

Vice, Virtue, Hercules—by the end of the Victorian period it would all seem somewhat meaningless to a later student generation. The triad lingers on in a Whig emblem of 1876 (Fig. 2), but it is rather perfunctory. Hercules is a puzzled youth in an ill-fitting bikini, Virtue gestures toward the owl of wisdom, Vice toward the peacock of Vanity. A man of letters dangles like a pendant unrelated to the total composition. The prospective man of letters seems to have been metamorphosed into an aspiring football player.

In the late 19th century the gods fell ill; weakened, they were wounded in World War I and died again. In 1921 the Princeton Whigs retired the *Choice of Hercules* as their main device.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Beam, *American Whig Society*, 114. As a last word, I might note that the Cliosophic Society also had engraved devices dating from the same period. They are now in the PUA.

10

University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany 1760-1806

by R. Steven Turner

Traditional histories have always regarded the 18th century as an era of institutional and intellectual decline for the German university system. They point out that the century of Aufklärung brought little to the German universities beyond falling enrollments, contracting budgets, and incessant attacks, often well-merited, from critics of every stamp. And while they detect at individual institutions during the later period from 1760 to 1800 marked signs of reform and revitalization, the first true wave of recovery and prosperity nevertheless arrived only during the early 19th century. Occasionally traditional histories have gone further to trace this lingering 18th century malaise into the field of professorial scholarship as well. There they detect primarily pedantry, encyclopedic repetition, and little which could be called original or innovative. Obviously the developments in philology, history, and the sciences pioneered by scholars at the University of Göttingen and many individuals at other institutions constitute important exceptions to this generalization. But traditional histories correctly note that these innovations had found little echo in the university system at large before 1790. For most institutions, although by no means for all, the later 18th century remained a period of relative stagnation for many traditional academic disciplines.

Especially where scholarship is concerned the universities of the later 18th century suffer in any comparison with those of the early 19th. Historians have always regarded the years from 1806 to 1835 as decisive in the renewal of the German university system and in the transformation of the universities' relation to scholarship. Between 1806 and 1818 the Humboldtian educational reforms in Prussia rationalized university administration, modernized and consolidated existing institutions, and founded new universities at Berlin and Bonn. The same period produced a renaissance in German scholarship associated with the names of the brothers Grimm, Karl Lachmann, Franz Bopp, F. C. Savigny, and Barthold Niebuhr.¹ By 1835 most universities in

¹ On the development of classical philology in Germany see John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge 1908), vol. 3, and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Geschichte der Philologie*, vol. 1 of *Einleitung in die*

northern Germany had already begun to assume, both in rhetoric and in practice, new functions as centers of scholarly and scientific research in addition to their traditional role as professional schools. In defense of this commitment they could point to the "Humboldtian ideology" laid down by Humboldt, Fichte, and Schleiermacher, with its stress on creativity, discovery, research, and a growing, organic concept of learning.² When mature, this "research ethos" would lead to the great university institutes of the late 19th century and to the new model for the organization of science and learning which they embodied. In 1790, however, the university system still afforded few hints of these innovations to come.

By comparison with the glories of the Humboldtian era, the later 18th century appears often as a pale prelude of decay and pedantry.³ In part this comparison accounts for the darker hues in which historians have often portrayed the intellectual history of the universities in the decades before the reform period. Furthermore, this unfavorable comparison has been carried over into examinations not only of the actual achievements of university scholarship during the 18th century, but also of the attitudes of academics toward scholarship and research. In contrast to the research ethos of the *Vormärz* era, the traditional interpretation insists that before 1800 the universities regarded themselves chiefly as pedagogical institutions whose function was to transmit and to propagate, but not necessarily to expand, existing learning. Only later during the reform era, the interpretation goes on, did the

Altertumswissenschaft (Leipzig 1921), 45-61. On modern German historiography see Eduard Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich 1936), esp. 415-42, 461-96, and George Peabody Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 2d ed. (New York 1935), 18-102. The rise of German philology is treated in Rudolf von Raumer, *Geschichte der germanischen Philologie* (Munich 1870), 292-378.

² The major treatises upon this theme by Schelling, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Steffens, and Humboldt are collected in *Die Idee der deutschen Universität*, ed. Ernst Anrich (Darmstadt 1964). For F. A. Wolf's ideas see *Ueber Erziehung, Schule, Universität*, ed. Wilhelm Körte (Leipzig 1835). The German secondary literature upon this new university ideology is immense. See particularly Helmut Schelsky, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen* (Reinbek 1963). An excellent English discussion of the basic categories of the new ideology is found in Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge 1966), 85-96. Also see Friedrich Paulsen, *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universitätsstudium*, 2d ed. (Hildesheim 1966), 204-05ff.

³ Alexander Busch, *Die Geschichte des Privatdozenten* (Stuttgart 1959), 13-14, esp. nn. 29, 30, and 31; also see Paulsen, *The German Universities and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly (New York 1906), 40.

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

professor adopt the further duty of expanding scholarship and come to regard research and teaching as linked inseparably to each other.

In contrast to the careful study which has been devoted to the thought of the Humboldtian reformers and to the emergence of the new scholarship, little notice has been taken of the corresponding efforts of 18th century theorists to define the relation of the professoriate to the advance of scholarship. The following essay attempts to evaluate these theoretical efforts, and so to provide a basis for tentatively re-evaluating the traditional interpretation of the professoriate's outlook on scholarship. Restricting its scope largely to the University of Göttingen and the universities in Prussia, it asks how German academics of the later 18th century actually did assess the universities' obligation to the advance of scholarship. It points out first how familiar institutional conditions and patterns of recruitment bore upon the professor's attitude toward learning. Second, it samples the opinions of university critics, theorists, and reformers on the subject of professorial publication and scholarship.⁴ In some respects the results of this examination confirm the traditional view; yet on a deeper level they also point to fundamental inadequacies in its assumptions. What divided the late 18th and early 19th centuries on the issue of professorial scholarship, this essay will argue, was more than merely different assessments of its desirability within the university context. The difference rather involved widely divergent assumptions about the nature of scholarship, its organization, its method of advancement, and its relation to teaching. Clarifying these two differing visions of scholarship not only explicates important issues affecting German academic life in the later 18th century, but also helps to set in historical context the Humboldtian reforms of the early 19th.

1. THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

In the 18th century as in the 19th, few professors escaped the trammels of institutional affiliation to lead the pure life of the mind. The pressures of the institutional setting affected both the scholarship carried out by individual professors and also the effectiveness of individual universities as centers of teaching and academic learning. These pressures seemed especially severe to academics of the later 18th century, for all contemporaries considered this a time of severe crisis for the German university system. Enrollment statistics in particular suggest

⁴ The sources for such a sampling are readily at hand. The 18th crisis of the universities provoked numerous treatises attacking or defending the universities. On this literature see René König's brief but invaluable treatment in *Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität* (Berlin 1935), 34-39.

the dimensions of that crisis. As late as 1720 some 4400 students had matriculated into the various German universities. But from mid-century on the level of matriculation dropped precipitously to 3400 in 1790 and plummeted to 2900 in 1800. Only Göttingen partly escaped the falling enrollments; even Halle, Leipzig, and Jena experienced severe decline, while smaller schools like Erfurt and Rostock suffered crippling losses.⁵ Professors, especially those in the arts or philosophical faculties, depended heavily upon student fees to supplement their small government salaries. As this source of income diminished, many teachers found themselves in severe financial straits. For the system as a whole it meant constantly fewer funds with which to attract competent teachers and to modernize a curriculum already widely recognized to be in need of expansion.⁶

The effects of falling enrollment would have been less severe had it not been for Germany's chronic overabundance of universities. In accordance with what Friedrich Paulsen called the "territorial-confessional" principle of university administration, each tiny German state strove to support its own provincial university. Even in periods of high enrollment, therefore, the number of students was divided among an excessive number of schools.⁷ Reformers complained that this condition harmed the intellectual as well as the financial life of the institutions. J. D. Michaelis in his 1768 study of the Protestant universities noted that "the number of students is so divided that the number can be only moderate at any university, and then the best and most school-

⁵ Franz Eulenburg, *Die Frequenz der deutschen Universitäten . . .* (Leipzig 1904), 132. The following statistics are reproduced from Eulenburg (132, Fig. 6):

Approximate Total Matriculations in German Universities					
Five-Year Intervals 1700-1805					
1700	4180	1740	4400	1780	3500
1705	4300	1745	4000	1785	3700
1710	4200	1750	4370	1790	3400
1715	4300	1755	4000	1795	3180
1720	4400	1760	3670	1800	2920
1725	4070	1765	3700	1805	2980
1730	4200	1770	3400		
1735	4300	1775	3600		

Source: Eulenburg, p. 132, Fig. 6.

Note: For the enrollments of individual universities, see Eulenburg, 164-65.

⁶ See Busch, *Privatdozenten*, 14.

⁷ The smallest of the institutions, mostly tiny Catholic universities in the south, were hardly universities at all. Although Strassburg and Ingolstadt remained among the best of the second-rank universities, other Catholic institutions like Paderborn, Graz, and Bamberg lost their university status during the century; see Eulenburg, *Frequenz*, 207.

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

arly professor must be satisfied if he can fill . . . his few 'bread courses.'" All professors, Michaelis went on, must neglect the teaching of basic scholarship (*grundliche Gelehrsamkeit*) because there are too few students to make advanced or scholarly courses possible.⁸ This condition, especially aggravated in smaller institutions, hampered the universities in fulfilling their role as centers of high academic culture.

A few reformers recognized a more insidious threat to the universities in the decay of the philosophical faculties. Heirs to the medieval faculties of arts, the philosophical faculties had originally dispensed a general, propaedeutic education to students who would later enter the upper, professional faculties. Late in the 17th century, however, secondary schools had begun to usurp this traditional propaedeutic function. Students began to matriculate directly into the professional faculties, bypassing or neglecting the lower. After 1700 the philosophical faculties declined in importance and deteriorated to direct preparatory schools dispensing auxiliary learning for professional study.⁹ Accordingly both the prestige and the income from chairs in the lower faculty reached their nadir in the 18th century. At Prussia's Frankfurt-an-Oder in 1721 salaries in the philosophical faculty ranged from 100 to 175 thaler yearly, while those in the theological, juridical, and medical faculties amounted respectively to 557-338, 500-200, and 300-100 thaler yearly.¹⁰ Furthermore, although professors in the higher faculties could and invariably did supplement their income by practicing the profession they taught, professors in the philosophical faculty usually had no auxiliary calling open to them except secondary teaching, which was notoriously unprofitable. Frequently chairs in the lower faculty were not considered independent positions at all, but temporary "first posts" in which perseverance would be rewarded by a promotion to a higher faculty. Often a professor from a higher faculty would hold a chair in the lower simultaneously and, of course, draw the salary from both.¹¹ These practices furthered the decay of the lower faculties throughout the late 18th century.

⁸ J. D. Michaelis, *Raisonnement über die protestantischen Universitäten in Deutschland*, 4 vols. (Frankfurt 1768), 1, 209; also see 247ff. This and all subsequent translations from the German are my own unless otherwise indicated.

⁹ Eulenburg, *Frequenz*, 138-39.

¹⁰ Conrad Bornhak, *Geschichte der preussischen Universitätsverwaltung bis 1810* (Berlin 1900), 113.

¹¹ Joseph Engel, "Die deutschen Universitäten und die Geschichtswissenschaft," *Hundert Jahre Historische Zeitschrift, 1859-1959* (Münich 1959), 248-49; A. Thölck, *Das akademische Leben des siebenzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Halle 1833), 57-58; Franz Schnabel, *Siegmund von Retzenstein, der Begründer des bairischen Staates* (Heidelberg 1927), 86; Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 23. For a contemporary account see Johann Christoph Hoffbauer, *Geschichte der Universität zu Halle bis zum Jahre 1805* (Halle 1805), 159-60.

This decay proved injurious to the universities for two reasons. First, it strengthened the image of the universities, not as centers of culture and liberal education, but as utilitarian professional schools. This in turn opened the universities to the attacks of critics who claimed that such professional education could better be dispensed within another institutional context. Still more serious, the contraction of the philosophical faculty lessened the number of teachers and scholars in the universities who had a direct, professional interest in the new developments in mathematics, science, and history. Just as these disciplines were entering periods of vigorous expansion late in the 18th century, the universities' ability to absorb these innovations into their traditional structure was becoming more and more feeble. Critics were quick to charge the universities with intellectual obsolescence, an obsolescence which had its institutional basis largely in the decline of the lower faculty.

As the universities never tired of pointing out, many of their troubles were ultimately financial. As income from student fees dwindled, territorial princes hesitated to sink money into their feeble universities. In Prussia state outlay for universities remained constant under Frederick William I and Frederick the Great; only at the succession of Frederick William II in 1787 did the state allot an extra 10,000 thaler yearly for its universities. Even this significant increase brought the annual government outlay to only 43,000 thaler, while it had been 26,000 almost a century before in 1697.¹² Although these figures refer to only one state, Prussia seems to have been typical in its approach to financing its universities. Government expenditures remained static throughout the late 18th century, even as the universities experienced new pressures to expand their curricula and to found medical clinics, libraries, and physical cabinets.

Falling enrollments, the decay of the lower faculty, government neglect—these difficulties expressed institutionally a malaise much deeper and more chronic. All during the 18th century the immense prestige of the universities, the very ideal of university education, had been slipping perceptibly away. One unmistakable sign of this loss lay in the growing number of attacks upon the universities. Critics of the universities were not new to the German scene, nor were they necessarily an unhealthy sign; throughout the century critics' ranks included many academics and administrators who combined criticism with their goal of moderate reform. After 1750, however, a more portentous and more radical critical tradition had come rapidly forward. Throughout

the 18th century Germany had experienced the growth of an urban intelligentsia which possessed few ties to the old academic system. This emerging group included journalists and literati, progressive bureaucrats, academicians, pedagogical theorists, and certain professional groups. Unhindered by loyalties to the older academic culture and fired by the Enlightenment's impatience with what it viewed as anachronistic institutions, representatives of this critical tradition began after 1760 to attack the universities with a vehemence unprecedented in previous decades. They no longer attacked curriculum and methods alone, but also the most basic institutions of the universities: corporate government, the lecture, and the division into faculties. Occasionally critics even impugned the integrity of the professoriate as a professional group and with increasing frequency called for the outright abolition of the universities.¹³

One line of attack adopted by critics alleged a general intellectual obsolescence on the part of the universities and cited in particular their neglect of such subjects as history, science, and modern languages. In the name of Aufklärung critics denounced the universities for their outmoded, medieval constitutions and their pedantic curriculum still mired in Wolffian philosophy, theological dogmatism, and the Latin *imitatis*. "The creation of our universities," wrote Christian G. Salzmann, "occurred in a time when the world was still poor in books, and a man who could read and write was still a rarity. And the universities would also like to be useful today. But now they make as sorry a figure as a fortress built during the crusades in a war in which men use bombs and cannons. . . ."¹⁴ The universities' function as professional schools, other critics wrote, could be better met by dissolving the old universities with their scholastic anachronisms and their corporate intransigence and founding separate academies for professional education. Their function as centers of scholarship, critics pointed out, had already been largely usurped by the academies of arts and sciences like that founded by Leibniz at Berlin (1700), that at Göttingen (1751), and that at Munich (1759).¹⁵ These institutions had been founded to advance and to promulgate learning, and they operated free of corporate restraints and medieval vestiges. At the peak of their

¹³ König, *Wesen*, 22-29; also Adolf Stözel, "Die Berliner Mittwochsgesellschaft über Aufhebung oder Reform der Universitäten (1795)," *Forschung zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*, II (Leipzig 1889), 201-22.

¹⁴ *Carl von Carlsberg oder über das menschliche Elend* (Carlsruhe 1784), I, 341; also see 168-73, 236-341, and 82-86.

¹⁵ Karl Biedermann, *Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1854), II, 661; J. H. Campe, *Allgemeine Revision des gesammten Schul- und Erziehungswezens* (Vienna 1792), XVII, 174-83; Stözel, *Mittwochsgesellschaft*, 201-4, and passim.

¹² Conrad Varrentrapp, *Johannes Schulze und das höhere preussische Unterrichtswesen in seiner Zeit*, 509; also see Wilhelm Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1894), I, 566-73.

confidence and vigor by 1760, the academies had not only become centers for the promulgation of Enlightenment ideas, but also the undisputed leaders of scholarly inquiry into such fields as science, mathematics, and history. The century of Aufklärung had no place for the universities, critics wrote, and had already produced alternative institutions.

Inseparable from the former line of attack was that which criticized the universities for their pedagogical failure. J. H. Pestalozzi had formulated an ideal of education based upon freedom, nature study, and individual observation and discovery. J. B. Basedow and the Philanthropists combined with these ideals an emphasis on utilitarian subjects, modern languages, and physical development. Teaching, both insisted, was an art, a profession which required professionally trained practitioners.¹⁶ Against these new pedagogical ideals stood the universities with their lectures, their stress on rote memorization, their strict segregation of students and professors, their obsession with outmoded dogmas and systems. "This arrogant pedantry, this monologic [teaching method], this declamation *ex auctoritate*, the whole old-Frankish, monkish concept of our universities—that is what annoys me," wrote one Berlin critic in 1795. "This corrupts the professors and can have no good influence on the students. . . . An oral, Socratic teaching method as Herr Maier has advocated is certainly excellent and is not to be found in one of our universities."¹⁷ J. H. Campe, in advocating the abolition of the universities, wrote bitterly, "Here [in the universities] the relationship of educator to pupil cannot take place. The students believe they have outgrown discipline. And why should they not? They are men; they wear daggers. . . . And who should educate them? Certainly not the professors. Who could require that of them? They have not studied the theory of education."¹⁸ The solution, Campe went on, is to abolish the universities, incorporate the philosophical faculties into the larger Latin Schools, and found separate professional academies for law, medicine, and theology.

How widespread among the German intelligentsia such anti-university sentiments as these had become by 1790 can only be inferred. Certainly the number and popularity of these critiques suggests a general public approval of their indictments against the universities. At the very least the critiques indicate a serious waning of the universities' intellectual prestige during the late 18th century. Professors pursued their scholarly and pedagogical functions within an institutional con-

text to which the general public, if not openly hostile, was becoming increasingly disdainful or indifferent. To make matters worse, critics concentrated their heaviest attacks upon the one issue which no German parent could ignore, the volatile issue of student immorality. Totally free of adult supervision, protected legally by the university's corporate privilege of academic jurisdiction, German students in university towns had by 1700 evolved an elaborate, coarse, and often violent student subculture. Long before 1750 the dueling, rioting, and whoring of student life had become open scandals in respectable circles. After 1750 critics directed their bitterest attacks against the rampant violence and immorality in the universities which clashed so strikingly with the moral and ethical ends of education they advocated. In *Carl von Carlsberg oder über das menschliche Elend* Christian G. Salzmann describes a student riot in progress. As Salzmann's protagonist sits in a darkened window he expresses the thoughts of thousands of German parents:

Dear Aemilie! How sad I am when I think of the wretched state of the academies. Are they not the site of the coarsest barbarism? And out of these raw, coarse houses are to be taken the men to whom we must entrust our body and soul, property and honor? These perverse minds in a few years are to take charge of the Aufklärung, the legal practices and the government of the nation. . . . ? Am I to send Ferdinand into these dens of baseness and depravity?¹⁹

Had contemporaries judged the universities only by the relevance of their scholarly ideal or by the efficiency of their pedagogy, the malaise affecting the institutions would have been neither as profound nor as widespread. But such charges of student immorality found immediate, fervent response in the moral outrage of German society over the conditions of student life. This moral outrage in turn furthered the erosion of public respect for the universities' intellectual function.

By 1790 critics had become so loud and vehement that they tended to obscure the formidable efforts made by various universities throughout the century to modernize themselves and to meet the many pressures of the 18th century crisis. These efforts centered in the Universities of Halle and Göttingen. Halle, founded in 1694, reached the peak of its fame in the 1740s. By then it had introduced into its curriculum such enlightened studies as the doctrine of natural law; pietistic theology; rational philosophy in the system of Christian Wolff; and the elements of the new science, especially in their more utilitarian form. Halle led the university system in introducing major institutional

¹⁶ Theobald Ziegler, *Geschichte der Pädagogik* (Munich 1917), 261-75; H. G. Good, *A History of Western Education* (New York 1968), 225-45.

¹⁷ Stözel, *Mitwochsgesellschaft*, 218.

¹⁸ Campe, *Revision*, xvi, 148.

¹⁹ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, I, 155-56.

changes: the vernacular lecture, a program for training teachers, and a level of academic freedom in theological matters unequalled in Germany.²⁰ The force of its example propagated these innovations among other universities.

After 1750, however, Halle gradually ceded to the University of Göttingen its claim to be the first university of Germany and the leader of the reform movement. From its founding in 1734 Göttingen had consciously and assiduously cultivated an atmosphere of aristocratic conservatism, of quiet and warranted superiority. In an age when theology and philosophy ruled the curriculum, Göttingen stressed law, history, politics, mathematics, and the sciences—subjects calculated to appeal to the noble youth destined for a career at court or in the diplomatic service. Through this policy it succeeded in attracting the wealthiest and most international student body in Germany.²¹ Better financed and administered than its Prussian rival Halle, Göttingen had by 1770 assembled in its faculty the most prestigious group of scholars in Germany outside the Berlin Academy. Especially in the philosophical faculty, uniformly neglected in other institutions, such men as J. G. Schlotzer, C. G. Heyne, and G. C. Lichtenberg pioneered the scholarly methods and approaches to be applied later with great success by

²⁰ See Schrader, *Halle*, vol. 1, and J. C. Hoffbauer's rather prejudiced account in *Geschichte der Universität zu Halle*, esp. 1-163.

²¹ On the history of the University of Göttingen in the eighteenth century see Götz von Selle, *Die Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1737-1937* (Göttingen 1937), 1-156, and Emil F. Rössler, ed., *Die Gründung der Universität Göttingen* (Göttingen 1855), esp. 257-468. Professor Charles McClelland of the University of Pennsylvania stresses the importance of Göttingen's excellent faculty of law in attracting the sons of the Hannoverian nobility. I am indebted to him for advice and criticism on this and other points. The prosperity and the rapid rise of Göttingen can be seen by comparing its estimated yearly enrollment over five-year periods with that of its rival Halle:

Dates	Göttingen	Halle
1731-35	330	1075
1736-40	416	1116
1741-45	385	1244
1746-50	625	1026
1751-55	600	918
1756-60	521	734
1761-65	427	799
1766-70	653	587
1771-75	805	673
1776-80	855	1021
1781-85	874	1076
1786-90	816	1042
1791-95	726	854

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

scholars of the early 19th century.²² Göttingen symbolized throughout the 18th century crisis the continued viability of the traditional university as a center of scholarship and teaching in the face of institutional conditions which militated against both activities. Göttingen theorists took it upon themselves both to lead the counterattack against the universities' critics and also to offer a program of conservative reform.²³ In doing so they attempted to defend the universities against the growing public disdain of their scholarly function and to clarify that function in the eyes of academics themselves.

II. THE MAKING OF THE PROFESSOR

The institutional context of university life greatly affected the general viability of the universities as intellectual and pedagogical centers. Other institutional factors, particularly those related to appointments and promotions, also helped to define the scholarly ideal to which most 18th century academics adhered. A comparison with the modern professorate offers the best approach to these factors.

In most modern university systems, as in the mature German university of the 19th century, the professorial role is characterized chiefly by its peculiar dual nature. The modern professor is a man of two loyalties, one directed toward the local institution of which he is a part, the other directed toward the larger community of specialists in his discipline. These two loyalties impose different and often conflicting sets of academic activities and values. On the one hand the professor's commitment to his institution imposes "collegiate values" which are locally defined. They esteem the man who teaches with competence and versatility, who fits well socially and intellectually with his colleagues, and who identifies with his institution and accepts his share of its tasks. On the other hand the professor's commitment to his academic specialty imposes largely "disciplinary values," values which concern standards of research, publication, and professional interaction. The discipline as a whole and the specialist community in particular define these professorial values, for they govern the struggle for reputation and recognition within the discipline community.

In any progressive university system the requirements imposed upon young academics who seek appointment or promotion define and sustain professorial duties and values. The modern research-oriented university, like the mature German university of the 19th century, im-

²² Herbert Butterfield, *Man on his Past, the Study of the History of Historical Scholarship*, 2d ed. (Cambridge 1909), 52-61; Friedrich Carl Savigny, "Der zehnte Mai 1788," *Vermischte Schriften*, 5 vols. (Berlin 1850), IV, 195-209, esp. 197-98; Selle, *Göttingen*, 150-56.

²³ For a brief survey of these writings see König, *Wesen*, 34-39.

poses requirements of a characteristic sort. In matters of salary, appointment, and promotion these institutions expressly subordinate university-centered collegiate values to disciplinary values in determining a candidate's fitness for promotion. Ostensibly the modern academic is hired to perform mainly pedagogical and other university-centered functions, but in practice his talents in these areas play only secondary roles in qualifying him for advancement. Instead his success within the local academic world is usually determined chiefly by the prestige which he holds or promises quickly to attain within his broader professional community, prestige gained largely, although by no means exclusively, through research and publication.²⁴ These criteria for appointment seem to have originated first in Germany during the 19th century and since then have played a major role in sustaining the ethos of research within the modern professoriate.²⁵

In the academic world of 18th century Germany, the modern dualistic concept of the professorate had barely begun to form. Academics directed fewer ties of loyalty and identification outward toward disciplinary or professional communities at large. Correspondingly, they felt fewer obligations to pursue scholarly or professional interaction with these groups. Instead the professor's conception of his post and its duties channeled his attention inward toward his local corporate ties. It promoted a strong localism in intellectual and social life which hampered the development of a second, outer-directed loyalty to his disciplinary colleagues at large. Many factors helped to sustain this corporate and collegiate interpretation of the academic post, most of them related to the institutional context of the professorate.

By 1790 the professorial life had become a "career" in the 19th century sense for only a few academics. The financial difficulties of the universities ensured that few single chairs offered sufficient income for the academic and his family, and consequently few academics looked on the professorate as a full-time occupation. J. D. Michaelis of Göttingen reported that not only did professors of medicine, theology, and law commonly maintain private practices, but also that their university salaries were set correspondingly low in the expectation that they would do so. Frequently chairs carried with them the right to a second ecclesiastic or civic post. At Königsberg, for example, chairs in the law faculty entitled their occupants to positions as magistrates in the city government. Even in the philosophical faculties most academics regarded themselves as educators or members of established professions.

²⁴ See Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace* (New York 1958), 82-83.

²⁵ R. Steven Turner, "The Growth of Professorial Research in Prussia, 1818 to 1848—Causes and Context," *Hist. Studies in the Physical Sciences*, III (1971), 167-82.

At Erfurt in 1778 exactly half of the professors in the lower faculty held second posts in the local schools, while another third held other simultaneous chairs in the professional faculties. As the professorate had not become a career, so the professor had not yet become distinguished by any specific scholarly or pedagogical expertise which differentiated him sharply from mere practitioners of the discipline he taught.²⁶

Methods of recruitment pointed to the same conclusion. In the 18th and well into the 19th century, professorial recruitment tended to be not only "vertical," through *Privatdozenten* and junior professors working their way up through the professorial hierarchy, but also "horizontal," through men recruited directly from private and professional life. A distinguished doctor, lawyer, or teacher who possessed local ties with a university might be invited into the university corporation. He would then hold his chair as a lucrative and honorific post while maintaining his professional practice. Such men usually joined the corporation directly and did not habituate themselves like vertically recruited faculty members who joined the university as *Privatdozenten*. Although no good statistics for the 18th century exist, the group of professors who were in no sense career academics seems to have made up a large percentage, if not a majority, of the professoriate. A sample group which will be studied extensively in this essay is the twenty-two teachers in the philosophical faculty at the University of Göttingen, who in the winter semester of 1765-66 announced lectures in the subjects of the philosophical faculty. Of these twenty-two, Johann Meusel in his *Lexikon der vom Jahr 1750 bis 1800 verstorbener teutschen Schriftsteller* provides biographical material for nineteen.²⁷ Of this nineteen, six or almost a third had never held the post of *Privatdozent* or comparable positions. Like the local librarians J. A. Dieze and S. C. Hollmann and the local preacher Lüder Kulenkamp, all seem to have been recruited directly from practical life, sometimes because of their local ties to the corporate faculty. Until the careers of larger groups of academics at different universities have been examined, no confident generalizations can be made. Nevertheless it seems reasonable to expect

²⁶ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 353; Predeck, "Ein verschollener Reorganisationsplan für die Universität Königsberg aus dem Jahre 1755," *Altpreußische Forschungen* 4 (1927), 81; Wilhelm Stieda, *Erfurter Universitätsreformpläne im 18. Jahrhundert* (Erfurt 1934), 134ff. Stieda's work reprints the lengthy, highly detailed reform plan proposed by Wieland in 1778. Also see Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben*, 64.

²⁷ Das gelehrte Teutschland oder Lexikon der vom Jahr 1750 bis 1800 verstorbenen teutschen Schriftsteller, angefangen von Georg Christoph Hamberger, fortgesetzt von J. G. Meusel . . . (Leipzig 1796-1834).

the comparable percentage of horizontally recruited professors in the philosophical faculties of universities less distinguished than Göttingen to be somewhat greater than a third.²⁸ Whatever their numbers, for men recruited in this manner the professorate represented no graduated career defined specifically in terms of scholarly expertise. Beyond the local, pedagogical duties of their chair such academics often devoted their attention to the practice of their profession rather than to the pursuit of esoteric scholarship.

In lieu of a definition based upon scholarly or pedagogical expertise, 18th century academics adhered to the traditional corporate conception of the professorial dignity. Membership in the corporate body of full professors conferred certain obligations to the state and the corporation, valuable financial opportunities in salaries and fees, and considerable social distinction. Even as the actual financial position of the local professoriate declined, it continued to enjoy social and financial prerogatives which set it apart as a privileged social group and reinforced the honorific aspect of the position. Although the professors' traditional sumptuary privileges and their frequent monopolies over certain kinds of trade and manufactures were disappearing in Prussia after 1740, their right of censorship, their right of representation in the *Landtag*, and their control over lucrative ecclesiastical posts survived in force. Even at Halle, a relatively new institution, professors enjoyed all these privileges as well as exclusive use of one of the city churches and the right to their own beer and wine cellars.²⁹ Partly because of these corporate prerogatives, faculty groups tended to be extremely homogeneous, ingrown, and static. Königsberg and Duisburg in particular remained isolated and ingrown until early in the 19th century. Of Königsberg University Chancellor Korff complained in 1768, "The natives do not go out; outsiders do not come in; hence everything here remains slack and complacent."³⁰ These conditions reinforced the corporate, honorific conception of the professorate and directed the academic's attention inward toward his collegiate obligations.

²⁸ The use of the percentage of unhabilitated faculty as a parameter in measuring the "professionalization" of the professorial career is introduced and discussed by Christian von Ferber in *Die Entwicklung des Lehrkörpers der deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen, 1864-1954* (Göttingen 1956), 20, 77 (Table VII). This parameter is inadequate for the period before 1800 when the status of the *Privatdozent* was quite different from that in the 19th century. It remains significant if supplemented with other biographical material like that provided by Meusel.

²⁹ Schrader, *Halle*, I, 83-89; Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben*, 41; Christoph Meiners, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen unserer Erdtheils*, 4 vols. (Göttingen 1805), IV, 215-16.

³⁰ Götz von Selle, *Geschichte der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg in Preussen* (Würzburg 1956), 161.

Extensive legal restrictions on the mobility of students and professors also encouraged the dominant sense of localism in academic life. To the princes of 18th century absolutist states universities existed to fulfill a mercantilistic purpose. The provincial university kept the money and the talents of native sons within the state by obviating the necessity of studying abroad; hopefully it would also lure a few wealthy foreign students. In keeping with this policy the kings of Prussia and especially Frederick the Great issued numerous edicts prohibiting Prussian youth from studying outside the state.³¹ In keeping with the same policy Prussia arbitrarily refused to allow prominent professors to resign their Prussian posts in order to accept more lucrative calls elsewhere in Germany. A decree of 1733 imposed on all Prussian academics an oath never to accept any future, foreign call. This prohibition fell particularly hard on natives of Prussia. A Professor Schmauss at Halle was able to accept a call to Göttingen in 1744 only by informing authorities that he had purchased another apartment in Halle, loading up his wagon with household goods, and then driving rapidly across the border.³² Such prohibitions seem to have been fairly common in Germany, for even liberal Göttingen restricted the right of its professors to resign until late in the 18th century.³³ In practice these regulations were poorly enforced and seem only to have hampered rather than to have eliminated the mobility of the professors and students; nevertheless, to the extent that they were enforced they promoted an intellectual as well as a social localism in the Prussian universities. For as the professor found his right to resign his post restricted, he found his material incentive to work for reputation in the broader academic world limited as well. Even if his labor resulted in a lucrative and prestigious call to another post, there was no guarantee either that he could accept the offer or that he could use the opportunity to better his local position. Limitations on the professor's right to resign his post survived almost to the Humboldtian era.

These legal restrictions combined with the corporate, honorific conception of the professorate itself to inhibit the professor from identifying with disciplinary groups across the university system. The centripetal pulls of collegiate duties, professional practice, and social prerogatives distracted him from actively participating in the larger

³¹ Reinhold Koser, "Friedrich der Grosse und die preussischen Universitäten," *Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*, 17 (1904), 118, 131.

³² Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 119-22.

³³ Ernst Brandes, *Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Universität Göttingen* (Göttingen 1802), 172-73. Undoubtedly such restrictions had fallen into disuse well before 1802.

world of scholarship, especially the intense, research-oriented scholarship coming rapidly to the fore. Of course, many scholars who held university chairs did pursue extensive scholarly research of all kinds throughout the 18th century. But the popular conception of the professorate implied no such duty intrinsic to the office itself.

Other factors also hampered the formation of a dualistic conception of the academic's obligations. The modern dualistic professorate, and especially the accepted use of predominantly disciplinary criteria in appointments, presupposes several conditions in the larger academic world. In particular it presupposes the existence of well-defined disciplinary communities, the reputation of whose participants can be at least roughly assessed by local administrators as a basis for their decisions about promotions. In 18th century Germany, however, these communities were themselves still in the process of formation. "Discipline community" as used here refers to the inner circle of recognized authorities who actively engage in research in the same subfield or on the same problem. They possess most direct access to research facilities and journals, and they carry out scientific debates largely among themselves. The rise of such disciplinary communities in the later 18th century can be traced in the emergence of self-conscious schools, the propagation of specific research techniques, and the proliferation of specialized journals. Mathematics, for example, had long been an established scholarly discipline within the universities. The consolidation of Germany's first disciplinary community in the field, however, can be traced to Professors Pfaff at Helmstadt and Hindenburg at Leipzig, who founded the combinatorial school of analysis and began Germany's first specialized mathematics journal, the *Archiv der reinen und angewandten Mathematik*. C. G. Heyne at Göttingen and his school broadened the scope of classical philology after 1750 to include a general study of antiquity. Heyne's pupil F. A. Wolf added to this program an emphasis on rigorous critique, and from his seminar at Halle trained a methodologically conscious philological elite whose cadres would dominate chairs of philology in northern Germany after 1800. In chemistry Karl Hufbauer has recently traced the formation of the German chemical community and its consolidation around Lorenz Crell at Helmstadt and his *Chemisches Journal*. In each of these fields an inner circle was gradually distinguishing itself from the larger group of practitioners who were learned in the discipline but who contributed infrequently or who engaged mainly in teaching or applying their knowledge.³⁴

³⁴ On the community of German mathematicians before 1800 see E. Netto, "Kombinatorik," *Vorlesungen über Geschichte der Mathematik*, ed. Moritz Cantor (Leipzig 1908), IV, 201-21, and Wilhelm Lorey, *Das Studium der Mathematik*

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

Despite their vigorous growth, these new communities remained rather novel during the later 18th century. The ideal of scholarly participation and performance latent in them had not yet become general norms for the larger academic world. In particular the criteria commonly used in academic appointments and promotions suggest that active participation in these communities had become neither obligatory nor universally expected of academics. The emerging young communities had not yet begun to serve as foci for a dualistic conception of the professor's loyalties or for the consistent use of disciplinary criteria in appointments.

In Germany by 1760 authority over academic appointments and promotions had generally become legally invested in the state. By that date the territorial princes had gradually usurped the universities' ancient corporate privilege of self-recruitment, even though a few institutions and individual faculties retained that right throughout the century. Prussian institutions enjoyed somewhat less autonomy than other universities in these matters, for they did not even possess a statutory right to nominate candidates. This did not mean, however, that the local faculties had ceased to exercise power over appointments. Prussia's bureaucratic control of its universities had remained remarkably ineffective throughout the 18th century, and except for short periods of despotic intervention it took little interest in superintending its universities or in exploiting its authority over appointments. Consequently, the local faculties or a few dominant individuals in each one managed, largely by default of the state, to retain considerable influence over professorial appointments. Conrad Bornhak's study of the Prussian university administration before 1810 cites numerous cases preserved in ministerial records in which Prussian universities were called upon to propose candidates for vacant chairs. In the case of Königsberg University, which Berlin administered indirectly through the provincial government, the state left appointments almost entirely in local hands. Bornhak concludes that "the participation of the university in the filling of vacant chairs was in no way extinguished and can be demonstrated during the whole century."³⁵ Although occasionally the state imposed controversial professors upon a university

an den deutschen Universitäten seit Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts (Berlin 1916), 26-29. For classical philology see Sandys, *Classical Scholarship*, III, passim. For chemistry see Karl Hufbauer, "The Formation of the German Chemical Community (1700-1795)" Ph.D. diss., Univ. of California at Berkeley (1966); and Hufbauer, "Social Support for Chemistry in Germany during the Eighteenth Century," *Hist. Studies in the Physical Sciences* 3 (1971), 205-32.

³⁵ Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 98-129, esp. 99-100; and Selle, *Königsberg*, 158-61. For a fuller discussion see Turner, "Professorial Research," 158-63.

against its will, on the whole the local corporate faculty successfully set the criteria used in most academic appointments.

The modern professorial system utilizes university appointments and promotions to encourage scholarship and research. This system presupposes that the authorities which control appointments will subordinate to disciplinary criteria the collegiate virtues of effective teaching, versatility, social and intellectual acceptability, and family ties. In 18th century Germany, however, university critics, theorists, and reformers of every ideological hue agreed that collegiate values far outweighed disciplinary values in importance, a condition they attributed to the domination of appointments by the corporate faculties. Although critics generally admitted that such faculty-controlled appointments did promote a desirable solidarity within the university corporation, they invariably condemned these appointments as damaging to scholarship. Faculty jealousies, they insisted, guaranteed the exclusion of the most competent teachers and scholars. Christoph Meiners of the University of Göttingen, where the state closely controlled all professorial appointments, wrote approvingly that "the great Münchhausen granted to our university the right to present and to nominate or to recommend as little as he did the right of free selection, because he knew through experience that although the faculties of universities know always the men who most deserve vacant chairs, they are seldom or never inclined to propose the most capable whom they know."³⁶ Christoph Martin Wieland wrote of the University of Erfurt that "it would be highly beneficial to the university and to the prevention of many abuses which have taken place, if the right of appointment was vested in the prince in those faculties where the opposite custom now prevails."³⁷ Without exception, 18th century reformers sought not more academic freedom in matters of appointment, but more state control to prevent what they regarded as open corporate abuses.

Critics also insisted that the great authority vested in the corporate faculties encouraged professorial monopolies and restricted the healthy competition necessary to vigorous intellectual life. J. C. Hoffbauer, in writing of the Prussian universities in 1800, urged that

every instructor ought to enjoy the fullest independence from every other. . . . In my opinion all relationships which make an instructor dependent on the interests of others in any manner must be banned. . . . I know of cases in which younger instructors have oriented their choice of lectures, however unwillingly, in accordance with the

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

wishes of their seniors in order not to displease them, because they hoped either for further advancement through their recommendation or for other sorts of advantages arising from their favor. . . . Everyone who seeks advancement in the university knows that it depends upon whether the faculty will recommend him or not. . . . Often everything hangs upon the will of one individual, to whose vote the other members of the faculty conform more than they should.³⁸

The professorial monopolies which restricted competition and innovation, Hoffbauer went on, affected not only younger academics but established full professors as well.

Reformers frequently observed that professorial evaluations ignored a candidate's disciplinary attainment and looked primarily to his social and corporate acceptability. At worst the universities' most bitter critics satirized the institutions as openly and unambiguously corrupt in this respect. In one scene from Salzmann's *Carl von Carlsberg* the young university instructor Ribonius confesses to a colleague that he loves Luise but is too poor to marry. A chair has become vacant at last to which Ribonius is entitled by seniority, but the full professors in charge seem cool toward him. "Indeed," says his friend, "you seem not to know how one gets a chair here in Grünau. . . . We have many pretty professors' daughters. Marry one! What does it matter? Things will go better." The virtuous Ribonius is shocked and replies that since he either has the requisite professorial ability or does not, such a marriage can have no effect. "That is certainly a *sylogismus disjunctivus* if I am not mistaken," laughs his friend. "Propositions are all right for the lecture room. . . . but in everyday life they are worth nothing. You don't yet know how it is." Ribonius soon learns, however, for he marries the daughter of a professor, enters into the dignity of the professorial office, and forsakes Luise, who promptly dies of heartbreak.³⁹

Other contemporary critics less hostile to the universities voiced similar conclusions in less outrageous terms. Even Frederick William I had chided his university curators early in the century, noting, "We do not wish to conceal from you our resolution that in the future when professorial posts become vacant you are to recommend to us only such people as have earned fame and renown at other universities and as will make our universities flourish and grow; and you are to ignore matters of kinship, marriage, and the like."⁴⁰ Wieland, by far

³⁶ *Ueber die Perioden der Erziehung* (Leipzig 1800), 182-84; also see 185-86. Hoffbauer was Professor of Philosophy at Halle.

³⁹ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, III, 141-42.

⁴⁰ Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 99.

³⁸ Meiners, *Entstehung*, I, 202; also see Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 100.

³⁷ In Stieda, *Universitätsreformpläne*, 154.

the bitterest critic of contemporary appointment criteria, complained of his own University of Erfurt that

all along the philosophical faculty, instead of concentrating at all times and to the best of its ability on the best possible choice, has let itself be led by completely false premises; it has notoriously concerned itself more with its relatives and personal friends, more with religious, fraternal, or collegiate relationships and the like in the selection of its new members than with true learned capability. Out of this practice has arisen not only a mass of quarrels, but also—understandably—the circumstance that it was only a fortunate coincidence when a really skillful man ever found his way to a teaching post.⁴¹

Always, Wieland wrote elsewhere, “the most essential concerns in the filling of a vacant chair are least discussed; often completely secondary matters predominate, and there is little talk of learnedness, scientific skill, teaching ability, and other necessary abilities and demands.”⁴²

Appointive criteria based upon “religious, fraternal, or collegiate relationships” discouraged the evaluation of young academics upon their disciplinary attainment. Even when this factor was weighed, the full faculty, dominated by professors of theology and law, usually lacked the ability to judge candidates in specific fields upon disciplinary grounds. It was even less prepared to judge specialized research within these fields, and Wieland used this fact to attack the principle of faculty self-recruitment:

Because a professor does not teach all the sciences and consequently does not need to understand them, so-called scholars can be guilty of still greater misjudgments about professors. Let us assume, for example, that a university has only one professor of mathematics and that this chair is to be filled. Then among the men who will make the appointment there are no real professional mathematicians; what, then, makes their judgment particularly accurate in comparison with that of others? The same case can occur in many other fields. [Such circumstances promote] . . . only too often the most common personal considerations which in no way further learning.⁴³

Reliance on such “common personal considerations” in appointments, Wieland went on, not only restricted the growth of university scholarship, but also blocked the possibility of reforms aimed at promoting

more effective teaching, a progressive curriculum, and the gradual improvement of student life and morals.

The programmatic intent of reformers such as Wieland, Hoffbauer, and their colleagues has to be kept in mind in evaluating their writings. Such critics did not undertake impartial assessments of university conditions; instead they wrote reform treatises aimed at exposing the corporate abuses of the university system and at rallying academics and administrators to reform. This reform, as theorists envisioned it, would proceed on many fronts, of which the reform of university scholarship would be only one. With this program in mind, critics usually phrased their complaints over appointment procedures as general indictments of the university system, even though in practice their criticisms applied neither to all appointments nor to all universities. The University of Göttingen constituted the obvious exception to all such generalizations about the 18th century universities, as to a lesser extent did Halle under Freiherr von Zedlitz, and as did individual faculties and universities of other states. Even with this qualification, however, the testimony of reformers provides entrée into important 18th century attitudes toward academic appointments. Clearly these men believed that in a sufficient number of academic appointments to merit a general university reform, social and corporate factors outweighed candidates' disciplinary attainment and even their pedagogical skills. This testimony suggests that the local faculties, which controlled or greatly influenced appointments, still felt little compulsion to subordinate their obvious local interests to the furtherance of an esoteric and specialized scholarship, even though they might regard such work as intrinsically valuable and important. This circumstance, as the next section will argue, did not so much discourage professorial scholarship as channel it into certain areas, away from the specialized research interests rapidly rising in sectors of German scholarship and science. The institutional conditions of late 18th century academia, especially as they expressed themselves in the criteria of academic appointments, had not yet begun to promote on a large scale the modern dualistic conception of the professorate.

III. THE PROFESSOR AS SCHOLAR

University theorists were quick to point out that the institutional circumstances surrounding the appointment and promotion of academics affected the universities' outlook on scholarship, usually for the worse. That argument made, they rarely hesitated to interject their own opinions concerning the professor's duties toward teaching, publication, and discovery. In this sense the reform treatises yield a small cross section of academic opinion regarding the professor's scholarly function.

⁴¹ In Strieda, *Universitätsreformpläne*, 227.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 134.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 153-54.

These discussions, however, ought not to suggest that the improvement of scholarship dominated the concerns of 18th century reformers. On the contrary most writers would have agreed that the demands of scholarship ought to take second place to the more pressing needs to stimulate enrollment and funding, to create a more competent system of state administration, and to improve student life and morals. This issue of reform priorities can be seen in the recurrent debates over the relative importance of teaching versus scholarship to the university's proper function. Two distinct traditions of reform thought emerged with respect to this question, although both shared a wide range of common views.

On the issue of teaching versus scholarship, a few theorists went so far as to argue that the university had no obligation at all to advance scholarship. Others agreed to the more moderate precept that the professor's role as scholar must be strictly subordinated to his role as teacher. This latter argument reached its most extreme form on the brink of the Humboldtian era among the circle of Prussian reformers whose chief representatives were L. H. Jacob and J. C. Hoffbauer. Both men charged that the failure of the traditional university lay in the near-total emphasis upon its role as a professional school to the neglect of its propaedeutic, pedagogical function. "The university is not merely a teaching institute (*Lehrinstitut*)," wrote Hoffbauer, "but rather also an educational institute (*Erziehungsinstitut*), and in a narrower sense is the school proper. The whole organization of the university ought to be referred to this role. . . ." Jacob added that "the surveillance over the students must be made more school-like (*Schulmäßsig*); otherwise all hope of improvement is lost."⁴⁴ As immediate remedies they advocated more rigid discipline of students, Socratic teaching methods, and more elementary courses. This emphasis upon the university's pedagogical function naturally implied that teaching rather than scholarship should be the chief concern in academic appointments. Although both authors honored the necessity of professional learnedness, both urged that scholarly activity be de-emphasized among academics. Occasionally there emerged a note of near-hostility to the professor-scholar:

In the future more consideration must be taken of both aspects of the professor's talents in selection of candidates. An orderly, upright man with a well-ordered erudition and a gift for communicating it is more suitable to become a professor than a scholarly monster who labors only for himself and the world or who does little for his stu-

dents, or a genius who has offensive morals and who does not think it worth the labor to employ diligence on lectures for his students, or a rhapsodic polymath who strews everything together without any connection and has no proper method in instruction.⁴⁵

Sentiments like these certainly imply no hostility to professorial scholarship in general, but they do testify to the primary emphasis upon pedagogy running through many theoretical assessments of the professorate and its requirements.

Against the opinions of the Prussian reformers must be balanced the ultimately more influential tradition emanating from the University of Göttingen. Göttingen theorists, and especially their dean J. D. Michaelis, agreed that the first duty of the university was to instruct the young and that consequently the professor was primarily a teacher. But they insisted upon a loftier concept of teaching than the propaedeutic, methodological instruction envisioned by the Prussian theorists, and they denied that the university was nothing more than a school. Ernst Brandes, in whose treatise the Göttingen tradition culminated, argued vehemently that as university instruction was "more rigorous and systematic" than that of the schools, universities must be sharply distinguished from true pedagogical institutions.⁴⁶

Göttingen's "more rigorous and systematic" concept of university instruction also left more room for professorial scholarship, a theoretical view supported by Göttingen's preeminence in German learning. Later writers in the Göttingen tradition especially stressed the importance of university scholarship. By 1805 theorists like Brandes and Christoph Meiners were ready to attribute to academic reputation an importance almost as great as that of effective teaching itself. Brandes, for example, wrote:

The distinguished scholar should be a teacher of youth by virtue of his designation as professor. But because . . . [perfection] is not always to be had, so can a few deserving professors, even if they train only a small number of students . . . still make great contributions to the fame of the university through their writings. The doubtful point of view by which we must always consider a university, namely that the professors at the same time are to maintain, disseminate, and enlarge the treasury of human wisdom and are to teach the youth, leads us to the wish that every professor might be a deserving teacher and a distinguished writer. If both are not possible, however, he must be one.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Hoffbauer, *Perioden*, viii; Ludwing Heinrich Jacob, *Ueber die Universitäten in Deutschland, besonders in den königl. preussischen Staaten* (Berlin 1798), 26.

⁴⁵ Jacob, *Universitäten*, 254-55.

⁴⁶ Brandes, *Göttingen*, 26-27.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 188-89; also see Meiners, *Entstehung*, iv, 372-76.

Against these opinions the older but still very influential tract of J. D. Michaelis maintained that the professor had no obligation either to publish or to make discoveries, and that in no case could these activities compensate for poor teaching. Even Brandes agreed that pedagogical fitness ought to govern appointments. The most important criteria in selecting a professor, he wrote, should be (1) his ability as a lecturer and (2) his "systematic embrace of the whole of his science." The professor's learnedness, Brandes went on, should be addressed not to discovery but to judgment and synthesis.⁴⁸

If any consensus emerged from these divergent opinions about the relative merits of teaching and scholarship, it was that the professor's role as scholar ought to be subordinated to his role as teacher at least in determining academic appointments. But the lack of consensus about how exclusively teaching should be emphasized opened the way to detailed discussions of the professor's broader duties as a scholar. The most heated of these discussions involved the relative merits of professorial publication. Did the professor's literary activity interfere with his teaching? Did it make of him a literary hack? These issues were bound to be important, for theorists agreed that the literary works produced by the professors of the local university largely determined the institution's fame abroad, and that fame, in turn affected the prosperity of the local institution in students and income. With a fine disregard for more idealistic or euphemistic justifications of professorial writing, 18th century discussions proceeded directly to the issues of finance and prestige at the heart of the matter.

J. D. Michaelis advanced the view that professors should not strive to be literary figures:

Must professors in general be writers—famous writers?—This is a new question to which one will expect an answer.

In fact I do not believe that this is an indispensable characteristic of a good professor; and where it is emphasized too much I suspect that the authorities . . . do so not merely for the effectiveness of the university or the advance of learning, but rather to do something to raise the prestige of the university.⁴⁹

The professor who is both a capable teacher and a noted writer is to be doubly valued, Michaelis went on, but the professor who is only the former has done his duty in full.

Against this view Wieland fervently argued that publication was an auxiliary duty (*Nebenamt*) inherent in the professorate. "The business

of publishing," he wrote, "belongs in and for itself among the activities of a scholar, and it is so much the more suitable to the professor because through it he has the opportunity to make himself known abroad and so promote the honor of the university. In this respect publication by professors ought to be favored in every possible way." But Wieland opposed any attempt to make publication obligatory, noting that "it is not given to everyone to be a writer, although through one's knowledge and other capabilities one may yet be a really good teacher."⁵⁰ Although no consensus emerged among theorists concerning the desirability of professorial publication, most writers agreed with Wieland that for the good of his university the professor should publish if he possessed sufficient skill and opportunity.

Reformers and theorists had little to say about the more significant issue of whether any literary production was actually incumbent upon the 18th century academic in virtue of his position. In Prussia, at least, other sources suggest that the state did make a few largely ineffectual attempts to require publication of its professors. Conrad Bornhak records decrees issued to Frankfurt-an-Oder in 1737 and to Halle in 1768 admonishing the local faculties to publish more in order to ensure the reputations of the institutions. In both cases the state made clear that it desired not works of esoteric scholarship but rather widely available works of practical interest to the common man. There is no evidence, however, that Prussia ever enforced literary activity by restricting the salary or advancement of individual professors who neglected to write, even though the administration did take these steps occasionally to discourage pedagogical laxness. Although the state recognized and encouraged professorial publication as important in sustaining the mercantilistic position of the universities, it seemed to maintain no consistent policy for promoting literary activity.⁵¹

In practice the degree of obligation or incentive to literary production undoubtedly differed greatly from university to university during the late 18th century. In discussing the proper criteria according to which professorial salaries should be allotted, Christoph Meiners, a firm advocate of professorial publication, made the following recommendation:

Most universities were formerly inclined to consider a special talent for the oral lecture as much more worthy of reward than distinctive gifts and fame as a writer. In my opinion smaller universities were correct to think in this manner. At larger universities [however], a widespread literary reputation accompanied by meager . . .

⁴⁸ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, I, 92-93 and passim; Brandes, *Göttingen*, 159-61.

⁴⁹ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 225.

⁵⁰ In Stieck, *Universitätsreformpläne*, 176-77.

⁵¹ Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 58.

approbation [as a teacher] counterbalances distinctive pedagogical talents which are enhanced by no literary fame. The repute of a good oral lecture promotes in local regions the prosperity and enrollment of universities, while literary fame [acts] in distant lands.⁵²

The few cases in which professorial output can be estimated seem to corroborate Meiners' distinction between large and small institutions. Not surprisingly they indicate that literary output varied greatly from academic to academic and that professors at more prestigious schools published significantly more than those at smaller institutions. Wieland reviewed the literary activity of the twenty-two professors in the Erfurt philosophical faculty between 1738 and 1778. Of that twenty-two he found only five who in his opinion had achieved any fame through their writings, five who were completely obscure and ineffectual, and the rest, mediocre. Karl von Prandl in his history of the University of Ingolstadt, forerunner of the University of Munich, reviewed the efforts of the lower faculty there. For the period 1715 to 1746 he discovered that twenty-eight of the forty-one professors maintained no literary activity. In the later period 1746 to 1773 he declared nineteen of the thirty-one professors in the lower faculty to be "without literary significance."⁵³ These relatively low levels of professorial output at smaller institutions like Erfurt and Ingolstadt suggest that professors there felt little compulsion to publish and experienced no significant pressure to do so from the administrative bureaucracy or their peers.

The prestigious University of Göttingen presented a rather different situation, for its faculty as a whole published extensively during the second half of the 18th century. Johann Meusel's *Lexikon* provides lists of publications for nineteen professors in the philosophical faculty of 1765-66, and his compendium shows that all of these men did publish at least a few works of some description during the course of their careers. Eleven wrote quite extensively, while the works of Samuel Christian Hollmann, Abraham Gottfried Kästner, and J. D. Michaelis could fairly be called encyclopedic in scope and approach. If by 1765 Göttingen could boast of being the most prestigious intellectual center in Germany outside the Berlin Academy, it clearly owed this reputation largely to the publications of its faculty.

Meusel's data also allows the literary activity of each teacher to be

correlated with the time of his first appointment to the university and his subsequent promotion into its corporate ranks. At the time of their first appointment to the professorship, i.e., as junior professors (*Extraordinarien*) or at comparable ranks, the nineteen academics of the sample had already produced an average of five works each.⁵⁴ Around this average, actual figures ranged from no works at all to as many as nine at the time of first appointment. These five works, however, by no means consisted only of scholarly treatises aimed at the larger community. In keeping with the localism of intellectual life they invariably included several academic dissertations, printed disputations, and occasional pieces printed in small numbers primarily for local use. If works of this kind are considered somewhat less important than books and journal articles, and if the significant differences in the number of publications from individual to individual are taken into account, then the literary output of academics prior to their first appointment at Göttingen would not seem to be significantly high. Certainly it permits no inference that any given level of literary output was required for a first appointment.

All but three instructors among the nineteen of the sample later received invitations to join the corporate faculty as full professors (*Ordinarien*). By the date of that promotion the average member of the group had published nine or ten works of some type, an impressive figure, since the percentage of required dissertations seemed to be much lower. Great individual differences remained, however, ranging from a few instructors who had produced only one or two works to the continual outflow of mathematics texts from the pen of A. G. Kästner. Those instructors who fell well below the average form a particularly significant subgroup. At least six professors reached the status of full professor on the strength of five publications or fewer, many of these required dissertations. With some exceptions this group corresponded closely to those academics previously mentioned as having been recruited "horizontally," directly from practical life. They included Gottfried Achenwall and the Bemann brothers who had entered the professoriate from established legal practices and who simultaneously held chairs in both the juridical and philosophical faculties. Others like Ernst Weber, Lüder Kulenkamp, and Georg Hamberger possessed nonacademic entrée into the faculty group through pastoral or literary positions; these collegiate connections clearly smoothed the

⁵² Christoph Meiners, *Ueber die Verfassung und Verwaltung der deutschen*

Universitäten, 2 vols. (Göttingen 1801; photocopy repr. Darmstadt 1970), II, 55.

⁵³ Sueda, *Universitätsreformpläne*, 224; Karl von Prandl, *Geschichte der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Ingolstadt, Landesbibl. München*, 2 vols., 2d. ed. (München 1968), I, 542, 613.

⁵⁴ The *Privatdozentur* conferred only permission to give private lectures under the auspices of the university. In 1765 this permission was relatively easy to obtain and constituted no official appointment or even significant recognition. The *Extraordinariat* or lectureship did constitute an official appointment and usually conferred a salary, although not corporate membership.

way for their initiation into the faculty. Although the size of the sample invites no generalizations, the impressive number of publications behind most academics at the time of their initiation into the university corporation does suggest that sustained literary activity was a professional norm at Göttingen. On the other hand the frequent exceptions made for men who possessed collegiate or professional entrée indicates that even at Göttingen extensive publication had not yet become the *sine qua non* of the professorial career.

The most important characteristic of the 18th century's attitude toward university scholarship did not lie in the number of works academics felt obliged to produce or even in assessments of the sheer desirability of professorial erudition. The distinguishing characteristic of the 18th century's attitude lay rather in the purpose for which scholarly works were intended, the form which they took, and the audience toward which they were directed. Again a comparison with the modern, dualistic professorate can bring these characteristics into sharper relief.

Consistent adherence in academic appointments and promotions to disciplinary standards sustains the modern dualistic professorate. This system, however efficient in promoting research, has had great implications for the kinds of scholarship pursued within the academic framework. The appointive criteria previously discussed in connection with the modern professorate do not, in theory, reward scholarship and publication directly. Instead they reward only scholarship which heightens the individual's reputation among his disciplinary peers. This means—or has meant in practice—that incentive accrues only to those forms of scholarly contribution which are of interest to the specialist group. Other forms such as didactic or popular scholarship are likely to be ignored or even disdained. The individual academic accepts the disciplinary community to which he feels allied as the only proper judge of his scholarly capacity. He directs his most important work toward this group and adheres to the problems, methods, and standards which it respects. Much scholarship carried on within this framework, therefore, carries within itself an innate tendency toward specialization. By 1840 this framework had been firmly established in Germany. The literary production of a professor had by then come to mean ideally the results of his original research addressed to the circle of specialists in his field. Conversely his work addressed to a larger audience—textbooks, popular works, belles lettres—had come to have a distinctly different connotation, to be considered as secondary to his principal scholarly activity.

German academics in the later 18th century approached the subject of professorial publication with completely different preassumptions.

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

The emerging young specialist communities had not yet established themselves as the arbiters of scholarly excellence. The adherence to collegiate criteria in local appointments greatly reduced the significance of scholarly achievement in specialized topics which could be evaluated only by a few specialists. Instead these conditions encouraged scholarship of a broader, more synthetic, and sometimes shallow nature, a scholarship which could be appreciated and evaluated by one's corporate fellows. They placed a special premium upon intellectual breadth and versatility, and they discouraged rigid distinctions between "learned" or "scientific" works on the one hand and pedagogical, popular, or didactic works on the other. Of course, theorists recognized the distinction, but they rarely declared the former to be in any sense "proper" to the professorate or to be intrinsically more desirable than works of a less esoteric nature. As a result the publications of 18th century professors often showed a diversity and diffuseness unrestricted by the later confines of specialized audiences, disciplinary boundaries, or methodological critique. By 1790 the familiar hierarchy of respectability in professorial publications had not yet become clearly established.

This attitude manifested itself in various ways and especially clearly in the "textbook tradition" of professorial scholarship. In keeping with his pedagogical conception of his post and the encyclopedic preferences of his age, the professor devoted much of his publishing activity to handbooks, translations, and works of a pedagogical or encyclopedic nature. When 18th century academics spoke of a professor's scholarly writings through which he won fame and reputation they usually meant these textbooks and compendia, works which by definition were rarely directed at specialized audiences. Even while recognizing its importance for pedagogy, Michaelis gently mocked this textbook tradition, noting that "as often as a new professor gets good, an old compendium goes bad."⁵⁵ But most other theorists, especially the pedagogically minded reformers in the Prussian tradition, regarded such production as wholly desirable, as the proper form of professorial literary activity. "I know that many have protested often and emphatically against the too-great accumulation of textbooks," J. C. Hoffbauer wrote in 1800,

but such protests are wrong. A textbook by a teacher is not written for the great public but for his hearers. One should never seek to discourage a teacher from such activity, for compiling a textbook affords him the best opportunity of ordering his knowledge and working out its individual parts. . . . Nor is one to worry that the

⁵⁵ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 227.

urge to write will lead more to the compiling of textbooks than to other writings. The public, whose demand determines the readiness of the publisher to accept a work, asks less after compendia than other writings. Furthermore, even a mediocre textbook demands more knowledge and diligence in most cases than the treatment of a learned topic in many volumes.

If an instructor lectures from his own text, then one outside the university is in a position to know what one can expect of him, whether he surveys the whole of his science and its parts. . . .

On these grounds it is perhaps to be wished that every instructor lecture only from his own textbook.⁵⁶

The many professors who ascribed to this view did not regard the production of textbooks as an activity wholly distinct from analytic examinations of smaller areas by research or speculation, and they certainly did not regard the former as secondary or inferior. On the contrary, the intellectual abilities associated more with the former than with the latter—the synthetic view, sensitivity to the relationship of the parts to the whole, breadth and clarity in presentation—these were the values which the professor ranked highest among the demands of erudition.

This tolerant, perhaps freewheeling attitude toward professorial publication expressed itself in other ways also. Consider the familiar nineteenth professors of the Göttingen philosophical faculty in 1765 and the literary work of each prior to his appointment as full professor. One can hardly review the literary output of these men and fail to be struck by the high percentage of works which the 19th century would never have called *wissenschaftlich*, by 1820 the supreme scholarly accolade. Most of the publications of at least eleven of the nineteen Göttingen academics would have clearly been regarded as “unscientific” by the 19th century; that is, the works made no claim to extending the frontiers of scholarship or were not the result of the methodical, critical methods for which later German scholarship became justly famous. The Beckmann brothers published only two or three joint literary works during their careers. Isak Colom wrote primarily translations of literary works from the French and textbooks of French grammar and stylistics. Johann Dieze the librarian contributed translations from the Spanish and editions of various Spanish works. Georg Hanberger edited the important encyclopedia of German writers continued by Meusel but did little else. Johann Tobias Köler published primarily poems and travel descriptions. Kästner, although he contributed sev-

eral original papers in mathematics, was most famous for his well-known textbooks and for his philosophical and literary writing. Professors Kulenkamp and Weber published frequent collections of sermons. Other professors such as Hollmann and Michaelis, who cannot fairly be listed with this group, nevertheless devoted much of their publication to popular or strictly literary efforts. Before 1790 the range of intellectual endeavors considered proper to the professorate had not narrowed to its 19th century limits, in which the ideal of academic publication would be the announcement to one's fellow specialists of the results of critical research.

Other preassumptions also helped to characterize the 18th century outlook on professorial scholarship. Consider the issue of scholarly performance from a broader perspective. During the Humboldtian era, in which the professorial ethos began first to take on its modern form, reformers urged above all else a rebirth of “creativity” in all phases of university life. Opinions about what studies and activities would actually evince “creativity” among professors varied from reformer to reformer. But despite this initial indecision, within a few decades the German academic world had reached a surprising consensus. Professorial creativity had come to mean—and usually to mean exclusively—the extension of scholarship, discovery. More important, discovery, in the only form considered proper to the professorial endeavor, had come to mean the fruit of original research, usually research of a highly esoteric and specialized nature.

German academics in the later 18th century esteemed professorial creativity no less than did their successors in the age of Ranke and Boeckh, but they perceived creativity in a far wider range of scholarly activities. In particular they refused to equate scholarly creativity with discovery alone; and, as the previous discussion indicated, they never tacitly assumed that publication would ideally embody discovery. On the contrary, theorists persistently bisected their discussions of professorial scholarship into discussions of the academic's proper activity as a writer and his activity as a discoverer of new truths. J. D. Michaelis, for example, found it completely proper to first discuss the professor's duty as a discoverer and then seventy pages later to return to his duties as a writer, with no reference to the former discussion and no suggestion that the two activities bore any necessary relation to each other.⁵⁷

This attitude toward the context of university scholarship led to the occasional debates within the writings of university theorists concerning the professor's responsibility as a “discoverer.” The authors did not

⁵⁶ Hoffbauer, *Perioden*, 178-80; also see Rössler, *Gründung*, 473-74.

⁵⁷ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 134-35.

assume discovery to be coterminous with scholarship, nor did they assume discovery itself necessarily to be the result of research. In this restricted sense nearly all theorists readily acknowledged the ideal of original discovery by professors. Meiners in his history of the German universities of 1805 noted with pride—and considerable exaggeration—that the professors of Halle had made rich contributions to scholarship. And “I can boldly claim,” he added, “that [also] among the living Göttingen scholars not a few are to be found who have broadened the horizons of human knowledge, increased the useful spheres of instruction, or improved the species of sciences.”⁵⁸ Even Michaelis was forced to admit that “the prejudice is certainly common enough which views the professor as a discoverer of new truths by virtue of his office,” and he noted that many academics cultivated this view for the sake of their own vanity.⁵⁹

But while many theorists, especially those at Göttingen, acknowledged the ideal of professorial discovery and noted with pride the universities’ achievements in this respect, none went so far as to declare discovery to be a duty inherent in the professorial post. Discovery constituted only one of many ways through which the academic could distinguish himself through his scholarship, and it was too rare an achievement to be routinely expected or to be a basis on which to evaluate one’s self and one’s colleagues. Many would have agreed with Michaelis, who delivered what perhaps approached a representative judgment on the issue of professorial discovery:

To improve the sciences and to make new discoveries is simply not the duty of a school whether it be high or low. It is rather the duty of a few fortunate geniuses, or, if one wants to have an official institution, of an academy of science. And yet the German universities have achieved so much in this regard, though it was not their obligation, that I need not say in their defense they had no such duty. A man of great genius who has ambition or impatience enough not always merely to repeat his lectures, nor to read merely bread courses, nor to overburden himself with lecture hours, never to lecture unprepared, and who is motivated by his way of life daily to immerse himself in learning, such a man can hardly fail to discover something new in his science where it is to be discovered. . . . But a school for young people does not have such a duty or purpose. The instruction of the young and the *Parte tueri* in the realm of learning is enough. Whichever of their teachers does more achieves an *opus supererogationis*, and is entitled to double honor and reward.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Meiners, *Entstehung*, IV, 372.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 92–93.

⁵⁹ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 134.

The professor regarded discovery as an academic ideal but not as a duty inherent to his post itself, defined as that post was by largely pedagogical and collegiate criteria.

This outlook received official recognition, for the Prussian government seemed to share it well into the reform era. Although the state encouraged its professors to publish, it never assumed or desired that this publication would contain scholarly discoveries. On the contrary, in a communication to the Berlin Academy of 1770 the ministry insisted that “the ultimate purpose of the universities is the instruction of youth. A professor of a university has fulfilled his office satisfactorily if he thoroughly teaches the youth what is known and discovered in his subject.” The academy of science rather than the university, the minister went on, has the responsibility of filling in the lacunae of learning. Geheimer Tribunalrat Steck, whom we have already seen criticizing the Halle professors in 1768 for their failure to publish, asserted in his visitation to Frankfurt-an-Oder in 1770 that the business of the universities is not discovery but the “service of the state and the enlightenment of the nation.” Still more pointedly, an 1802 decree to Halle from the government denied that the purpose of the university was the expansion of science as many professors believed; its purpose was rather teaching, which would lead indirectly to discovery.⁶¹

Both university theorists and the Prussian state could advance excellent reasons for their conviction that discovery could not and should not be a duty of the university. First, the efforts devoted by the professor to discovery would surely distract him from teaching, by common agreement his first responsibility. Second and more important, theorists agreed unanimously that the psychological and intellectual characteristics of the successful discoverer differed so radically from those required of the effective teacher that the two could rarely be combined in one individual. Upon this premise the Berlin academician F.A.M.G. Castillon rested his last-ditch defense of the division of labor between the university, the domain of teaching, and the academy, the center of creative scholarship. The academician, Castillon argued in his *Ueber die Begriffe einer Akademie und einer Universität*, is a creator partaking of the genius; the professor, he hinted, is a mere pedant. Only in the rarest of cases, he concluded, could the same individual belong to both institutions and simultaneously fulfill the contradictory demands of teaching and discovery.⁶² Others better disposed toward professorial scholarship than Castillon also shared this opinion, includ-

⁶¹ Bornhak, *Universitätsverwaltung*, 147.

⁶² F.A.M.G. Castillon, *Ueber die Begriffe einer Akademie und einer Universität. . . . Eine Vorlesung gehalten in der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften am 26sten October 1809* (Berlin 1809), 36–37.

R. Steven Turner

ing Ernst Brandes in his *Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Universität Göttingen*. In arguments that prefigure those of the Humboldtian reformers, Brandes urged that the professor is not merely a teacher of youth, but a scholar and a writer as well. But that professorial scholarship should be oriented toward research and discovery Brandes was not ready to admit:

A few thoughtful men set too high a criterion in judging the worth of an academic; they demand that all professors be among the foremost intellects, that all be distinctive geniuses and discoverers. Aside from the impossibility of this demand, a discoverer in individual branches of learning could be a bad professor. Aside from the gift of lecturing, which minds of this type often lack, the professor ought to embrace and to have worked out the whole of his science. This characteristic is essential; and it is completely different from the perceptiveness (*Scharfblick*), the creative spirit (*Erfindungsgeist*), and it can be combined with them occasionally but not always.

We prefer the more sufficient and in general more useful demand that the professors ought to maintain, disseminate, and where possible enlarge the treasury of human wisdom. The fundamental erudition (*Gelahrtheit*) which we demand of professors is not an un-systematic, useless learning which leads to nothing, but rather it must be directed by judgment and order . . . , an erudition which does not dissolve the powers of judgment, an erudition which can be maintained only by the greatest diligence like that which the scholars of Göttingen so excellently exemplify.⁶³

In part, theorists' unanimous faith that the intellectual attributes of the successful discoverer must differ radically from those of the teacher reflected their preassumptions about the nature of academic discovery itself. The modern academic tacitly assumes that discovery arises normally from research, that is, from the systematic application of definite scholarly techniques to some limited area of investigation for the purpose of extracting critical knowledge. The 18th century, however, did not tacitly equate academic discovery with the results of research in any formal sense. In fact the very concept of research in its familiar form seems not to have been clearly articulated before 1790, for even university theorists spoke invariably of discoveries (*Entdeckungen*) and emendations (*Verbesserungen*) in the sciences rather than research (*Forschung*). Most theorists viewed discovery as arising from sheer force of intellect, from the penetrating mind which could seize a previously unrecognized relationship, or from the powerful mind

Reformers & Scholarship in Germany

which could order a mass of learning on a new level of comprehensiveness and so extract the higher generalization. In short, discovery remained the prerogative of genius alone except in the cases when it resulted from sheer chance:

Finally, the discovery of new truths depends so very much on chance that one can scarcely establish it as someone's duty. Most discoveries are made, not because one seeks them, but rather because chance brings them into our hands, or that with one long known truth another will occur to us at just the right time, out of which a third may be concluded. In only a few cases it is within the power of the greatest genius to discover through mere diligence and continued investigation some unknown truth which one desires to know.⁶⁴

Occasionally theorists combined with this outlook on the nature of academic discovery surprisingly pessimistic views on the very possibility of new discoveries in various academic fields. J. D. Michaelis and Christoph Meiners, at least, regarded large fields of learning as essentially static. In his defense of the academic career in 1776, Meiners contrasted those sciences which are constantly in flux with "those sciences that are static and admit of no change." This distinction seemed to draw upon Michaelis, who in his *Raisonnement* had argued against the expectation of professorial discovery on the grounds that "there are in fact sciences in which one can scarcely expect the discovery of new truths." These sciences by no means included only a few isolated fields, but rather philosophy, law, theology, and by implication, much of history as well. Medicine and the natural sciences lay open to discovery, but only, Michaelis carefully pointed out, to men of innate genius. If the possibility of discovery was so restricted, if it was the mere product of chance or the monopoly of genius, then the average professor could never be a discoverer and the expansion of scholarship could not be a major duty of the university.⁶⁵

IV. CONCLUSION: THE OLD UNIVERSITIES AND THE NEW

As the mood of crisis deepened over the German university system in the decades after 1760, many thoughtful academics sensed the institutions to be approaching a historical crossroads. The sudden outpouring of hostile critiques and reform tracts probed the symptoms of university decline, including the gradual loss of the universities' once

⁶³ Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 132; also see Castillon, *Begriffe*, 29.

⁶⁴ Christoph Meiners, "Schutzschrift für den Stand und die Lebensart der Professoren," *Vermischte philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig 1776), III, 141; and Michaelis, *Raisonnement*, II, 124, 129.

preeminent leadership of Germany's intellectual and scholarly life. Critics vaguely sensed that the corporate definition of the professorial career was beginning to hamper the vigor of professorial scholarship. The centripetal, collegiate loyalties which that definition implied gave academics little incentive to participate in the rigorous modes of research and scholarly interaction rapidly emerging in many areas of German learning. Similarly, the use of collegiate and corporate criteria in appointments, so necessary to solidarity and economy, seemed simultaneously to be depriving university scholarship of needed incentive. By 1800 these considerations and many, many others had convinced academics, especially those in Prussia, that a major upheaval was imminent and inevitable. The question was, would it be university abolition or university reform, and if reform, along what lines.

The reformers and theorists who spoke for the universities proved better at diagnosing old ills than in agreeing upon a new ideal of university life. But in spite of many disagreements and differences of emphasis, they approached a consensus on the difficult issue of professorial scholarship. Publication is commendable and beneficial to the university, most agreed, but few advocated it as an absolute criterion for the professorate. Publication itself, they felt, should embrace many different kinds of literary work, including popular or didactic treatises and belles lettres, with a special premium placed on textbooks beneficial to the professor's pedagogical duties. Theorists regarded discovery as the highest, most honored achievement of scholarship; but at the same time they considered it too rare, too illusive, to form a realistic scholarly norm. These convictions set the 18th century attitude toward professorial scholarship apart from the new university ideology soon to arise in Germany in the wake of the Humboldtian reforms.

The preceding discussions give a basis for reevaluating the traditional interpretation of the 18th century universities' outlook on scholarship. That traditional view maintains that the professoriate regarded itself primarily as a teaching body. The individual academic felt no obligation by virtue of his chair to make "discoveries" or to strive for new interpretations. That imperative, the traditional view goes on, arose only in the 19th century largely under the influence of Humboldtian ideology. In support of this interpretation many university spokesmen did claim that the institutions' first duty was to teach, to prepare students for a profession, and some urged this even to the exclusion of university scholarship. No theorist claimed that discovery, as distinct from other forms of scholarly activity, could ever be regarded as a duty intrinsic to the professorate. The great emphasis placed upon creative scholarship at a university like Göttingen shows that the general-

ization cannot be applied indiscriminately to all institutions; but even at Göttingen a literary reputation had not become an absolute prerequisite for a chair by 1765. These characteristics do suggest for the university system as a whole a predominantly pedagogical conception of the professorate.

On a deeper level the preceding discussions suggest that the distinction which the traditional interpretation attempts to draw is not so much false as trivial. What distinguished the "old universities" of the later 18th century from the "new universities" of the 19th was not their differing assessments of the professoriate's obligation to learning. It was rather their different visions of scholarship itself, their very different assessments regarding of what scholarship should ideally consist. By 1835 much professorial learning had narrowed into disciplinary channels oriented toward research, discovery, and specialization. The old universities, however, would never have accepted the 19th century's tacit assumption that this approach should represent the exclusive or ideal form of scholarship. Granted their convictions about the nature of academic discovery and the potential for academic advance, they could only have regarded that assumption as wholly unrealistic and unduly restrictive. Their own vision embraced a more synthetic, more style-oriented, and in many respects more humane approach to learning. Furthermore this vision of scholarship lay deeply rooted in the institutional context of the professorate and the social patterns of scholarly interaction, both of which were to undergo substantial changes only during the early 19th century. To approach the old universities unaware of these distinctions of institutional context and academic vision means to impose upon them 19th century concepts which had no place in German academia before the Humboldtian era.

LIBRARY OF THE
CENTRAL EUROPEAN
UNIVERSITY
BUDAPEST

THE

UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY

VOLUME II

*Europe, Scotland, and the United States from
the 16th to the 20th Century*

Written under the auspices of the
Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies,
Princeton University

CONTRIBUTORS

- Richard L. Kagan Nicholas Phillipson
James McLachlan R. Steven Turner
Konrad H. Jarausch Robert L. Church
James M. McPherson

Edited by Lawrence Stone



PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS