unworthy of praise or admiration. In 1876, Hettner's interpretation offered a compromise: he agreed with Börne et al that the mode of assassination was unbecoming, but the scene with Parricida was viewed as exculpatory.

After 1880, however, a new strategy of justification evolved. In Scherer's influential history, for example, Tell is portrayed as eminently guiltless, as an exemplum of the man of few words and much action. The literary histories and textbook editions of the play from American Germanistik between 1890 and 1905 shared this response. For Wells (1895), Tell was "a type of natural independence." Francke (1896) still wished "that some nobler way had been found for Tell to strike his blow against Gessler than from out of an ambush," but, in contrast to both Börne and the early Julian Schmidt, he categorically dismissed the possibility of Tell rebelling against "the tyrant on the village green of Altorf immediately following Gessler's savage attack.
against Tell's paternal feeling" (p. 395). Francke's esteem for the "lawful freedom" of the play militated against viewing Tell as a rebel. After the time when Schiller's Tell was regarded as the drama of national unity par excellence and as healthful pabulum for the people, when Tell's deed was celebrated as the primum mobile of freedom, this new strategy of justification shifted the focus from political concerns. In 1901, Thomas diagnosed "a reversion to primitive conditions in which 'man stands over against man' . . . Tell does what he must do. . . . His conduct is not noble or heroic, but natural and right." Thomas' appeal to a context of "pre-civilization" where people deal according to what is "natural and right" insisted on unambiguous clarity at the most fundamental level. The suggestion that Tell perpetrated murder was thus anathema. Deering wrote in the introduction to his edition of the play that "Tell is no coward, no assassin; he merely planned his attack in a manner certain to succeed." Here Deering made Tell appear as a level-headed pragmatist, but in his notes to the text he reinforced the idea that "Tell's shot must be justified as righteous self-defense, lest it appear as murder" (p. 228). This addendum clearly gives the deed a different, and greater, significance. Tell's act is seen as the expression of righteousness, the symbol of a larger transcendent approval, and as such beyond reproach: "the provocation of Tell's deed is his own defense, he needs no further justification." The problem of the individual committing a socially offensible act--not only Gessler's inhumane treatment of Tell and his son, but Tell's questionable modus operandi of revenge as well--was no longer considered. While the interpretations extol Tell's act, they belie a
predilection of the liberal humanist. Whereas Börne (and even Boyesen) regarded the disjunctive motivations of Tell and the Rütli entourage as an inappropriate response to oppression, the interpretations of American Germanistik between 1890-1905 preferred to magnify and exalt the isolation of Tell. The discontinuity of plots was viewed instead only as a formal problem, as a failure to conform to the classical unities. For the pragmatic American mind, the play was a portrayal of "the suffering and the termination of it through sturdy self-help."

The reestablishment of the status quo, of the original idyllic quietude, was cherished. The myth held intact, perhaps because of its long-standing dominance within the tradition of Germanistik as a prime component of the canon. Its status as such did not accommodate controversy.

Tell was seen to require "no further justification" for his assassination of Gessler because the "lawful freedom" resulting from his actions was associated with the American context of justifiable "revolution" and exemplary democracy. Interpretations of Tell, more pronounced as the 19th century drew to a close, aligned with the prevailing conservative esteem for the status quo. They read, in fact, as much like a justification of the Monroe Doctrine and inalienable right to self-determination as a defense of the Swiss Cantons' desire for "unmittelbare Reichsangehörigkeit."
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CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

In his study of Germanisten in Schule und Hochschule. Geltungsanspruch und soziale Wirklichkeit (1975), Martin Doehlemann concluded that "Der Geltungsanspruch der Germanisten und die von ihnen erfahrene Geltungswirklichkeit klaffen weit auseinander" (p. 204). This assessment can be applied to Germanistik and Germanists in America between 1870 and 1905 as well, although the American context exerted its special influence, as it continues to do. American Germanistik understood its role as cultural mediator in terms of missionary work; the examples discussed above testify to this pervasive and sincere commitment time and time again. The tendency of literary criticism toward judicial and prescriptive commentary accommodated this sense of missionary calling; with the unswerving esteem for German scholarship emerging and prevailing within American Germanistik after 1880, the assimilation of its latent ideology began. The canonization of German Classicism acted as a propelling force behind the "cultural message" to be promulgated. Throughout the last three decades of the 19th century, when Germanistik in America as well as in Germany grew and consolidated, German Classicism was viewed less in terms of the larger parameters of European Romanticism and more in terms of German literary and cultural achievement, as a national pinnacle. The classical heritage was not
interpreted chiefly to mean the artistic realization of harmony, of proportion, balance, style. With patriotic clamor and ideologically conservative élan, Classicism was instead, and above all between 1890 and 1905, fundamentally construed as the realization of an ideal humanity, of a specifically Germanic harmonia. This essentially anthropological reception aimed at a synthesis of both the realms of ethics and aesthetics. Thus dehistoricized, the perceived attributes of German Classicism operated as value-giving norms demanding universal validity—Goethe and Schiller took on super-human dimensions, and the heritage was mythologized. More than the prefiguration of Germany's political unification, German Classicism was regarded as the anticipation of the millenium. The tendency of American Germanists to be more visceral than cerebral, to engender emotive rather than analytical response, reinforced rather than dispelled the mythical contours.

In the case of Schiller's reception in 1905, for example, his deified stature implied that critics could ignore historical facts and critical explication of the texts. The appellation of Schiller as a "divinity" or genius served further as a taboo mechanism: critics exercised their function as the "poet once removed," a facade which allowed them to sidestep critical rebuttal as they "preached" Schiller. In the light of his "apotheosis," "eternal truths" were crystallized from his writings. Finally, amidst these overtly depoliticized perspectives a conscious appeal to patriotism survived, as the reception of Tell corroborates.

Tell was instrumentalized to substantiate the sense of missionary calling; in this sense its assimilation reflected its ideological
canonization in Germany. But in addition, American Germanistik's reception of Tell also refracted the nuances of its German institutionalization: its reception was carried out less in terms of formal, aesthetic considerations than in terms of a peculiarly American perspective on the polity of the play. I have attempted to show how interpretations of Tell prior to 1870 were predominantly concerned with the genius loci of the play, with its idyllic versimilitude. Later interpretations of Tell, however, inclined to emphasize the notion of (conservative) democracy and consequently subdued the issue of revolutionary change. The distinguishing characteristic of the play's reception after 1890 was the loose analogy of Tell to the American context. This association, as I noted above, tended to de-emphasize the historical context of the work and, by extension, the profile of German Classicism as a whole. In a sense, it could be said to have generated and perpetuated a different sort of illusory idyll, one aligned with the conservative ideology of the time and its respect for the status quo.

The implications of this reception are that American Germanistik functioned analogously but not synonymously to German Germanistik. With the transplanting and cultivation of German Classicism that came with the growth of Germanistik in America, the Klassik-Legende survived and grew on American soil.

The Introduction to this dissertation quoted a recent study which claimed that, in America, "By 1870, the idea of the superiority of German literature, scholarship, art, thought and philosophy had, indeed, become a myth. This myth survived largely from the cliché of 'Dichter und Denker,' which although maintained still in some groups,
had lost its 'popular' appeal." Within American Germanistik of 1870-1905 this "cliché" was given critical imprimatur. Placed against a background of increasingly hostile sentiment toward Germany on the part of the American public between 1870-1914, a sentiment resulting from conflicts of interest in the race for colonization of territories such as Samoa, Manila, and Venezuela, such an ideological strategy exhibits, as Habermas has explained, "eine schützende Funktion," which ignores precisely these realities.

Our study of Germanistik in America between 1870-1905 has tried to point to its involvement in the prevailing temperament of those years, which fostered the cultivation of nationalism and the formation of cultural-political ideologies on a broad scale. The subtexts of the interpretations of Tell (as well as of the celebration of the Germanic Museum and the other occasions examined) reveal an Erkenntnisinteresse which could belong only to American Germanistik of the late 19th and early 20th centuries: first, because its Umfunktionierung of the German classical heritage tended to seek out the "American analogy" as we have described it; and second, because of the broader correlation between American Germanistik's and German Germanistik's fabrication of a Klassik-Legende. This relationship forms a link to contemporary debate over American Germanistik's relative dependence on its German model-counterpart, a question which obviously has not been put to rest here.

Finally, I would like to recall the temptation, also noted in the Introduction, to chide the obstreporous rhetoric of early American Germanistik, to flog dead horses. We must acknowledge that this
lineage constitutes a portion of our pedigree today, and to meet the future of the profession we should recall Ernst Bloch's suggestion that "Werke des Uberbaus auch nach Wegfall ihrer gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen im KulturbewuBlsein sich fortschreitend reproduzieren." I hope that the viability of Bloch's proposition for American Germanistik after 1905 will be put to the test. In this instance, I have sought to avoid a polemical debate with the past, to draw skeletons from the closet for the sake of mere exhibitionism or antiquarianism. Instead, I have tried to problematize a new field of inquiry. If the study is to be understood as polemical at all, then only as an attempt to generate interest and concern for a historical awareness of the heritage within which we operate.
NOTES: CHAPTER V

1. Heinsohn, The Reception of German Literature, p. 168; see also p. 3 above.
2. See Clara Eve Schieber, American Sentiment Toward Germany (Boston/New York: Cornhill, 1923).
4. Bloch, Das Prinzip Hoffnung, p. 176; also see above, p. 7.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED


Ferren, H.M. "Die nationale Aufgabe des Deutschamerikanischen Lehrerbundes." Monatshefte, 2 (1900/01), pp. 7-10.


Florer, W.W. "The Importance of Contemporary German Literature for the American Student." Monatshefte, 6 (1905), pp. 212-19.


Glimpses of Modern German Culture. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1898.


"Schiller als Held." German American Annals, NS 3 (1905), pp. 207-17.


"German Classics as a Means of Education." PMLA, 1 (1884/85), pp. 156-69.

"Goethe und Schiller." Monatshefte, 2 (1900/01), pp. 352-59.


Hedge, Frederic H. Hours With German Classics. 1886; rpt. Boston: Little, Brown, 1902.


Hosmer, James K. A Short History of German Literature. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Jones, 1879.


Parry, E.C. "Friedrich Schiller in America." German American Annals, NS 3 (1905), pp. 81-96; 113-26; 148-60; 163-76; 300-21; 327-41; 359-68; 410-20; 547-58.


Roedder, Edwin C. "Das Schillerjahr in Deutschland." *Monatshefte,* 7 (1906), pp. 133-40; 165-78.


Steuber, Frederick J. "When and How to Teach Schiller's Wilhelm Tell in the High Schools." Monatshefte, 10 (1909), pp. 100-04; 168-72.


Wells, Benjamin W. Modern German Literature. Boston: Roberts, 1895.


