

Richard C. Spuler

Mediating German Culture: American Germanistik at the Turn of the Century

A history of *Germanistik*—or German Studies—in America remains to be written.¹ That this history has never been properly chronicled is not surprising; the two World Wars tend to inhibit our view of an often traumatic past. However, colleagues in Germany have insisted since the 1960s that *Germanistik* needs to come to terms with its past if it is to adapt to a changing world. The history of German literary criticism and pedagogy has therefore received widespread attention there, while no such systematic studies have been undertaken here. Of course the record of the growth of German Studies in America is important, but more important still is determining how German scholars and pedagogues functioned—or believed they functioned—as mediators of German culture in America, both inside and outside the academic sphere. A full appreciation of the discipline would have to account for its situation within an expansive socio-historical context; it would need to consider, for example, its position within the American academic system, the relationship between American and German methods and schools of thought. Further, it would need to examine the pro- and anti-German sentiment in America, the social and political issues which engaged Germanists here, the links between the Germanist as academician and the nonacademic German immigrant culture. These are surely complex relationships and invite, as one observer has noted, the cooperation of cultural and political historians alike.²

This article, then, is only a prolegomenon; it intends to examine one feature of German Studies in America at a given point in history. Victor Lange helped describe this feature recently when he wrote that "In its broadest sense *Germanistik* has, in America, meant the transmission and presentation of German cultural attitudes and institutions, both social and literary, to a fairly disparate and heterogeneous, chiefly academic audience."³ The mediation of German culture inheres in the practical day-to-day existence of German Studies here. We shall look now at its function around the turn of the century.

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

A prime initiator of the movement for a Germanic Museum at the institution where he taught was Kuno Francke.⁴ Already in March, 1897, Francke and his colleagues at Harvard had sent out a general appeal for such a foundation.⁵ Its plea was based on the premise that there existed at that time "an ever-increasing disposition on the part of Americans to approach the study of German as a study leading to an insight into a great national civilization."⁶ The growth of the German department at Harvard since the 1870s was cited to support their argument. Members of the profession then believed that the modern languages, especially German, were rivaling the status of Greek and Latin within the traditional curriculum. But whereas the student of antiquity had access to documents and monuments from Greek and Roman culture, nowhere, so it was argued, did such an opportunity exist for the student of German civilization. A museum, then, was considered a desideratum for the furthering of German Studies in America. Initial overtures, however, met with only limited success. Although its authors had estimated in 1897 the minimum sum of \$10,000 for the project even to get off the ground, not more than \$4,000 were raised over the next four years, despite the personal support and urging of the German ambassador, Dr. von Holleben, in March of 1899. He spoke to a gathering at Harvard (by invitation of the noted sociologist, Hugo Münsterberg) and, after having acknowledged the attention given the study of German in America, pressed on: "Yea! resting upon the public spirit and on the prosperity of the American people, German ideals are well harbored. But, gentlemen, is it for us to fold our hands in idleness? Is not standing still equivalent to sliding backwards?"⁷ The presiding dignitaries, Münsterberg, Francke, and Hugo Schilling, also of the German department at Harvard, responded in like fashion. Francke, for instance, rejoined: "We Germans in the North must look upon ourselves as champions of German stamp in America; we must consider it our foremost duty to open the eyes of our American fellow-citizens to all that German thought has aspired to and produced in the course of centuries in industry, art, philosophy, literature, and music, and what has led to the commanding position which the German Empire, thanks be to God, occupies at the present day. The very isolation of our position simply makes an undertaking like the museum in question a patriotic duty."⁸

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

We know that if not the attention of the world, at least the eyes of one thousand and one American colleges and universities are bent upon us. All that

is done in Harvard is echoed and imitated by all the institutions in the country. This may be said of all other branches as of the study of the German language and literature; nowhere else is the history of literature, of art, and of thought studied as extensively and scientifically. . . . If we succeed in forming an institution that will bear the proper relation to teachers, there is no doubt but that in a few years Harvard will be the chief seat and central point of Germanic studies in America. That is what we have in mind.⁹

Francke, to be sure, was sincerely concerned for the well-being and prosperity of his and his colleagues' and university's reputation, interests, and affairs. But his rhetoric is conspicuous because of its base-metaphor, which remains throughout that of the German Empire. His panegyric, advocating the attainment of a "commanding position," contains muted allusions to a feature which later texts we shall examine display in much bolder relief: the notion of political aggrandizement, a core concept of doctrinal imperialism. What takes place in Francke's discourse is an *Umfunktionierung* or ideological manipulation of the German context to fit the American one. It is clear in this instance that, as another speaker on the rostrum proudly proclaimed, "Germany is our first home, England the second, and America the third."¹⁰

Despite efforts dating back to the mid-1890s, the formal opening of the Germanic Museum did not take place until 1903. In attendance were Hans Carl Günther von Jagemann and Francke of the German department, President Eliot of Harvard University, Carl Schurz, Hugo Münsterberg, and a handful of other political and scholarly dignitaries. In his introductory address, von Jagemann voiced his motives, and those of his colleagues, which first set them to contemplating the possibility of such a museum. His remarks describe *in nuce* the self-perceived role of the German culture mediators:

The project of a German Museum had its inception in the growing conviction on the part of the instructors in the Department of German, that their function was not merely to teach the German language, or even German literature, however important these might be, but to give our students a true conception of what Germany stands for in modern civilization, what her ideals have been, what she has contributed to the world's best intellectual possessions.¹¹

It is telling that von Jagemann speaks of Germany's cultural contributions as "intellectual possessions," a phrase which is particularly appropriate in light of the advent of the museum as a storehouse for these "objects," and which also suggests the "Bildung und Besitz" attitude at that time toward the assimilation of cultural tradition.¹²

What enabled the museum to open was the "imperial gift" of Emperor Wilhelm II. He sent a collection of reproductions of German sculptural monuments, "hoping," in the words of his ambassador, Baron von dem Bussche-Haddenhausen, "that they will kindle the interest and encourage in the United States the study of the sculpture of our ancestors, who, to a great extent, are your ancestors as well."¹³ While the new curators were not in a position to be selective about the materials displayed, it is important to note which monuments they considered representative or, perhaps more accurately stated, how the founders of the museum made a virtue of necessity

and acknowledged the works which they received as being significant. Holdings consisted almost exclusively of sculptural artifacts of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Karl Detlev Jessen, of Bryn Mawr, found in these works symbolic import: "Vor allem die deutsche Kunst des Mittelalters und der Renaissance mit ihren intimen Beziehungen zum Geistes- und Seelenleben der Nation, spiegelt die Religion und Weltanschauung in unverkennbarer Weise und giebt einen Schlüssel zum wahren Wesen des Deutschtums, zum Verständnisse deutscher Art und deutschen Wesens, wie kein zweites Gebiet deutscher Tätigkeit."¹⁴ Other monuments included a model of a Germanic boat found in the Nydam moor; two warrior figures, one of a Frankish soldier from around 600 B.C., and one Swiss *Landsknecht*; also a photographic history of German architecture.¹⁵ From the eleventh century were the bronze doors of the Cathedral at Hildesheim, from the thirteenth an array of sculptures from the Naumburg Cathedral. Placed at the entrance to the museum was a facsimile of the Golden Gate of the Cathedral of Freiburg. These, wrote Francke, "cannot help being a revelation to American students."¹⁶ A committee formed in Berlin, including, among others, Virchow, Mommsen, Harnack, Paulsen, Schöne, Lessing, and Wildenbruch, donated fifty-five reproductions of works of German gold-smiths and silver-smiths from the fifteenth through the eighteenth century. A gift of 10,000 books on the history of Germany and German civilization was made by Professor Archibald C. Coolidge as a memorial to the visit of Prince Henry of Prussia to Harvard in 1902. The contributions of Adolphus Busch of St. Louis and Hugo Reisinger of New York provided funds for a building. (The museum is in fact known today not as the Germanic but as the Busch-Reisinger Museum.)

Both President Eliot and Edward Robinson, the director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, greeted the museum as a deterrent to the material degeneration of the times, as a bastion of "spiritual progress."¹⁷ Kuno Francke saw one of its functions as counteracting the narrow specialization of modern scholarship, and hoped that it might ultimately embody the spirit of St. Martin, Luther, and "Schiller, the prophet of the society of the future."¹⁸

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

Wo bin ich? Wie! Aus Deutschlands Wäldern
Bin übers Weltmeer ich entrückt?

Statt Rebenhügeln, Roggenfeldern,
 Seh' ich die Flur mit Mais geschmückt?
 Und welche Laute mich umgeben!
 Wie fremd, verwirrend, fieberhaft!
 Ich fühle schauernd mich erbeben!
 Mir schwindet Sicherheit und Kraft! —
 Und doch! seh' ich nicht heimische Zeichen?
 Seh' ich nicht in die Wolken reichen
 Den Turm von Strassburgs Münsterbau?
 Seh' ich nicht Nürnbergs Dächermassen,
 Sankt Lorenz' mächtigen Doppelkurm?
 Und schimmert nicht durch enge Gassen
 Die Wunderpracht des Doms von Ulm?
 Und blicken nicht von ernsten Wänden,
 In Ritterrüstung, steinern schwer,
 Das deutsche Schwert in starken Händen,
 Mir Naumburgs Heldenbilder her?
 Und dort, der Mann im Panzerkoller,
 Auf stolzem Klepper, siegsbewusst,
 Ist's nicht der grosse Hohenzoller,
 Die Zukunft Deutschlands in der Brust?
 Ist's möglich? Hier, an fremder Welle,
 Erblüht aufs neu der Väter Ruhm?
 Hier steigt empor mit Geisterschnelle
 Ein allgermanisches Heiligtum?
 Heil dir, o Heil, du fremde Erde,
 Du neue Welt, Heil dir und Macht!
 Dein Genius ruft dir zu: "Es werde"
 Und sieh: es wird! es ist vollbracht!
 Du stürmst dahin mit Riesenschritten,
 Es weht ums Haupt dir Sternenglanz,
 Um Freiheit hast du je gestritten,
 Stolz flattert dir der Siegeskranz!
 O lass mich schweben dir zu Seite!
 Ich bringe dir des Herzens Glück!
 Aus Sturm und Drang, aus Thatenweite,
 Ruf' zu dir selbst ich dich zurück!
 Ich bringe, was im Stillen blühet,
 Den keuschen Sinn, der Treue Hort;
 Ich pflüge, was zum Mann erziehet,
 Des Wahrheitsforschers furchtlos Wort.
 O Neue Welt, Urvätersegen,
 Sei deines Volkes köstlich Teil!
 Dann spriesst empor auf deinen Wegen
 Das schönste Reis: der Menschheit Heil!¹⁹

Francke's poem provides a unique opportunity to consider the sentiments and motivations behind the celebration of the museum.²⁰ It is exceptional in two ways: first, it comes from the hand of a preeminent Germanist of the time, a significant representative of the profession; second, the circumstances of this poem suggest a serious and deliberate authorial intent. The potential for spontaneous interjections, as in commemorative addresses of the sort delivered at the opening of the museum, remains relatively lim-

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

The contact between the Germanist and the German-speaking public provides an additional point for investigation, for here the ideological subtexts are even more obvious than in the material already examined. Two texts will be cited in this instance. The first, by Karl Detlev Jessen, was addressed to the German-speaking populace in America and printed in the *Neu Yorker Staatszeitung* and the *Mississippi Blätter*; the second, by Kuno Francke, was published in the *Deutsche Rundschau*.²¹

For Jessen, the museum embodies German culture. More than that, he would have it function as a hallowed object and a somewhat intimidating admonition: "Uns Deutschen legt die Existenz dieses Museums erneut die Verpflichtungen auf, uns selber getreu zu bleiben, unserer Sprache und den heiligen Überlieferungen unseres Volkes, uns und unseren Nachkommen."²² Jessen's justifications for the museum frequently turn chauvinistic: "dass es [i.e., the German *Volk*] nicht ohne Rest sang- und klanglos in den Brei eines englischredenden Allangelsachsentums untertauchen darf" (p. 47). Jessen's aggressive rhetoric suggests an adversary. Elsewhere his remarks clearly define his position in terms of social and ideological conflict, and thus the position of his antagonist. Speaking of Schiller, he maintained: "Ein jeg-

licher Versuch, des naturwissenschaftlichen wie des historischen Materialismus, seitens jener philosophischen Barbiergesellen vom Schlage [Ludwig] Büchners oder der Marxisten (Schopenhauer ist für diese Bezeichnung verantwortlich), Schiller als den ihrigen zu reklamieren, prallt an den nackten Tatsachen ab."²³ Factual references, however, were infrequent in Jessen's discourse; instead it appealed to emotionalism and patriotism. In sum, Jessen's dialogue abounded in appellations to "die deutsche Seele" and "das deutsche Wesen," and his posture was one of ardent genuflection before the altar of German *Geist*.

The notion of *Lebensraum* dominates Francke's report: "Der deutsche Kaiser wird also, das ist nicht zu viel gesagt, der eigentliche Begründer eines amerikanischen Universitätsinstitutes werden, welches in hervorragender Weise dazu angethan ist, deutsche und amerikanische Cultur zu verschmelzen, und so zu der Verwirklichung des grossen pan-germanischen Bündnisses beizutragen, auf dem die Gewähr dauernder Leistungsfähigkeit der teutonischen Rasse in dem Kampf um die Weltherrschaft beruht."²⁴ As with Jessen, the dialogue is expressly chauvinistic and racial and, although in less excited prose, Francke likewise enshrines the German past and the sense of tradition in pseudo-religiosity: "Ich sprach nun vorher davon, dass es zu wünschen sei, dass die Deutsch-Amerikaner auch noch bessere *Deutsche* würden. Wie ist dies zu verstehen? In welcher Beziehung ist das Deutschtum in den Deutsch-Amerikanern der Steigerung bedürftig? Um es mit einem Worte auszudrücken: in der Pietät für die deutsche Vergangenheit" (p. 138). The touted "germanische Grösse" is at once spiritualized—an act that allows its arbiter to distort the unique historicity of every literary, cultural, and artistic document—and given symbolic form in the monuments and artifacts gathered within the halls of the Germanic Museum. The transformation, as Francke underscores more than once, is nothing less than the fulfillment of a spiritual calling. He speaks of "die gemeinsamen Aufgaben des Culturlebens . . . , die aber doch besonders der germanischen Rasse durch ihre ganze Vergangenheit als heiligster Beruf vorgezeichnet sind: die Arbeit für echte Humanität, Geistesfreiheit, sociale Gerechtigkeit und friedlichen Fortschritt" (p. 145).

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

Marion Dexter Learned delivered the presidential address, "Volkserzie-

hung und Weltpolitik," at the 30th congress of the *Nationaler Deutschamerikanischer Lehrerbund*.²⁵ Learned opened his speech by broaching the topic of world literature and national enmity. He referred to Goethe's remarks made to Eckermann about his indifference toward the German uprising against the French, 1812-1815 (Goethe justified his stance by noting his inability to hate the nation which had contributed so much to his education), and further by acknowledging his sense of cosmopolitanism. Goethe's correspondence with Thomas Carlyle in 1827, Learned pointed out, described *Weltliteratur* as the best means for eliminating national antipathy. Learned found in Goethe's disposition "die Lösung des grossen Weltproblems, des Weltfriedens und des Fortschritts, und es ist die Aufgabe der Volkserziehung, zur Lösung dieser Aufgabe beizutragen" (p. 2). He saw pedagogues entrusted with a tremendous responsibility: to educate their students toward achieving the salvation of world peace. As Learned phrased it: "Mit einem Worte, der Schulmeister—sei er Volksschullehrer oder Universitätsprofessor—ist dazu berufen, die Jugend nicht nur für das Alltagsleben des Bürgers, sondern auch für die richtige Auffassung seiner Pflicht als Weltbürger heranzubilden" (p. 2). In the cosmopolitan spirit espoused by Goethe, Learned advanced what he saw as a fundamental pedagogical maxim. (A larger context for Learned's—typical—position is given by national educators of the time. In the 1890s, the N.E.A.'s Committee of Ten recommended a rigorous academic program for schools aimed at solid intellectual training, with considerable attention awarded to the study of history. In 1911, the N.E.A.'s Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College urged instead the fostering of good citizenship and vocational training, while the subject of history received short shrift.²⁶ Learned's address, in 1900, anticipated the later position.)

Learned took the notion of *Weltbürgertum* as his premise and then proceeded to contradict it repeatedly. His introduction and the remainder of the speech are so unequivocally at odds that the whole must attest to a good, if unfortunately perverted, faith, and the antinomy suggests a subtext which reconciles, in Learned's mind and in that of his contemporaries, the ambivalence apparent to today's reader. We can summarize the essential arguments of Learned's speech. He maintains that in the course of history peoples sustain themselves "durch Kämpfe und Verträge." Some conflicts of interest, however, can only be solved by war (such as between France and Prussia in 1870). The causes of war are cultural differences and economic interests. Every nation strives to maintain and expand its national character as well as its trade and industry in foreign countries. Change (implied is a shift of power) is equated with progress: individuals may not stand still but must be strong or succumb to the maelstrom of history. America's position among the world powers at the end of the nineteenth century exemplifies its successful participation in world-historical progress: "So waren wir ein grosses Volk, eine grosse Nation geworden, ohne dessen völlig bewusst zu sein."²⁷ The Spanish-American War and the Manila conflict gave America an unexpected role in world politics. Accusations of imperialism and militarism could be heard (Learned hears them as the voices of conservatives, not liberals), but calls this a misunderstanding and in fact approves of this description of America's growth. *Volkserziehung* and German-Americans

in general must perceive their task in this historic role in world culture. In the future, all nations must work toward the common goal of civilization.

When discussing Francke's poem about the German Muse, I wrote of his appropriation of rhetoric from the political sphere. Here the well-spring is military strategy. Learned begins his address with an appeal to a Goethean cosmopolitanism, but the discussion soon turns to the nature and substance of war, and Learned shows himself ultimately in favor of this "inevitable" phenomenon. His assessment that the United States "suddenly met with war" against Spain disguises rather than clarifies the causes of war. Similarly, he credits "fate" with the responsibility for leading America into world politics: "Das Schicksal hatte uns ganz unerwartet in die Weltpolitik eingeführt, und wir standen plötzlich ein Elementarvolk, eine Riesenmacht vor den staunenden Grossmächten der Welt da. . . . Das Schicksal (sage man vielleicht besser unsere Kulturbestrebungen) hat uns gelehrt, wir müssen gehorsam folgen" (pp. 4, 5). Here Learned's address sounds like an anticipation of the notorious German General Friedrich von Bernhardi's *Germany and the Next War* (1912), where he wrote for example that "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization."²⁸ Linguistically, it is telling that Learned uses America not as the subject of the sentence, but frequently as the object ("Das Schicksal hatte uns . . .," "Der Maischuss vor Manila gab uns die Philippinen in die Hand," p. 4). This usage typifies a mentality which refuses to admit of personal responsibility. Transgressions are authorless, and war is seen more as the agency of the *Weltgeist* than of real social and economic interests.

Learned could justify the policy of cultural expansionism because, within his purview, conflicts were seen as inevitable; more than that, they presented an opportunity to prove one's mettle. To call the "change of fortunes" in war by the neutral term *Wechsel* displaces the agency of such maneuvers. Battle becomes a brand of cultural Darwinism, a survival of the fittest, with its equation of rationalization being the adage "might makes right." It was, Learned maintained, a question of yielding to the *Weltgeist*. This legitimized the hunger for conquest. At this point, Learned's prosody grows apocalyptic: "Schon dieser Tage gewährt uns das Schicksal einen Blick in die dunkle Zukunft, für die es uns vorbereitet. Die altmongolische Halbkultur muss erobert werden und vor dem heranschwellenden Strom der höheren Zivilisation weichen" (p. 5). Bernhardt echoed: "Without war, inferior or decaying races would easily choke the growth of healthy budding elements, and a universal decadence would follow."²⁹

In this distorted and hyperbolic scheme of world relations, the educator takes on messianic dimensions. Learned's argumentation makes the German teacher the proprietor of a monumental *Weltrolle*: "Als Volkserzieher und besonders als Deutschamerikaner und deutschamerikanische Lehrer erblicken wir in dieser neuen Rolle in der Weltkultur eine neue, höhere Aufgabe. Der Schulmeister darf sich nicht länger begnügen damit, im alten Wirkungskreis sein tägliches Brot zu verdienen und seine Schüler lehren, das Gleiche zu thun" (p. 5). We see, then, how the function—more appropri-

ately, the "duty"—of the mediators of German culture in America was viewed as seminal, as uncompromisingly urgent. And I find it telling that, as if in response to Learned's hyperbole, the next issue of *Monatshefte* (1900) follows this presidential address with a clarification of "Die nationale Aufgabe des Deutschamerikanischen Lehrerbundes." It is clearly intended to pique moribund educators out of lethargy:

Warum spielt unser Bund eine so klägliche Rolle im Vergleich zu dem, was er leisten sollte und könnte? Weil wir unsere Aufgabe nie zu Ende gedacht, und weil es uns an überlegenen Führern gebricht, denen die Erreichung unserer Ziele mehr als Nebensache wäre. Was entbehren wir am meisten? Das philosophische Bewusstsein und den Willen zur That. . . . Was jetzt im Volke nur ein Scheinleben führt, wird erst dann in Fleisch und Blut übergehen, wenn man allerorten den Anfang des deutschen Unterrichts ins zarteste Kindesalter verlegt. Wer dieses leugnet, gehört nicht zu uns, mag er immerhin der gefeiertste Professor der deutschen Sprache sein. . . . Zur Beherrschung des amerikanischen Schulwesens ist jedoch die Sicherstellung des Seminars nur der erste Schritt. . . . Nicht im Gründen neuer Schulen besteht unsere fernere Aufgabe, sondern im Erobern der schon vorhandenen.³⁰

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

In the first issue of *Die Pädagogischen Monatshefte* in 1899, the publication outlined its intent:

Alles, was dem deutschamerikanischen Lehrer als solchem am Herzen liegen muss, soll in diesem Blatte Berücksichtigung finden. An der ebenso grossen als schönen Aufgabe, die deutsche Sprache und Litteratur und mit diesen den deutschen Geist nicht nur denen zu erhalten, die sie von ihren Eltern ererbt haben, sondern ihnen ein immer grösseres Gebiet zu erobern, wollen wir unentwegt festhalten, in der Ueberzeugung, dass sie fruchtbringend auf die Entwicklung unserer grossen Nation und auf die Bildung ihres Volkscharakters wirken müssen (p. 2).

Importance is given to the development of a fit and cultivated citizenry. In 1899, M. D. Learned wrote of pedagogues as ambassadors: "It is, after all, the teachers of America who are the medium of cultural intercourse and friendly feeling between Germany and America."³¹ Learned's formulation is relatively tepid. Less timorous was Carl Beck, who maintained that ". . . die junge Studentenschaft ist auch in Amerika für das Ideale viel empfänglicher als man im alten Vaterlande glauben will. Es hängt alles nur von denen ab, welche das hohe Evangelium predigen."³² This phraseology points to a common attitude, which Julius Goebel extended to its logical conclusion: "Ich habe schon vorher bemerkt, dass sich die Erhaltung der Sprache und der idealen Güter unseres Volkstums³³ nicht spielend erreichen lässt in fremder Umgebung, sie bedeutet Arbeit, Hingebung, Opfer.³⁴ Und diese ihrem Volkstum zu leisten, fällt den berufenen—es gibt auch unberu-

fene—Vertretern der deutschen Sprache und Literatur an unsern amerikanischen Universitäten, fällt den gebildeten Lehrern des Deutschen in den niederen Schulen, fällt den deutschen Predigern aller Konfessionen, ja allen gebildeten Deutschen zu."³⁵ That Goebel's description should begin with an elitist conception of the professor or instructor of German and end with the image of the minister is, given our previous experience, not surprising. The presentation approaches the pitch of the Germanic Museum celebration. But its implications affect more directly the teacher of the German language and literature. As Goebel later stated:

. . . den unbestechlichen Wahrheitssinn des deutschen Geistes, seine sittlichen Kräfte und seine Liebe zum Schönen der werdenden Nation einzupflanzen, ist unser höchster deutscher Beruf in Amerika. Ihm aber bleiben wir am treuesten, wenn wir die heilige Quelle hüten, aus der uns diese Güter zugeflossen sind, die Mutterprache:

Pflegt die deutsche Sprache,
Hegt das deutsche Wort,
Denn die Gunst der Väter,
Lebt darinnen fort.³⁶

Goebel's attitude is indicative of the stance toward cultural tradition: it was, as we have seen elsewhere, uniformly deified, and it reflected a "Bildung und Besitz" mentality. The pedagogical consequence of this view is a rigorously authoritarian role for the teacher of German. Adolf Spaeth wrote in 1900:

Wodurch hat Deutschland in diesem Jahrhundert seine Weltstellung wieder gewonnen? Vor allem durch Einordnung aller individuellen Kräfte in das allgemeine Beste durch die stramme Disziplin, die den Einzelnen Gehorsam lehrt, nicht bloss als ein hartes unausweichliches Muss, sondern auf Grund seiner eigenen innersten Überzeugung: Das Wohl des Vaterlandes, und wenn es das Opfer fordert von jedem Einzelnen, ich bin willens und bereit es zu bringen. . . . Wenn wir Männer haben wollen, die das Leiten verstehen, müssen wir eine Jugend haben, die sich leiten lässt, die in den Jahren ihrer Unmündigkeit einer liebevollen verständigen Autorität eine vertrauensvolle Pietät entgegenbringt.³⁷

But was there indeed another justification for "the study of the traditions of this sturdy race," other than "the presence in our population of 19,000,000 Americans in whose veins German blood flows?"³⁸ The rise of America's world-historical star, as Learned outlined it, worked as a feeder for the German ideology: the success of America's future would seem to depend on its assimilation of the German *Geist*. Goebel knew that behind his office "steht die Ahnung oder die bewusste Erkenntnis, dass nur der deutsche Geist dem zum Höchsten aufstrebenden amerikanischen Volke Befreiung bringen und den rechten Weg zur Weiterentwicklung zeigen kann."³⁹

An important question remains: Can one discern, behind the rhetorical veneer, what interests American *Germanistik* sought to serve? Was it perhaps as simple as Calvin Thomas expressed it: "And is it not rather a comforting thought that in simply living the larger social life, in recognizing its obligations and responding loyally and cheerfully to their call, we are

working steadily in our own interest?"⁴⁰ I do not think so. An answer, I believe, can be found in M. D. Learned's "Germanistik und schöne Litteratur in Amerika" of 1901.⁴¹ Learned was interested, like many of his colleagues, in cultivating a knowledge of the relationship of German and English-speaking literatures.⁴² He sought to establish a connection between German influence in the field of scholarship and American *belles lettres*. Despite the vast and influential German element in the United States, Learned was constrained to state that there existed "eine erstaunlich weite Kluft zwischen den Philologen und den zeitgenössischen Schriftstellern, ich will nicht sagen Dichtern, in Amerika."⁴³ He complained of "verderbliche Tendenzen" in American literature, blaming rapid industrial development, neglect of the liberal arts, the sensationalism and provincial perspective of the newspaper business, an insatiable hunger for the short story, and the lack of high ideals and critical perception such that "die litterarische Kritik der Gegenwart bei uns hinter der ersten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts zurücksteht" (p. 105). History teaches, according to Learned, that the most fruitful epochs of literary activity have their origin in foreign literature, for the contact with the life and culture of a foreign people stimulates literary production by widening perspective and providing native poets with new themes and forms. At this juncture Learned specifies how *Germanistik* is to serve as a model for American literature, chiefly since America had not had a classical period.

Learned stresses five points: 1) that classical *exempla* like Goethe and Schiller combined the best of antiquity and the modern spirit; 2) that *Germanistik* has "eine wissenschaftliche Methode und litterarhistorische Kritik, was bekanntlich den Engländern wie den Amerikanern in den letzten Jahrzehnten beinahe gänzlich gefehlt"; 3) "die Germanistik führt zu einer kulturgeschichtlichen Auffassung des einheitlichen Stoffes, der litterarischen Momente der Nationalgeschichte und des Volkslebens"; 4) *Germanistik*, German literature in particular, leads to an understanding and appreciation of classical forms; 5) *Germanistik* lays the groundwork for an "ästhetische Volkserziehung" reminiscent of Schiller's work on the aesthetic education of mankind. In sum, Germanists in America were not only to motivate students to pursue research within *Germanistik*, but to impart to them, and through them to the American people, a deeper knowledge of German literature and the relations of German and American culture, "und so mit zu arbeiten an der Entwicklung einer wahrhaft nationalen Litteratur in Amerika."⁴⁴

Learned's comments are of interest not so much because he interprets *Germanistik* as a kind of cure-all for the malaise of American literature as he saw it, but because of its claim to scientific and methodological soundness, because of its concern for the national element of both literatures, because of the pedagogical implications of *Germanistik* as a format for "ästhetische Volkserziehung," and finally because of his repeated emphasis on the central role of German Classicism within *Germanistik*.⁴⁵ In yet another sense, then, we find *Germanistik* in America of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries impelled by an intrepid sense of mission, be it in the mediation of German culture or in the rehabilitation of one aspect of American culture.

At the outset of this article I mentioned several aspects for which a full appreciation of the discipline, viewed within an expansive socio-historical context, would need to account. To urge speculative responses to these many questions here would not prove satisfactory. However, I would conjecture about some additional concerns which my investigation suggests more immediately. When reading the names of such "stellar" Germanists at the turn of the century as Francke, Goebel, Learned and others, all more or less singing the praise of *deutsches Volkstum* in a manner abundantly clear and disturbingly suggestive, one may wonder indeed: What kind of influence did these leading scholars really have on the remaining hundreds of German teachers of the time? Were they all equally supportive of the opinions held by the outstanding scholars in their field? While I do not command over sufficient pertinent sociological data to make conclusive remarks in this regard (it is questionable whether such evidence even exists), I would surmise that a significant uniformity obtained within the profession at large. To substantiate this claim, I would point to the celebration of the centenary of Schiller's death in 1905. Ceremonies were held throughout the nation then, and many prominent Germanists (among them Francke, Goebel, and Learned) figured among the key speakers. Several of the addresses are reprinted in the *German American Annals* of 1905,⁴⁶ and they reveal a collective conformity with regard to the kind of proselytizing already observed. I would maintain that the absence of dissimilar receptions of Schiller in 1905 suggests a homogeneous constitution within the ranks of the academic institution (and perhaps beyond).⁴⁷ In addition, when simply reading the volumes of *Monatshefte* prior to the First World War,

. . . we shall be struck by the curious mixture in almost every issue, of labored pedantry and the unquestioned assumption that the teaching of German should be motivated by a passionate and unswerving attachment to the values—political, philosophical and literary—that were then held in Germany: pride in the German imperial power, reverence for the idealism which German artists and thinkers appeared to defend against all corrosion of public and private life by the alien forces of materialism and, most emphatically, the example which this sum of superior aspiration offered for the missionary work of American teachers of German.⁴⁸

With the onset of World War I, German Studies in America suffered, I would further argue, precisely because of its widespread allegiance to this kind of propagation of German ideals. The anti-German reaction incited by the war brought about a significant caesura in the long tradition of German-American cultural relations. Jeffrey Sammons suggests that this discontinuity (it is of course repeated in World War II) profoundly affected the state of *Germanistik* in America. For one, it meant the loss of more than one generation of *American* Germanists, positions later filled largely by emigrants from the 1930s. For another, the repeated discontinuities forced upon the profession by external events have had the cumulative effect of subverting our sense of the (actual) long-standing cultural interchange, even and especially as it took place within German Studies in America, with the result—as I noted at the beginning of this essay—that a history of *Germanistik* in America still remains to be written.⁴⁹

Finally, one other compelling association needs to be addressed, namely: Did the tenor of scholarly work within American *Germanistik* parallel its German model-counterpart in the latter's incorporation of Nazi ideology, as it clearly did the ideology of Wilhelminian Germany? To the reader of the 1980s, the obviously racist and chauvinistic attitudes displayed so blatantly by our professional forerunners (as examined here around the turn of the century) make easy the perhaps hasty inference of proto-fascism. After all, cultural and political ideologies were common in the late nineteenth century. To pursue this particular ideological genealogy is speculative and—worse yet—perhaps even aberrant. The connection, however, does certainly warrant investigating. In this regard, one might consider the words of Ernst Bloch, who suggested that "Werke des Überbaus"—and here one can include ideologies as well—"auch nach Wegfall ihrer gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen im Kulturbewusstsein sich fortschreitend reproduzieren."⁵⁰ Perhaps future studies will document the viability of Bloch's proposition for other chapters in the history of *Germanistik* in America.

University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Notes

1. I am aware of a few isolated studies in progress, but on the whole a professional self-assessment tracing the development of *Germanistik* in America from its origins to its present state is sorely lacking. See R. Spuler, "A Study of 'Germanistik' in America: The Reception of German Classicism, 1870-1905," Diss. The Ohio State University 1980.

2. See Victor Lange, "Thoughts in Season," *German Studies in the United States: Assessment and Outlook*, eds. Walter F. W. Lohnes and Valters Nollendorfs (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1976), pp. 5-16, especially pp. 12-13.

3. Lange, pp. 7-8.

4. Francke wrote on the reception of German culture in the New England area:

Ich selber fühlte es als eine Notwendigkeit, wenn das von mir vertretene Fach sich gegenüber dem alles überwiegenden englischen und französischen Einfluss dauernd behaupten sollte. In den dreizehn Jahren meines Harvard'er Aufenthaltes hatte ich trotz alles persönlichen Wohlwollens doch immer aufs neue und immer deutlicher empfunden, wie fremd meine Umgebung im Grunde allem gegenüberstand, was mich im Innersten bewegte. Die deutsche Literatur selbst in ihren grössten Vertretern blieb dem durchschnittlichen Neuengländer schliesslich doch etwas innerlich Fernes; von deutscher Kunst wusste er überhaupt nichts; und deutsche Politik erschien ihm mehr oder weniger verdächtig. Aber selbst so hochstehende und weitsehende Vertreter feinsten Kultur, wie der geistvolle Ruskin-Bewunderer Charles Eliot Norton oder der scharfsinnige Hegelianer Josiah Royce, verhielten sich deutschen literarischen und künstlerischen Leistungen gegenüber im wesentlichen ablehnend. Die einzigartige Grösse der deutschen Musik wurde anerkannt, aber im übrigen wurde das Formlose, Sprunghafte, Übertriebene, Sentimentale des deutschen Charakters hervorgehoben und gegenüber der massvollen Feinheit des Franzosen und der weltmännischen Kraft des Engländers als etwas Minderwertiges empfunden. Dieser Voreingenommenheit gegen deutsches Wesen hoffte ich nun durch die Errichtung einer Art von Heiligtum des deutschen Geistes, in dem das Beste deutscher Kunst, wenn auch nur in Nachbildungen, vereinigt werden sollte, entgegenzuwirken. (Kuno Francke, *Deutsche Arbeit in Amerika. Erinnerungen von Kuno Francke* [Leipzig: Meiner, 1930], p. 41.)

One can understand why Francke spoke of his work as a cultural mediator as "Pionierarbeit für deutsche Geisteskultur," p. 19.

5. "The Need of a Germanic Museum," *The Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, 5 (1896/97), 356-60; also reprinted in Louis Viereck, "German Instruction in American Schools," *U.S. Bu-*

reau of Education. *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-01* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1902), pp. 679-81.

6. "The Need of a Germanic Museum," p. 357.

7. See Viereck, p. 680.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 682.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 682-83.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 684.

11. See *German American Annals*, NS 2 (1904), 4.

12. See Herbert Marcuse's "Affirmative Character of Culture" on this topic:

For the common man it [art] has been confined to museums for at least a century. The museum was the most suitable place for reproducing in the individual withdrawal from facticity and the consolation of being elevated to a more dignified world—an experience limited by temporal restriction to special ceremonies. This museum-like quality was also present in the ceremonious treatment of the classics, where dignity alone was enough to still all explosive elements. What a classic writer or thinker did or said did not have to be taken too seriously, for it belonged to another world and could not come into conflict with this one. (*Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, trans. Jeremy Shapiro [Boston: Beacon, 1968], p. 131.)

13. See *German American Annals*, NS 2 (1904), 9.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

15. About which Jessen boasted: "wie vielseitig und reich an Ausdrucksformen ist sie [i.e., German *Baukunst*], verglichen etwa mit der englischen Architektur," *ibid.*, p. 52.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

17. Our contemporary perception of statements like these has changed since Marcuse's exposé of such "spiritualization." He wrote (*Negations*, p. 95):

By affirmative culture is meant that culture of the bourgeois epoch which led in the course of its own development to the segregation from civilization of the mental and spiritual world as an independent realm of value that is also considered superior to civilization. Its decisive characteristic is the assertion of a universally obligatory, eternally better and more valuable world that must be conditionally affirmed: a world essentially different from the factual world of the daily struggle for existence, yet realizable by every individual for himself 'from within,' without any transformation of the state of fact. It is only in this culture that cultural activities and objects gain that value which elevates them above the every day sphere. Their reception becomes an act of celebration and exaltation.

18. *German American Annals*, NS 2 (1904), 20.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

20. John Walz, *Books Abroad*, 5 (1931), 5, speaks of Francke, "the poet":

Francke was a German poet of no mean power. His poems, all lyrical, show beauty of diction, rhythm, nobility of thought and warmth of feeling. Poetic inspiration seems to have come to him only in moments of great joy or deep sorrow. Some of his finest poems were inspired by the suffering of the German people during and after the war. He had the artistic temperament which shrinks from conflict and yields to the feeling of the moment, with all the childlikeness and loveliness of the true artist.

21. Jessen's article is reprinted in the *German American Annals*, NS 2 (1904), 44-58; Francke, "Deutsche Cultur in den Vereinigten Staaten und das Germanische Museum der Harvard Universität," *Deutsche Rundschau*, 111 (1902), 127-45.

22. *German American Annals*, NS 2 (1904), 58.

23. Jessen, "Schillerrede," *German American Annals*, NS 3 (1905), 185.

24. *Deutsche Rundschau*, 111 (1902), 127.

25. See *Monatshefte*, 1, No. 9 (1900), 2-6.

26. See Francis FitzGerald, *America Revised* (Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown, 1979), pp. 168-70.

27. *Monatshefte*, 1, No. 9 (1900), 4.

28. Quoted in *The Traditions of the Western World*, eds. J. H. Hexter et al. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967), p. 776.

29. *The Traditions of the Western World*, p. 776.

30. H. M. Ferren, *Monatshefte*, 2, No. 1 (1900/01), 7-10.

31. Quoted in Handschin, "The Teaching of Modern Languages in the United States," *U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 3* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1913), p. 46.

32. Beck, "Schiller und die alten deutschen Studenten," *German American Annals*, NS 3 (1905), 290-91.

33. The tautology in Goebel's argumentation becomes evident when he states a few pages later: "Wir haben ein Recht auf die Bewahrung unseres Volkstums nur auf Grund seiner idealen Güter." See J. Goebel, *Das Deutschtum in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika* (Munich: Lehmann, 1904), p. 84. Significantly, the volume is edited and published by the *Alldeutscher Verband*, and is dedicated to the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt.

34. See Gunter Reiss, *Materialien zur Ideologiegeschichte der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft. Von Wilhelm Scherer bis 1945* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973), I, xxxv: "Hermeneutische 'Kunst' und wissenschaftliches Verhalten erscheinen als ideologisches Instrumentarium: die 'hingebende Liebe zur Arbeit,' die 'pflichtgemässe Zucht, die uns zum Dienst für das Ganze erzog und damit zu Herren unser selbst machte' [Gustav Roethe], sind nicht nur literaturwissenschaftliche Tugenden."

35. Goebel, *Das Deutschtum*, p. 79.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 84. The verse stems from F. C. Castelhun, of whom Goebel said "unter den lebenden deutsch-amerikanischen Dichtern . . . fraglos der bedeutendste," p. 72. One wonders if the inevitable conclusion of Goebel's view is the later (1914) diatribe of Houston-Stewart Chamberlain: "Was wir deutsch nennen, ist das Geheimnis, wodurch es den Menschen Licht wird, und das Organ dieses Lichtwerdens ist die Sprache. Durch nichts lasse ich mich irremachen; dieser Sprache ist gewiss der Sieg bestimmt! . . . Deswegen muss der Deutsche— und mit ihm das Deutsche—siegen; und hat er gesiegt—heut oder in hundert Jahren, das Muss bleibt das gleiche—, so gibt es keine einzige Aufgabe, die so wichtig wäre wie diese, die deutsche Sprache der Welt aufzuzwingen." Quoted in Werner Ross, "Die Stellung der deutschen Sprache in der Welt," *Nationalismus in Germanistik und Dichtung: Dokumente des Germanistentages in München vom 17.-22. Oktober 1966*, eds. Benno von Wiese and Rudolf Hens (Berlin: Schmidt, 1967), p. 22.

37. Spaeth, "Der deutsche Pädagog in Amerika," *Monatshefte*, 1, No. 8 (1900), 17.

38. M. D. Learned, quoted in Viereck, p. 612.

39. *Das Deutschtum*, p. 78.

40. Thomas, *Culture and Service. An Address Delivered at the Sixtieth Annual Commencement of the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1904), p. 13.

41. See *Monatshefte*, 2, No. 3 (1900/01), 97-101.

42. Others included A. R. Hohlfeld and Camillo von Klenze. See for example Hohlfeld's "Der Literaturbetrieb in der Schule," *Monatshefte*, 3, No. 2 (1901/02), 46-53; No. 3 (1901/02), 73-85.

43. *Monatshefte*, 2, No. 3 (1900/01), 104.

44. Learned makes these points on pp. 106-07.

45. For the larger aspects of this final point, see the reference in note 1.

46. See *German American Annals*, NS 3 (1905), 177-90; 191-201; 207-17; 218-33; also *German American Annals*, NS 4 (1906), 180-92.

47. Moreover, Schiller's reception is paradigmatic of the assimilation of German Classicism by American *Germanistik* at the turn of the century. See R. Spuler, "American *Germanistik* and German Classicism: A Nineteenth Century Exchange," *Germans in America: Aspects of German-American Relations in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. E. Allen McCormick (forthcoming).

48. Lange, "Thoughts in Season," p. 11.

49. That the immediate effect of World War I on *Germanistik* in America was both swift and drastic can be seen in the retrospective account by a Germanist himself, Edwin Zeydel, in 1928:

Einem Überblick über die Ergebnisse der letzten neun Jahre amerikanischer Forschung auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte müssen einige erklärende Bemerkungen zur Orientierung derer, die mit den amerikanischen Verhältnissen nicht vertraut sind, vorausgeschickt werden. Als Amerika auf Seiten der alliierten Mächte in den Weltkrieg eintrat, verkündete es durch seinen Präsidenten die hohen Ideale, die es angeblich vertrat, leitete aber gleichzeitig einen Propagandafeldzug ein, nicht nur gegen den deutschen Militarismus und das deutsche Kaisertum, ja selbst gegen die deutsche Literatur und Sprache. Dieser Feldzug, der unter dem Deckmantel der *public information* vor sich ging, wurde äusserst geschickt geführt. Inseheim unterstützten die Behörden und Regierungsvertreter alle unfreundlichen Massnahmen aufs nachhaltigste, amtlich allerdings

überliessen sie sie der Tagespresse und den vielen Patriotenverbänden. . . . Der Feldzug gegen den Deutschen hatte schliesslich das Ergebnis, dass die deutsche Sprache nicht nur als Lehrfach in den öffentlichen Schulen, sondern auch als Umgangssprache verboten wurde. Diese engherzigen, gehässigen Verfügungen seitens gereifter, verantwortungsvoller Menschen werden leider stets ein Schandfleck auf Amerikas Ehre, ein beredtes Zeugnis für das geistige Niveau der Vereinigten Staaten am Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts bleiben. (Zeydel, "Die germanistische Tätigkeit in Amerika 1918-1926," *Euphorion*, 20 [1928], 239-40.)

For comparison, see also Zeydel, "The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present," *Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages* (New York: MLA, 1961), pp. 285-308; especially pp. 298-99.

50. Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1959), p. 176. See also Wolfgang Emmerich, *Germanistische Volkstumsideologie. Genese und Kritik der Volksforschung im Dritten Reich* (Tübingen: Tübinger Verein für Volkskunde, 1968), passim.

