

*Hist. Sci.*, xxvii (1989)

## ON THE DIALECTICAL ORIGINS OF THE RESEARCH SEMINAR

**William Clark**

*Columbia University*

Like the medieval scholastics, we modern researchers are not only a product of the university, but also produce knowledge most essentially through it and its agencies. This marks a point of contrast with those who came between the medievals and us: those of the Early Modern Era. For the intellectuals of that era, let us say, for those who lived during the period from 1500 to 1800, the university did not possess the authority which the medievals and we accord it. One need not read esoteric articles to know that many of the most luminous figures of the Scientific Revolution, and especially the Enlightenment, held the university in low esteem, even reviled it. The Early Modern Era was the great age of private societies and sovereign academies, which set out to usurp the university's position. Measured against these modern societies and academies, the university seemed a hopelessly benighted and obscurantist medievalism.

It was, of course, in the 'reactionary' Germanies after 1789, where and when the university recovered its medieval status, as the ultimate instance of authority over knowledge. The conjunction of numerous factors — to name but a few: aristocratic conservatism, obsessive francophobia, speculative idealism, intellectual romanticism, the ideologies of *Kultur* and *Bildung* — played a part in this. Tradition also mattered. The Germanies were, after all, the land of universities. By 1789 almost fifty universities yet clung to an ignoble existence there. Since most of them resided within out-of-the-way and sleepy small towns, their abolition seemed, on the whole, more trouble than it was worth. Except for rare cases, the German intellectual had remained, thus, ever the provincial academic, a rustic out of place in the new world of the salon. You could detect him not only by his unfashionable attire, but also by the pedantic, professorial air always about him.<sup>1</sup> (So very many German academics were pastors' sons; the 'sermon' underlay most of their discursive practices.) However, after the collapse of the *ancien régime*, both the bureaucratic state and civil society in the Germanies found sudden virtue in these pastoral intellectuals, and collaborated with them in the university's restoration.

The modern university, restored to its medieval position of authority, was no longer the scholastic university of the Corporate State, but rather the

‘research university’ of the Bureaucratic State. The research university, at least in its nineteenth century form, was a creation of state and society in the Germanies.<sup>2</sup> This essay concerns one of the research university’s institutions: the seminar. As background, a few more words on the university itself come first.

The distant origins of the research university lie in the course taken by Humanism and the Protestant Reformation in the Germanies. The collegiate university disappeared then in the Germanies. While the opposite was happening in England, in the Germanies residence in the university colleges and hostels began to fall off late in the fifteenth century.

I remember that in days gone by ..., students were as decorous as so many angels; but now they run wild, ... and are all minded to dwell in the Town  
....

The Masters at Leipsic [*sic*] bitterly lament the scarcity of scholars. It is the Poets [i.e. the Humanists] that do them this hurt. Even when students are sent by their parents to hostels and colleges, they will not stay there, but are off to the Poets to learn stuff and nonsense .... [Thus], we cannot make a living. Students no longer will dwell in Hostels under Magisters .... And thus the universities throughout all Germany are minished and brought low.<sup>3</sup>

The Protestant Reformation completed the evacuation. Scholars, unless constrained, forsook the monastic order of the hostels and colleges for life amongst the burghers. The masters soon followed. It was not the German universities, but rather the scholastic mentality that was minished and brought low.

This social transformation, the crumbling of the collegiate university, inhered within a broader socio-juridical transformation, the dissolution of the corporate university under the German police-state (*Policey-Staat*) of the *ancien régime*. During this long night under the *ancien régime*, the German university slept through the liquidation of its collegial bodies and corporate autonomies. German ministers of state put in long hours then. They cultivated a new ethos of academic labour. *Industrie* became the watchword. All this laid the essential ideological and organizational bases for the emergence of the nineteenth century research university, whose bureaucratic and industrial ‘institutes’ replaced the archaic and shiftless bodies of the collegial and corporate university.<sup>4</sup>

In so far as the modern research university traces its ancestry to this German creation, an analysis of the origins of the research institute in the Germanies ought be of interest.<sup>5</sup> Alongside the research laboratory as university institute,

the research seminar embodies a Germanic institution descended from such collegial and corporate dissolution in the Early Modern Era. I shall not worry about the research laboratory as university institute. I write here about the origins of the research seminar as institute.

The notion of the university research institute, and the seminar style of teaching, emerged in an unlikely place: the institutes for classical philology, the *seminaria philologica*, founded between 1738 and 1838. Though the historiography of these philology seminars began in the eighteenth century, the first and only work dealing with the origin of the seminar in general appeared in 1913.<sup>6</sup> Since then I know of little written on the origins of the research seminar, until the 1970s. A detailed, general study seems, however, still lacking.<sup>7</sup>

This essay provides such a general study. It traces the development in the Early Modern Era of four institutions (the *cathedra*, the *collegium*, the seminary, and the society) which first filled, then extended the social and intellectual space left void upon the evacuation of the medieval colleges in the Germanies. On the basis of these four institutions, the essay then analyses the structure and evolution of the philology seminar, from 1738 to 1838, as the original site of the research seminar. The essay thus provides a reconstruction of the medieval and early modern academic institutions from whose synthesis the research seminar of the Modern Era arose. But I intend to give as well a socio-political characterization of the origins and nature of the research seminar.

Consequent upon the disintegration of the medieval corporate state, two seemingly antithetical social spheres emerged in the Early Modern Era. These were the opposing domains of public interest and private interest, the disjoint spheres of *Staat* (state) and *Gesellschaft* (civil society). In the socio-political space of these post-medieval antitheses — *Staat* and *Gesellschaft*, the public and the private — I shall trace the dialectical development of the research seminar. But do not take this merely as an institutional analysis in the guise of German political philosophy. For we shall concern ourselves as well with the relation of these antitheses to the development of modern science's personality system.

If individuals both create and are created by social institutions, then we need ask not only: what kind of institution is the research seminar? But also: what sort of *persona* produced and is produced by the institutions of research science, in particular by the seminar? In other words: who or what is the researcher? Enmeshed by the new socio-political nexus of *Staat* and *Gesellschaft*, bound by the dialectic of their competing interests, the Germanic academic of the Modern Era created the institutions and practices of research science, and was in turn created by them. It is this academic persona whom we seek to find through the seminar.

This essay, therefore, reconstructs the origins of the research seminar as an academic institution, and provides a socio-political analysis of the academic persona produced by it.<sup>8</sup>

## I. FROM THE COLLEGE TO THE SEMINAR

In this part of the essay, I shall exhibit the development of four academic institutions of the Early Modern Era. These four institutions were: (a) the *cathedra*; (b) the *collegium*; (c) the seminary; (d) the society. The following four sections, A to D, handle them in turn. These four institutions are the elements of the subsequent analysis (Part II), for from their synthesis the research seminar of the Modern Era emerged.

### A. *The Public Cathedra*

After the Reformation in the Germanies, the endowed colleges of fellows transformed into a system of salaried *cathedrae*, professorial ‘chairs’. The medieval endowment, possessed corporately and collegially by the fellows, was divided into salaries for specific professorships. A salaried master took charge thereafter of a specific academic office, which he performed ‘publicly’ (*publice*), that is, free of charge.<sup>9</sup> The replacement of the system of endowed colleges by salaried *cathedrae* worked to undermine the monastic life amongst the masters, and began the liquidation of collegial and corporate bodies within the faculty.

The members of the faculty soon regarded the salaried professorships, not as professions attained by mastery of subject, but rather as sinecures won by seniority. They conceived them, in fact, as analogues of canonries, and adopted the old ecclesiastical principle of *jus optandi*. By this principle, any time a canonry fell vacant, all canons below it could move up a notch, in order of seniority, to a new canonry. With the establishment of salaried, public *cathedrae*, this practice (*Aufrücken*) became characteristic of the reformed university, and continued far into the eighteenth century.<sup>10</sup> Taking into consideration another ecclesiastical principle embraced by the reformed university, pluralism in office holding, one appreciates why the holders of *cathedrae* in the arts and sciences faculty during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often showed little private interest in the subject matter of their public offices.

### B. *The Private Collegium*<sup>11</sup>

Inveterately impecunious, sixteenth century professors also taught private courses (*collegia privata*), for a fee to auditors. Holding the *cathedra* for a discipline defined a public persona for the professor, and granted him

monopolistic rights to certain academic offices. However, given the practices of *Aufrücken* and pluralism, the professor might take no personal interest in these offices. It was otherwise with the private collegium, because it was offered on a voluntary basis and had to attract a paying audience. The private collegium tended to be more open to the current interests of scholars and more representative of the professor's private, academic interests. A private collegium might present subject matter of a wider scope than the ordinary lectures, or even new topics.<sup>12</sup> Whence the situation realized during the Early Modern Era, where the centre of academic activity no longer lay in the formal structure of the lecture courses required for degree and taught publicly, but rather in the informal and unstructured practice of the elective, private collegia.

In their first incarnation, the private collegia assumed a traditional form: they were little else than disputational collegia (*collegia disputatoria*) and resembled the practices of the circular disputations of the medieval colleges.<sup>13</sup> Session by session, the disputational roles of defendant and designated opponents were exchanged around the circle of students, whence the name "disputationes circulares". The tendency of the professors to inject specific content into them is what seems to have remade most of these disputational collegia into veritable private lecture courses. Some courses did fuse the two ancient scholastic practices, lecture and disputation, into something new (*collegia conversatoria sive explicatoria*), and in the eighteenth century these collegia no doubt approached something like an academic salon.<sup>14</sup> However, to account for the method of teaching characteristic of the seminar, we must look not ahead to the salon, but rather back to elements drawn from the original form of the private collegium: the circular disputation and the disputational collegium.<sup>15</sup> Even apart from their corruption into symposia or salons during the Early Modern Era, the disputational collegia *per se* provided an essential pattern for the conduct of the seminar in the Germanies.<sup>16</sup>

The private disputational collegium was virtually the only class in which the normal scholar had actively to participate, in so far as he elected to take such a course at all. From the lecture catalogues, it is apparent that private disputational collegia existed at some places into the nineteenth century.<sup>17</sup> The lecture catalogues imply that participants would be obliged not only to speak, but also to write for the collegium, and in Latin.<sup>18</sup> While it is unclear what character the written work took, the circular disputation had transformed itself into something other than the simple disputation of arbitrary theses. Since the seventeenth century, some of these collegia had undertaken the circular disputation of dissertations written for the collegium, or even the reading and disputing of a book.<sup>19</sup> The pedagogical importance of the disputational collegium did not escape the ministers of state, who endeavoured to maintain and resurrect them; but in vain.<sup>20</sup>

### C. *The Pedagogical Seminary*

After the Reformation, monies appeared not only to salary public cathedrae, but also to support poor students. This support ranged from fee deferments to full scholarships with free room and board in a new sort of institution: the university *convictorium*.<sup>21</sup> On the surface, this new institution much resembled a medieval college. In fact, most convictoria inhabited the quarters of what had been a college before the Reformation. The principal difference between the college and convictorium lay at a juridical level. Unlike the medieval college, the convictorium of the reformed university possessed no endowment. Merely a segregated entity within a budget, the convictorium had no corporate form; it did not even have the status at law of a foundation.<sup>22</sup> The convictorium was, in fact, the original ‘institute’ at the university, clearly a creature of the emerging bureaucratic state. Yet these convictoria nonetheless preserved an archaic, ascetic discipline. They preserved the monastic life of the colleges.

The scholarship students of the convictorium were supervised and monitored. The students took all their meals at common table, at which they sat in silence to hear the inevitable reading (*lectio divina*). Nocturnal cloistering continued. Through this ancient regimen, students could be made obsequious and loyal servants of the state.<sup>23</sup> Complementing the ascetic social discipline, scholastic intellectual discipline lived on here. Above all, the convictorium upheld and preserved disputation and latinity, the practice of which was degenerating in the general student body.<sup>24</sup> Enforcement of attendance at disputation and of perfection in latinity was successful in the convictorium, for the authorities held a point of leverage over these students: their scholarships. The convictorium housed an essential tool for social control discovered by the modern state: the poor.<sup>25</sup>

At the Jesuit institutions the case was slightly different. Their convictoria swiftly became populated by the well-to-do, whose parents thought them in need of such disciplining.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, the Jesuits must be accorded the honour of having further developed the idea of the convictorium. Canon xvii in the “Decreta super reformatione” (1563) of the Council of Trent mandated theological seminaries for the proper education of the clergy.<sup>27</sup> Tying the institution of the convictorium to this idea of the seminary, the Jesuits conceived the idea of the pedagogical seminary (*Seminarium repentium humaniorum*). The first such seminary appeared at Würzburg in 1568, and others soon followed. Regulations laid out the curriculum precisely, with the schedule for each day stipulated in detail.<sup>28</sup> These pedagogical seminaries, socially structured as convictoria, served for the further training of academically advanced members of the order, especially in the humanistic disciplines. The Jesuits would hereby secure a core of future lyceum and university instructors, the humanistic shock troops for the Counter-Reformation.

Owing to its amorphous nature, the pedagogical seminary in the Protestant lands is somewhat harder to trace. The idea of the pedagogical *seminarium* first arose around 1654, and was restricted to primary school training.<sup>29</sup> The first such institution for higher schools seems to have been the *Seminarium praeceptorum* founded at Halle in 1695, which soon formed a branch for training advanced students in the humanities.<sup>30</sup> These seminaries in Halle aimed to support poor scholars dedicated to a career in teaching. Though deriving ultimately from the concept of the convictorium, the *Seminarium praeceptorum* at Halle does not seem to have mandated the cloistering of its charges. It was not essentially a boarding house.<sup>31</sup> The formation of the professional persona could then assume a more abstract pose at Halle. This seminary might have commenced the transformation of the old, monastic asceticism into its modern form: the bureaucratic.

#### D. The Private Society

Concentrate on the private societies for the arts and sciences, and consider those centred around a university. Numerous incidences of these can be found at least since the seventeenth century in the Protestant lands.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, private societies, centred on a university and accepting students as members, were originally but private collegia grown permanent, cheaper and more colloquial. In this sense, every private collegium is a potential private society. One might, therefore, easily push the obscure origins of the private society back into the sixteenth century. The historically close connection between the cathedra and seminary thus finds a counterpart in the close connection between the private collegium and society, at the Protestant universities.

At the Jesuit universities, neither the private collegium, nor the private society, existed. There was, however, a Jesuit institution which approximated the notion of the private collegium or society.

By “academy” we understand a group of students ..., selected from the whole student body [at the university], who meet under the superintendence of a member of the order, for the purpose of undertaking special exercises related to their studies.<sup>33</sup>

The *Ratio studiorum* required Jesuit universities to have such academies. Although student members of the order were compelled to participate in the academy, other scholars could freely choose to join. The academy possessed a republican structure; the scholars elected the officers to govern the academy. Pedagogically the academy much resembled the medieval, collegiate lessons for review, repetition and disputation. But an essential departure lies here.

The academy members [i.e. scholars!] may themselves occasionally give lectures from the lectern [*ex cathedra*] in which they learnedly [*erudite*]

handle some question resolved by their own labor [*suo Marte perfectam*], or exposit the arguments on both sides of some subtle problem, to which one or two other members respond.<sup>34</sup>

At the Protestant universities, such extracurricular fora arose less frequently (unless we count private collegia), and emerged more variously, because they were not regulated by a central authority. No doubt atypical thanks to the large number, the case of the private society at the University of Leipzig should prove instructive.<sup>35</sup> Beginning in 1624, numbers of private societies arose at Leipzig. All initially styled themselves as 'collegia'; all initially aimed at training in preaching; and, all arose under the auspices of professors or doctors as presidents, but admitted students of one degree or other. By 1680 there were six collegia meeting weekly and existing as societies. Beginning with the Collegium Gellanium of 1641, and the Collegium Anthologicum of 1655, which both met weekly on Sundays, private societies more oriented to the humanities made their appearance. Later on, private societies for the natural sciences also appeared.<sup>36</sup>

During the eighteenth century, private societies became not only more common, but also specialized. Centred on universities, and admitting students as members, there were, for example, three private societies for the natural sciences (at Halle, Jena, Leipzig), and six for classical philology (at Altdorf, Erlangen, Halle, Jena, Leipzig, Wittenberg).<sup>37</sup> As private societies, they differentiated themselves from mere private collegia. The societies had their own statutory structures. They divided themselves into officers and several categories of membership (ordinary, extra-ordinary, honorary). And they usually possessed a treasury, a cabinet and/or library, and sometimes a journal.<sup>38</sup> In agreeing to the fellowship of the society, the members accepted the binding duties imposed respectively upon them. For the 'ordinary' members, that usually meant writing.

Whereas the ubiquitous Jesuit academy envisaged written work as the exception, the occasional Protestant private society considered it the rule. In Leipzig the members of the Collegium Gellanium and of the Collegium Anthologicum met on Sundays to hear and discuss essays which were written and presented by members, including students. The Walch'sche Collegium Historiae Literariae (1715) heard and criticized each week two or three papers presented by their members.<sup>39</sup> The Latin Society at Halle (1736), though given a pedagogically and politically rather conservative constitution, nevertheless expected participation from its student members.<sup>40</sup> The Latin Society at Jena (1733), possessed of a seemingly more democratic constitution than the society at Halle, also required student members to submit written dissertations which exhibited eloquence and erudition.<sup>41</sup> The Latin Society at Altdorf (1762) required the same.<sup>42</sup> Through these private societies, an idea very foreign to the



medievals took shape in the intellectual élite of the student body. Writing became conceived as the highest form of academic labour.

## II. THE PHILOLOGICAL SEMINAR: 1738–1838

In Part I above, I have pieced together a story wherein the origins of the research seminar are to be found in the development of the cathedra, collegium, seminary, and society in the Early Modern Era. I have presented this development after the manner of a dialectic. Sections A and B, on the public cathedra and private collegium, set the initial dialectical opposition. This was reflected at a higher level of complexity in the opposition of pedagogical seminary (*Staat*) and private society (*Gesellschaft*) in Sections C and D. Compelled then by the logic of History (or the artifice of Narrative), we shall now consider the philological seminar as the next level of complexity, the synthesis of public or state seminary and private society. There will be four points in the analysis, presented in Sections A to D, below.

First (in Section A), the seminar emerges as a public institution, under a ‘director’, thereby incorporating an aspect of the public cathedra. Secondly (in Section B), the seminar defines a sphere of private interest for the director, thereby incorporating an aspect of the private collegium. Thirdly (in C), the seminar functions as a pedagogical institute of the state, thereby incorporating an aspect of the pedagogical seminary. Finally (in D), the seminar constitutes a domain of private interest for its community, thereby incorporating an aspect of the private society. Through this analysis, we shall recapitulate the four sections of Part I for the philological seminar.

### A. *The Seminar as Public Institute*<sup>43</sup>

The *Seminarium philologicum* (for classical philology), instituted at Göttingen in 1737, could be seen as a significant event. The founders themselves had perhaps no inkling of this, because they intended but a synthesis of the pedagogical seminary at Halle (1695/1702) and the Latin societies at Jena (1733) and at Halle (1736). However, at an historic conjuncture (1809/10), theorists of the research seminar for classical philology traced its advent to this institution at Göttingen.<sup>44</sup>

Though imitations of the Göttingen philological seminar did arise, foundations of strictly pedagogical seminaries/seminars, and of private philological societies, continued throughout the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century. The period of change toward the model of Göttingen commenced only in the last third of the eighteenth century. By the first decade of the nineteenth century, the transition was completed. Thereafter, pedagogical seminaries either transformed themselves into seminars for classical philology and

pedagogy, or existed within the new academic order instituted by them — they became seminars for the academic discipline of *Pädagogik*. Similarly, beginning in the last third of the eighteenth century, philological societies sought status as seminars. After 1806, university-centred philological societies arose only either as temporary institutions waiting to be made seminars, or as counter-institutions to the officially recognized seminar (founded upon the instigations of disgruntled professors or students). With the foundation of a philological seminar at Tübingen in 1838, every extant university, excepting one, within the Germanies proper had a seminar for classical philology.<sup>45</sup> In some cases, however, the transition from pedagogical seminary and/or philological society was rather complex and delayed.<sup>46</sup>

Like the cathedra and the seminary, the philological seminar functioned as an institution of the state. When they became seminars, the private philological societies had to accept this.<sup>47</sup> As state ‘institutes’, the seminars conducted themselves, not as intramural, corporate and collegial endowments, but rather as ministries of the modern state: budgeted bureaux.<sup>48</sup> Their statutes appeared as governmental edicts and regulations, mandating the structure of the institute. The professor leading the seminar was the ‘director’, a servant of the state. Neither the faculty nor academic senate, but rather an extramural agency acted as the supervisory instance above the director. For the University of Kiel, the King himself initially supervised the institute’s finances.<sup>49</sup> At Helmstedt a specially appointed commission of the Prince exercised oversight. The deputation of four ministers in Bayreuth, who actively controlled the seminar at the University of Erlangen, paid no heed when the Erlangen academic senate complained about this arrangement as a breach of their corporate autonomy.<sup>50</sup>

In most places ministerial supervision assumed the less apparent (so perhaps more insidious) form of the annual, or bi-annual, written report of the director to a supervisory agency. For the Göttingen seminar, regular reports do not seem to have been mandated at its inception (1738); nor could I uncover any mention of reports for the next seminar founded, Wittenberg (1771). However, the next foundations, Erlangen (1777) and Kiel (1777), regularly reported to extramural agencies, the former having done so since foundation, while the latter only somewhat later. The seminar at Helmstedt (1779) had to report regularly in writing to an external agency, at least since 1786.<sup>51</sup> At the next foundation, Halle (1787), the director was required at inception to report each semester.<sup>52</sup> Thereafter, a mandate for regular, written reports constituted a typical clause in a seminar’s statutes or foundation document.<sup>53</sup> In Prussia the format of reporting eventually became regulated and standardized. Through these techniques of regular reporting, the bureaucratic mentality, so essential for the transformation of academic labour into ‘research science’, would slowly take shape in and through the seminar directors.

The philological seminar as institute of the state, like the cathedra and the seminary, provided an organ to transform corporate and juridical entities into bureaucratic ministries. What the cathedra had wrought in the sixteenth century, the seminar-institute was destined to recapitulate in the nineteenth: the fragmentation and reorganization of the faculty. The first cathedrae at the medieval universities had been canonries, benefices for the theological faculty. The notion of the cathedra eventually diffused into the collegium of masters of arts in the fifteenth century, initially through the few salaried chairs for humanistic disciplines. In the sixteenth century, the entire collegium fragmented into disciplinary cathedrae (as shown above, in Part I, Section A). The institute would do this to the faculties in the nineteenth century.

Because they had descended from the university convictorium, the original pedagogical seminaries had stood under the theology faculty. The Göttingen philological seminar inherited, however, within the arts and sciences faculty.<sup>54</sup> When the idea migrated from Göttingen, for a long time such budgeted institutes (centred on disciplines) remained largely those for classical philology and pedagogy.<sup>55</sup> Until the second half of the nineteenth century, the only other institutes for arts or sciences whose existence I can establish were these: the Polish seminar at Königsberg (1813), the pedagogical seminar at Münster (1824), the natural sciences seminar at Bonn (1825), the Lithuanian seminar at Königsberg (1827), the historical seminar at Halle (1832), the mathematics and natural sciences seminars at Königsberg (both in 1834), the physical sciences institute at Leipzig (1835), and the mathematics and natural sciences seminar at Halle (1837/39).<sup>56</sup>

The dearth of budgeted institutions for mathematics and the natural sciences is striking. One cannot ignore the ubiquitous *cabinets de physique*, especially those granted their own chambers and incomes. But these warehouses and workshops ought not be regarded as institutes in the sense of the above.<sup>57</sup> There is a profound distinction between a mechanism for the accumulation and disciplining of capital and labour (the Benedictine monastery, the factory, the laboratory as budgeted *cabinet*), and a system for the bureaucratization of patronage and office (the Society of Jesus, the civil service, the seminar as budgeted institute). In the second half of the nineteenth century, the diffusion of the seminar, as public institute, would fragment the entire faculty, reorganizing it along new lines. The faculty would reorganize, not into mere chairs as in the sixteenth century, but rather into institutes, and ultimately into separate bodies conceived as bureaux of knowledge, disciplinary 'departments'.<sup>58</sup> These institutes would be the preserves for civil servants of a particularly elevated sort. With few exceptions, the directorate of the seminars came from those with a cathedra, and one of an elevated sort: the *professores ordinarii*.<sup>59</sup> The seminar embodied, then, a *Steigerung* of the cathedra.

### *B. The Seminar as Private Collegium*

As institutions of the state, the first philological seminars possessed little autonomy. Though directors present at foundation probably helped draft the statutes, self-direction found small scope in the written constitutions. Like the pedagogical seminaries, the seminars had their curriculum statutorily regulated in detail; in some cases the texts to be employed were mandated at foundation. For the seminars at Erlangen and Helmstedt, selection of students came not from the directorate *per se*, but rather from the supervisory instance above it.<sup>60</sup> At Göttingen and Kiel, the directors, when reporting vacancies to the ministry, could nominate students to the seminar, but selection came *de iure* from a superior agency.<sup>61</sup> Ministerial surveillance, if vigilant and thorough, could even eradicate directorial influence over the work of those admitted.<sup>62</sup> Prescribed a detailed curricular structure, and standing under the surveillance of a ministerial agency, which authorized candidates for admission, or chose them itself, the first philological seminars were clearly not envisaged as private collegia led by the director.

All this had changed by the first decade of the nineteenth century. Thereafter, the state allowed the directorate to conduct the public seminars on the model of the private collegium. Ministries left selection of members and governance of seminarial work to the directors. Within the superstructure of public or state interest vested in ministerial supervision, an infrastructure of private interest, a sanctioned domain of directorial autonomy, embedded itself in the seminars. The changes had commenced during the second half of the eighteenth century.

The format of the Göttingen seminar in 1765 bore little resemblance to its structure as mandated at foundation. Without official proclamation, the ministry in Hanover had apparently allowed the new director (having arrived in 1763) to modify the seminar's structure to his own liking. And, either then or somewhat later, the ministry also granted him the power to select the candidates for admission.<sup>63</sup> Concerning the philological seminar at Halle, directorial autonomy emerged even more clearly. In the negotiations during 1787 and 1788 for the founding of the seminar, the director obtained complete control of the institute, including the right to select members, and to determine seminarial work.<sup>64</sup> At Kiel the director of the philological scholarship-institut also seems to have obtained at least the right to determine admissions in 1789.<sup>65</sup>

In the nineteenth century, it became the norm to constitute the public seminar as directorial private collegium. Statutes or foundation documents stipulated the directorate's control over admission to the seminar.<sup>66</sup> No longer was there a required curriculum. Statutes simply set out the general character of work: oral practice in latinity and disputation, the reading and writing of

Greek and Latin, philological critique and interpretation, experience in teaching.<sup>67</sup> Apart from such methodological provisions, control over seminarial work resided with the directorate. The directors could teach any philological texts or topics they wished. Incredibly, while founding the seminars as agencies of the state, ministries enabled the directorate to institutionalize its own personal, academic interests within the seminars.

Ideas about the composition of the directorate proved, however, more various than those about autonomy. Like the private societies and pedagogical seminaries, the philological seminars of the eighteenth century had possessed a directorate constituted by one person.<sup>68</sup> Once ministerial control weakened or lapsed, the seminar fell more or less into the hands of this single director. Henceforth the seminar embodied his own personal institute. From 1738 to 1812, only two individuals in succession ran the Göttingen seminar.<sup>69</sup> The seminars at Wittenberg and Kiel were likewise each possessed of but two individuals who ran the seminars in successive tenures, from 1768 to 1806 at Wittenberg, and from 1777 to 1808 at Kiel. The seminar at Erlangen had the same director from 1764 to 1815, as did the seminar at Helmstedt from 1779 to 1809.<sup>70</sup> A second in charge to the director at Halle is mentioned in one place; but all other sources, including the lecture catalogues, indicate that only one person ran the seminar from 1787 to 1804.<sup>71</sup>

In the first part of the nineteenth century, while some institutions continued this policy, many composed the directorate more complexly. The seminars at Erlangen (till 1827), Greifswald (excepting one year), Kiel, Königsberg, Leipzig (till 1834), Marburg (after 1825), Munich (till 1827), and Rostock, all preserved the pattern of a single director, as did Helmstedt and Wittenberg so long as these universities lasted. At some places a directorate emerged consisting of one director (*Vorstand*), with one or more 'co-directors', apparently officially under the director. This was so at Breslau, Dorpat, Erlangen (after 1827), Freiburg im Br., Giessen, Heidelberg, Jena, Leipzig (after 1834), and Munich (after 1827). Directors no doubt treated co-directors as equals on some matters. Yet the possibility of the director as autocrat clearly existed. Such seminars, possessed now of subaltern faculty, might easily become powerful mechanisms for the institutionalization of private academic interests.

To preclude the conflation of the institute with the personality of one individual, four of the most prestigious philological seminars (Berlin, Bonn, Göttingen and Halle), as well as two of the lesser ones (Marburg and Tübingen), sought to constitute the directorate more collegially.<sup>72</sup> Marburg tried most aggressively to erect the directorate as an impersonal agency. From 1811 to 1815 the directorate there consisted of a collegium of three or four individuals. Then a revolving directorate evolved, with one or two persons, out of a group of six, being director(s) each year. Continual conflicts arose, and the

system collapsed in 1825. Thereafter, Marburg embraced the principle of the single director with permanent tenure.<sup>73</sup>

Less ambitious than Marburg, the seminars at Göttingen and Tübingen set up a triumvirate of equals, while the principal Prussian seminars (Berlin, Bonn, and Halle) created a bipartite directorate. The arrangement at Göttingen seems to have arisen in response to the misfortunes begotten as the second director waned intellectually, yet ruled on and alone.<sup>74</sup> The Prussian institution of a bipartite directorate probably emerged from dissatisfaction with the original one-man-show at Halle. At Berlin the seminar divided into a Latin section and a Greek section, with a separate director for each. At Bonn the two directors shared all the powers generated by the seminar, not only between themselves, but also with a third philologist, creating a very collegial environment.<sup>75</sup> At Halle (as reorganized) decorum seems to have been maintained between the two co-directors; however, a third philologist, excluded from the directorate, was not a happy man, and reverted to archaic behaviour.<sup>76</sup>

Though all essentially acknowledging an intrinsic domain of directorial autonomy, the ministries of states pursued then differing policies on the composition of the directorate, that is, on the question of the authority-structure of these agencies. Nevertheless, excepting the case of Marburg from 1811 to 1825, the directorate always embodied, not an impersonal institution, but rather an institutionalized persona, either unitary or multiple. The philology seminars functioned as institutes empowered to cultivate the academic interests of one, two or three individuals. They worked as publicly funded entities, but acted like elevated species of private collegia.

### *C. The Seminar as Pedagogical Institute*

The philology seminars served as pedagogical institutes of the state.<sup>77</sup> Though the Prussian seminars also contained mostly future teachers (usually for *Gymnasia*), the nascent ideology of the 'research seminar' prohibited acknowledgement of this in Prussia after 1809.<sup>78</sup> All these pedagogical institutes, including the Prussian, had descended from the convictoria and seminaries. They, therefore, gave their students access to free private collegia, and usually offered scholarships.<sup>79</sup> The secularization of the teaching profession began through such means of support outside the theology faculty.<sup>80</sup>

The Göttingen seminar offered free meals and 50 Reichsthaler for nine students. Erlangen provided free room and board, plus 40 Gulden for eight students, raised later to 50 Gulden for twelve students. Kiel had a stipend of 200 Thaler for four students, eventually raised to 300 Thlr and free meals. Halle had scholarships of 40 Rthlr for twelve students. Helmstedt offered room and board in the convictorium, and provided some financial support of

an unstipulated amount for at least the four ordinary members, and possibly also for the six extraordinary. The Wittenberg seminar, while salarizing the director, had only patronage for its eight to ten seminarians.

All but one of the seminars of the eighteenth century could thus provide scholarships, sometimes including board and even room. The single exception (Wittenberg) proves the most illuminating. Though not all giving scholarships, all seminars did offer two things: free private collegia (the lessons in seminar) and patronage. A scholarship was the most visible means of patronage, but not the only, and ultimately perhaps not the most important means. In the nineteenth century, the incidence of indeterminate monetary patronage increased.

The philology seminars, founded during the nineteenth century at Bonn, Dorpat, Freiburg im Br., Königsberg, Marburg, Munich, Rostock and Vienna, all had stipulated amounts guaranteed their seminarians.<sup>81</sup> The seminars at Berlin, Breslau, Giessen, Greifswald, Leipzig and Tübingen did not.<sup>82</sup> Tübingen promised its ten students support, but on a case by case basis. The directors at Greifswald could give prize money to a few, and might petition for grants up to 30 Rthlr for each of their five ordinary members. Giessen provided free meals for all eight members, plus undetermined prizes for three, and special consideration in university scholarships for the rest. The seminars at Berlin (for eight students), Breslau (for six) and Leipzig (for twelve) could only promise access to unstipulated prize monies for some, and special consideration for university scholarships for all. Dorpat also promised to help in finding a future career at a *Gymnasium* for its ten students.

The fundamentals guaranteed by all seminars amounted then to free private collegia and patronage. While the patronage of scholarship must have been the most desirable to the seminarian *in statu pupillari*, the less tangible guarantee of patronage in future teaching career constituted the more important offer. Not only Wittenberg and Dorpat, but rather all philology seminars could discipline their inmates with such future promises. The seminars functioned not only as a system of training in humanities, but effected as well a bureaucratization of the patronage system for humanists. The philology seminars emerged during the period in which control of the educational system passed from theologians to philologists. As members of ministerial commissions, the philologists transformed the old Latin School into the Humanistic *Gymnasium* of the nineteenth century. Indeed, these two phenomena, the proliferation of the philology seminars and the apotheosis of the Humanistic *Gymnasium*, stood in a mutually re-enforcing relation with one another.<sup>83</sup>

Through the seminars, the new corps of *Gymnasium* teachers was made the loyal tools of state interests. The seminars, as pedagogical institutions of the state, provided a means to normalize the élite of future humanities teachers.<sup>84</sup> The promise of scholarship, even when dim, coupled with the threat of its

removal, facilitated the recasting of seminarians into the standardized shapes sanctioned by ministry and directorate. In 1774 a seminarian at Göttingen got into a dispute with the director on the proper writing, interpretation, and critique of poetry. The student persisted in not deferring to the director. A bad move. The seminarian, along with his friend who had been too often absent, were both kicked out of the seminar.<sup>85</sup> The case of the iconoclastic student shows the directorate's power to produce seminarians who work along a sanctioned path. The more telling case, that of the lazy student, indicates the power of the seminar to fashion subjects who work at all. The inculcation of *Industrie* and *Fleiss* was, of course, a matter of grave importance to ministries of state. Another director put it so:

the twelve seminarians must distinguish themselves as exemplars of industriousness [*Fleiss*], knowledge and good moral character at the university, and also arouse the emulation of others .... For the state has little use for the mere humanist ....<sup>86</sup>

Regarding the lessons of the seminarians, ... the director ... must always use methods which inculcate industriousness and perseverance, and which also accustom the students to precise, punctual organization in all their required tasks ....<sup>87</sup>

A refrain heard in all seminars: the seminarians are to exhibit *Industrie*. Punctuality counts. Written assignments, paperwork, must be handed in on time. Sloth constitutes grounds for expulsion. The directorate, therefore, ought to be empowered to withdraw a scholarship and expel a seminarian, given cause.<sup>88</sup>

Less drastic than removal of scholarship, there were other techniques to insure proper work habits. In the nineteenth century, while a few seminars (Kiel, Marburg, Munich, Rostock) gave differential amounts based on the seniority of the seminarians, a number of others (Bonn, Freiburg im Br., Halle, Königsberg) hit upon the idea of differential awards each term based on competition amongst the seminarians in "industriousness, progress and proper conduct".<sup>89</sup> Indeed, those seminars (Berlin, Breslau, Giessen, Greifswald, Leipzig), which only offered promises of favour regarding general scholarships and prizes, implicitly incorporated the same competitive structure. Not all seminarians would get awards, and not all awards would be the same. Punctual output, and in constant competition, became hereby a *sine qua non* of the successful seminarian.

The mechanism of the annual or bi-annual director's report crowned this bureaucratized patronage system. In their reports to supervisory ministries, directors recounted the labours in seminar, and evaluated the performance of



the members. These evaluations of the seminarians laid the bases for ‘promotions’ within the good offices of state. The evaluations functioned as the criteria for future fellowships, being crucial when differential amounts were at stake. More importantly, they fed the dossiers which would govern the future competition for positions after graduation.

The convictorium’s and seminary’s spirit, best described as orthodoxy and piety, gave way through the seminar’s practices to our modern industrial and bureaucratic sensibility at the university. It was not so much the contents of consciousness which the seminar sought to recast, as it was rather a particular attitude toward academic labour. The seminarians, creations of an elevated convictorium, grew as creatures of punctuality and industriousness. They were productions of, and thus partisans to an ideology which envisaged the objectification of worth and patronage as a dossier of competitive evaluations. As these apostles of paperwork went forth and remade the *Gymnasium* in their own images, they fashioned the habits and values in their charges which would prove essential for the genesis of the nineteenth century bureaucracy. In its academic incarnation, it established research science as cultural norm.

#### *D. The Seminar as Private Society*

Although cast into types by the routines and reports of the seminar as pedagogical institute, the seminarians were, nonetheless, condemned to a domain of autonomy. Ministry and directorate compelled the seminarian to acquire an original personality. Embodying the dialectical reconciliation of *Staat* and *Gesellschaft*, the seminarian fashioned himself as a routinely normalized yet peculiarly differentiated individual. A visitor to Halle in the early 1790s remarked:

Most of the seminarians affect peculiar and atypical mannerisms [*sonderbares und von andern abstechendes Aeusseres*], by which they very noticeably distinguish themselves; you can spot them at a great distance on account of their attire and other small details.<sup>90</sup>

The seminarian had to cultivate a distinct and specialized academic persona. He had to articulate a sphere of private academic interest, and must transfix this persona for evaluation in writings. This moment of private society, understood as a realm of original writing, completed the constitution of the philology seminar as the research seminar. As with all great historical ventures, the reconstruction of the seminarian as researcher — as normalized and objectified, yet individualized and subjectified persona — proceeded cautiously and unevenly.

Though for the most part philologists by professional calling, the directors did not originally demand this of their charges.<sup>91</sup> They presumed that the

seminarian would matriculate in the theology faculty, which was a wise move for anyone intending a teaching career.<sup>92</sup> Even by the early nineteenth century, when the concept of the differentiated ‘major’ in the arts and sciences had emerged, not all seminarians had become philology majors.<sup>93</sup> The case of the Göttingen seminar, though notorious, proves instructive.<sup>94</sup> Table 1 records: (i) the numbers of Göttingen seminarians by registered major, broken down into three year intervals; and, (ii) the total enrolments of philology majors, together with the absolute total enrolment from all faculties.<sup>95</sup> From the table you can see how long the philology seminar remained a preserve for theology majors. Though a sufficient number of philology majors existed after 1773, they did not constitute the majority of those admitted to the seminar until after 1815, and then usually only with the dual theology/philology majors.

The Halle seminar inaugurated a change. The founding director sought the secularization of the teaching profession. Therefore, he admitted theology majors, but with reluctance.<sup>96</sup> During one semester at least (Winter 1801) he managed to fill all twelve positions in the seminar with pure philology majors. But, alas, by the next semester, eight of the twelve listed either theology or pedagogy as joint major with philology.<sup>97</sup> Thus, while not precluding theology or pedagogy majors, the preference for philologists by calling was clear at Halle.

Nearly every nineteenth century foundation embraced the view conceived at Halle, made in fact canonical within the Prussian seminars: the philology seminars were for students of philology.<sup>98</sup> Given the periods from which their statutes issued, I presume that the other Prussian philology seminars pursued in the 1810s and 1820s the path marked out at Halle in the 1790s. Moreover, given the period (*c.* 1815–20) during which the Göttingen seminar began taking mostly pure philology or joint philology/theology majors, it perhaps lagged slightly behind some of the Prussian seminars. But it probably kept pace with, even preceded, a general drift toward assimilating the professional consciousness of the seminarians to that of the directorate, as specialists in philology.<sup>99</sup>

If not in respect of the seminarian’s declared major, then in respect of seminarial work, the Göttingen seminar instituted the reorientation. Following practices of the seminary, Göttingen had originally prescribed a detailed curriculum. And, although called a “philological” institute, it had encompassed a wide survey: religion, pedagogy, history, geography, mathematics, astronomy, natural sciences, and so on.<sup>100</sup> In the 1760s the Göttingen seminar significantly changed; one could see this as virtually a second foundation. The seminar abandoned the curricular practices of the pedagogical seminary, and embraced elements of the private collegium and private society, which rendered the labour of the seminarian nearly exclusively philological. The director at Göttingen described the new regime in 1765:

TABLE 1. Registered Major of Göttingen Seminarians, 1764–1835.

\* = Theology  
 § = Theology & Philosophy  
 + = Theology & Philology  
 × = Philology  
 – = Philology & Philosophy  
 = = Liberal Arts  
 ÷ = History  
 # = Philosophy  
 Ø = Law

Column 1 = New Philology Majors  
 Column 2 = New Philology & Theology Majors  
 Column 3 = New Philology & Miscellaneous Majors  
 Column 4 = Total New Enrolment of All Faculties

	Numbers of Seminarians by Major																						Total Majors Columns				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	1	2	3	4	
1764–66	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	#	Ø						4	0	0	880
1767–69	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*									2	0	0	837
1770–72	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*									0	0	0	936
1773–75	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	×	=	Ø								5	1	0	1013
1776–78	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*									9	1	0	1027
1779–81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	×	=	=	#								8	0	0	1187
1782–84	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	×	×	Ø										8	1	0	1119	
1785–87	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	×	×	×	–	Ø	Ø								13	2	1	1043	
1788–90	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	+	×	×	×	×	×	Ø	Ø						16	2	0	1102	
1791–93	*	*	*	*	*	+	×	×	×	=	=	#											14	3	0	1028	
1794–96	*	*	*	*	*	*	§	+	+	+	×	×	÷	÷									14	5	0	967	
1797–99	*	*	*	*	*	*	×	×	×	×	×	–	Ø	Ø	Ø								16	2	1	1031	
1800–02	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	+	+	×	#	#							7	5	3	1020	
1803–05	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	§	×	×	Ø										7	6	0	1011	
1806–08	*	*	*	*	*	*																	8	2	4	949	
1809–11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	§	×	×	×		13	4	1	1087	
1812–14	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	×	×	×								19	9	4	1069	
1815–17	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	+	+	+	+	×	×	×							14	14	2	1720	
1818–20	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	+	+	+	+	×	×	×	×								21	13	0	1708	
1821–23	*	*	+	×	×	×	×	×	×														30	10	3	2175	
1824–26	*	*	+	+	+	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	38	20	1	2089	
1827–29	*	*	+	+	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	Ø	Ø						37	16	2	1816	
1830–32	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	×	×	×	×	×	#										57	33	1	1183	
1833–35	+	+	+	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	#	#										45	30	1	1214	

The table contrasts, for any given cohort of three years, the registered majors of students who eventually get into the seminar (“Numbers of Seminarians by Major”) with the total pool of available Philology majors in that cohort (“Total Majors”, columns 1–3), indicating as well total enrolments (column 4). So, for example, in the first cohort, 1764–66, 18 individuals who matriculated that year eventually got into the seminar, their majors being: 16 in Theology, 1 in Philosophy, and 1 in Law. Columns 1–3 of “Total Majors” indicate that in this same cohort, 4 individuals had registered as Philology majors. Thus, though a pool of Philology majors existed to draw upon, none of them from this cohort got into the seminar. Further remarks on the table are in reference 95.

The seminarians are obliged to attend several hours of collegia in the humanities each day. In addition to this, the Professor of Eloquence will offer, without charge, a collegium in which they will be practised and instructed in interpretation, and in writing, speaking and disputing in Latin. To this end, each [seminarian] in turn will explicate, both grammatically and critically, an ancient author, as well as writing and defending an essay, written in good Latin, on a topic dealing with [philological] sciences in the same manner [*eine in diese Art der Wissenschaften einschlagende Materie*].<sup>101</sup>

The other philological seminars of the eighteenth century (Wittenberg, Erlangen, Kiel, Helmstedt and Halle) arose after this refoundation of the Göttingen seminar in the early 1760s; yet, only the last founded (Halle in 1787) assimilated the new form. The other seminars, though officially philological, functioned curricularly as traditional pedagogical institutes.<sup>102</sup> The second Göttingen foundation, together with Halle, emerged as the epitome of the seminar only in the nineteenth century. With few exceptions (Dorpat, Marburg, Tübingen), and these only to a very small extent, the foundation of new seminars, and re-organization of old ones, created institutes devoted solely to classical philology. More particularly, nineteenth century seminars statutorily enjoined nothing more than the mastery of methodological technique, and practice in disputation and composition.

In seminar, thereafter, one read only works of Greek or Latin authors. Methodological training, practice in grammatical analysis, textual interpretation and critique, proceeded not as abstract theory, but rather from an intensive study of the sources themselves. The directors no longer sought to provide a survey of the accumulated contents of philology, much less of the humanities in general. For these latter, encyclopedic concerns of the future teacher, collegia outside the seminar and self-study were to serve. In seminar, one now learnt to be a philologist, a ‘researcher’.

The passive mastery of a canonically prescribed corpus of philological material gives way to the active cultivation of philological abilities through participation. To achieve such participation, seminarial work restricts itself in scope. It sacrifices breadth, and often perspective, for depth. When the seminar is given the collective assignment of searching the entire Ciceronian corpus to establish the several shades of meaning of a single word, this must appear pedagogically nonsensical, should one not comprehend the nature of the new persona under construction.<sup>103</sup> Such an assignment — an exhaustively insipid exercise in grammatical minutiae made possible only as the endeavour of well-organized and collective labour of the seminarians — is a parable of the new academic discipline which is research. (Source-referenced, etymological dictionaries arose from such exercises in minutiae.)

Seminarial labour, the discipline of philological research, is, however, not simply a bureaucratic socialism for antiquity's sake. Whereas the convictorium and seminary had sought to produce uniformly replicated types (the orthodox and pious), the research seminar seeks to construct the seminarian as a normalized, yet autonomous individual. The research seminar shapes an individual pursuing its own 'interests', and in competition. Most seminarial work envisages not the collaborative assimilation of the members, envisages not the seminar as joint persona, but rather the multiplication of personalities through the seminar, their enforced differentiation, and so their inevitable ranking. Exercises centred on textual interpretation and exegesis serve well for the theatrics of individuation, for role-reversals, as each comes forward from the chorus, with the director become critical audience.<sup>104</sup>

The presentations of the seminarians [*Seminaristenlection*] existed for practice, ... [for example] in interpretation, where difficult authors or difficult passages, in either Greek or Latin, would be chosen. The seminarian played the role of the teacher [*vertritt die Stelle des Lehrers*] ....<sup>105</sup>

The members of the advanced seminar [*Ober-Seminar*] have the special obligation ... to lead the seminar [*den Vortrag zu halten*] in the interpretive and exegetical lessons as often as the sequence of turns falls on them.<sup>106</sup>

Such techniques cultivated the seminarian as professional persona, as virtual director-for-a-day, and fused the mechanisms for training with those for evaluation. Indeed, a basic common denominator of knowledge was presupposed by the seminar, so that, as you should, you might be kicked out for not knowing the meaning of "ἐν".<sup>107</sup> And formal examinations, oral or written, might yet be inflicted upon the seminarian, especially as his rite of passage into the seminar. But these were exceptional circumstances, rites.<sup>108</sup> Oral examination gave way to the individually evaluated performance of each seminarian, for example, in his turn as director-for-the-day. So too did written examination give way to the individually evaluated performance of each seminarian in his turn as author of original writings.<sup>109</sup> While thus fusing the techniques of formation and evaluation, the seminar also hereby absorbed and elevated the elements of the private society.

If the original prerequisite for admission to seminar had been passing an oral or written examination, it soon became complemented, sometimes replaced by submission of a written essay.<sup>110</sup> Admission to seminar thereby presupposed an already formed disposition to written composition.<sup>111</sup> This disposition, and increasingly so, provided a central pivot for the project of individuation and differentiation. Yet the movement toward original writings

by no means abolished the medieval technique of scholastic formation and evaluation: the disputation; rather, it embraced the disputation as a fundamental genre. The research seminar hereby absorbed and elevated not only the private society, but the private collegium as well, and in its original form, as *collegium disputatorium*.

Every seminarian will present a paper every eighth week, so that once a week at least one [paper] is presented. Whoever, without a valid excuse, is twice late [with his paper] can thereby be expelled. Frequently, the director will give his own evaluation of the paper, and then give the paper to another seminarian for critique, whereupon practice in disputation can follow. Disputational practice can moreover sometimes be held concerning theses.<sup>112</sup>

Oral lessons consist in: (a) disputation on papers handed in, which two opponents will have carefully read and judged in form and content. Therefore the papers must be provided the opponents at least eight days before the disputation, and the director two days previously for his review ....<sup>113</sup>

This was the structure of the 'circular disputation' of the medieval colleges. In the seminar the disputation is centred, however, not on oral theses, but rather on written essays. Nonetheless, the format follows the circular disputation. Each seminarian appears in turn as defendant in the disputation, often faced by several officially designated opponents, and all conducted under the director (as *praeses*). The conduct of the seminar as disputational collegium seems, moreover, to have been part of its reorientation away from the pedagogical seminary; circular disputation became more, not less, frequent.<sup>114</sup> At early foundations, such as Kiel (1777) and Wittenberg (1768/1771), formal disputation occurred either irregularly or not at all. In Göttingen, at its original foundation (1737), disputation officially structured only the rite of passage from the seminar.<sup>115</sup> In Erlangen (1777), disputation transpired irregularly on written essays, and also regularly on theses, but then only once every six weeks.<sup>116</sup>

Regular circular disputation on written essays emerged unequivocally: in Göttingen, weekly some time after 1763, though it is not clear when; in Helmstedt, weekly at least by 1788; and, in Halle, at foundation in 1787, perhaps weekly, or perhaps only every eighth week.<sup>117</sup> In the nineteenth century, the regular, circular disputation of papers written for seminar became the norm, taking place usually either once a week or every two weeks.<sup>118</sup> In the normal case, the composition would have been written by the seminarian more than a week before the disputation, thus written in time for the official opponents to read it and prepare their critique in advance. And then, if

possible, the paper would have been circulated amongst the rest of the seminarians. If the director had done his job well in teaching them to perform, he spoke only in prologue and epilogue.<sup>119</sup>

Like the exegetical-critical lessons, the circular disputations displaced performance in seminar from directorate to seminarians, and functioned as a mechanism for the differentiation of individual seminarians, as each is forced to step into the spotlight. The disputational lessons, however, proceeded in this much further than the lessons in interpretation and critique. In the latter, though the seminarians did often moderate the sessions, the director usually chose the texts and relevant passages for the entire seminar.<sup>120</sup> In so doing, he fulfilled his role and prerogatives as director. In the disputational lessons, however, the choices came to lie with the seminarians, not the director.

The self-choice of topic for composition had been a hallmark of the private society, but not of the pedagogical seminary. Movement toward the private society in this regard had commenced with the first philological seminar. Though the Göttingen seminar does not seem to have incorporated disputation and composition as regular lesson, it did so as rite of passage from the seminar.

Before leaving the university, every seminarian is bound to hold a public disputation .... In this the director may give him some help. But the work is to be done so that it can be seen as a specimen [*Probe*] which he [the seminarian] has delivered.<sup>121</sup>

By this time, the requirement to “hold a public disputation” was a requirement to write a dissertation.<sup>122</sup> This exceptional work of writing became in time routine. It became routine as the circular disputation did. Before the close of the eighteenth century, the normal seminarian wrote at least once per term, for his turn as defendant in the circular disputation. And, though no doubt consulting with the director, the seminarian wrote on topics chosen by himself.<sup>123</sup> While constrained to a greater or lesser extent by the director’s interests, the seminarian shaped himself as autonomous agent by his choices. He realized personal, academic interests, perforce differentiating himself from his colleagues. He produced ‘research’.

The condition holding for all written work of the seminarians is that their work be not merely a hastily thrown together collection of notes long familiar to the author; rather, even if imperfect, the written work is to be the result of their own reflection and research [*des eignen Nachdenkens und Forschens*].<sup>124</sup>

The publication of a final, perhaps perfected composition would symbolize the transformation of the seminarian’s persona, would inaugurate his passage as

original creation into the new world of academic labour. The practice of writing in seminar attains perfection in the institution of the doctoral dissertation.<sup>125</sup>

It is presumed that the director seeks to guide the studies of the seminarians to the end that each of them at some time chooses to bring some philological topic to such a learned state so as to be worthy of publication. Mindful of this, the seminarians should be rewarded with the costs of graduation, and of publication of such essays, when these specimens of industriousness and learning are delivered, as is the norm, with their graduation from the university, and thus with their departure from the institute.<sup>126</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The research seminar is an institutionalized technique for the formation of normalized, yet individualized academic personalities. The marvellous nexus of paper-work accomplishes this. Though embodied as 'objectified spirit' in their dossiers, seminarians cultivate a 'subjectified spirit' in their essays. Through the seminar, the juridico-theological conceptual space of the medieval college has given way to the politico-economic order of the modern institute: the conceptual space of private interests enframed by reason of state. This Germanic discipline, perfected under the bureaucratic state, thus exhibits itself to be unregenerately addicted to the proliferation of discreet, but peculiar, personalities. *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, an obscure work published in 1788 by a provincial Prussian, formulated the metaphysical explication of these academic agents given to research. They are entities possessed of personal autonomy, inscribed within a sphere of impersonal, categorical duty. It is the ideal of freedom of a bureaucratic class seduced by the romantic ideology of 'originality'. It is the rise of the romantic mandarins.

Who or what is the researcher? A modern Germanic academic? I think so, to some extent. There are some who might trace seminarial practices from a Socratic method of teaching. But in so doing, they confuse who they are with what they read. This is quixotic history. A Socratic symposium may have been, after all, as little centred on engaged conversation as was a scholastic disputation. The historical origins of the seminar, however, lie in the latter, not the former. They lie in the particular course taken in the decomposition of the scholastic university by Humanism and the Protestant Reformation in the Germanies: the dissolution of the medieval colleges, and the constitution of the cathedra, the collegium, the seminary and the society. Through their dialectical reconciliation of the interests of *Staat* and *Gesellschaft*, the researcher was born in the modern Germanies.



Or, at least, one species. Because this essay has confined itself to the origins of the philology seminar in the Germanies, its conclusions must suffer qualification on at least two counts. The essay tells us only about the researcher created within one disciplinary locus (at most, those disciplines centred on the seminar), and within one socio-political context (the Germanies, up to 1871 at most). Studies of those disciplines centred on the laboratory may or may not yield the same conclusions as the above. Moreover, the translation of research institutions outside the socio-political space of the Germanies has surely produced differential effects. The particular university-traditions of the various lands must have had some effect: for example, the longer preservation of the collegiate university in England; or, the rupture within the university-tradition in France. And, at least in Western Europe and North America, neither the bureaucratic mentality, nor the cult of personality, seem ever to have been as strong as in the Germanies. The assimilations of German research institutions into different socio-political spaces must, therefore, merit their own special studies. While there may be something of the modern Germanic academic in us all now ('discipline and publish'), we are not romantic mandarins, when through our writings we seek not merely normalized originality, but also provocative engagement. The peculiarities of the German intellectuals, not to be imitated, were well recognized by Mme de Staël.<sup>127</sup>

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is drawn from materials originally collected for my doctoral dissertation. That research was supported by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Social Science Research Council. Rudolf Vierhaus, Director of the Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen, allowed me the use of his institute during the completion of the research. The paper was completed during tenure as Mellon Fellow at Bryn Mawr College. The essential theses of the paper have been presented as part of a larger topic at several conferences and symposia between 1985 and 1988. I profited from the comments of Stephen Cross, Robert Frank, David Sabeau and Mary Terrall. I most especially thank the members of my doctoral committee, Jeffrey Alexander, Amos Funkenstein, Peter Reill, and the co-chairs, Robert Westman and Norton Wise.

#### APPENDIX: PHILOLOGICAL SEMINARS AND SOCIETIES TO 1838

Note: sources cited below are not sufficient to reconstruct the lists of directors given. These lists have been compiled from sources too numerous to cite. For complete reference to the sources, see Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 1), Appendix. While the lists of directors are not given in

*ibid.*, the sources cited there are sufficient to reconstruct them. The lists below only concern the period up to 1838. A dash (“-”) after a date indicates the individual was a director at least up to 1838.

*Abbreviations to status of directors*

e = extra-ordinary professor  
o = ordinary professor  
PD = *Privatdozent*

/ = simultaneous chairs  
, = successive chairs

*Abbreviations to chair/discipline of directors*

As = Aesthetics  
Ar = Archaeology  
Aw = *Alterthumswissenschaft*  
CL = Classical Literature  
CP = Classical Philology  
Dt = German  
E = Eloquence  
EP = Eloquence and Poetry  
G = Greek Literature  
H = History

HL = History of Literature  
J = Law  
L = Latin Literature  
M = Metaphysics  
Ma = Mathematics  
O = Oriental Languages  
P = Philosophy  
Pd = Pedagogy  
T = Theology

ALTDORF

*Societas latina*: 1762–1809 (private)

source: Will, *op. cit.* (ref. 13), 151f.

presidents:

1762–1788: J. A. M. Nagel (oE/M/O)  
1788–1795: W. Jäger (oEP)  
1795–1809: ?

BERLIN

*Pädagogisches Seminar*: 1787– (state)

source: L. H. Fischer, “Das königliche pädagogische Seminar in Berlin, 1787–1887”, *Zeitschrift für Gymnasial-Wesen*, xlii (n.s. xxii, 1888), 1–43.

directors:

1787–1803: F. Gedike (*Oberschulkollegium*)  
1803–1812: J. J. Bellermann (*Gymnasium*)  
1812–1819: K. W. F. Solger (oP)  
1819– : A. Boeckh (oE/CL)

*Philologische Gesellschaft*: 1811–1812 (private)

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1812– (state)

statutes: in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 560ff.

directors: Greek Section

1812– A. Boeckh (oE/CL)

Latin section

1812–1827: P. K. Buttmann (oCP)

1827–1829: G. Bernhardt (eCP)

1829– : K. K. Lachmann (oCP/Dt)

**BONN***Philologisches Seminar*: 1819– (state)statutes: *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 621ff.

directors:

1819– : K. F. Heinrich (oCP), A. F. Naeke (oE),  
[with F. G. Welcker (oCP/Ar)]**BRESLAU***Philologisches Seminar*: 1812– (state)statutes: in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 679ff.

directors:

1812–1813: J. G. Schneider (oE)  
1815–1832: F. L. Passow (oAw)  
1833– : F. W. Ritschl (oE)

co-directors:

1812–1813: L. F. Heindorf (oCP)  
1818– : K. E. Schneider (oCP)**DORPAT***Lehererinstitut*: 1802–1821 (state?)*Pädagogisches-Philologisches Seminar*: 1821– (state)statutes: *Reglement ... Dorpat* (ref. 77).

directors:

1802–1806: K. S. Morgenstern (oCP/As)  
1806–1810: ?  
1810– : K. S. Morgenstern (oCP/As)

co-directors:

1821–1830: J. V. Francke (oG/Pd)  
1831– : C. F. Neue (oCP/HL)**ERLANGEN***Privatgesellschaft für die lateinische Sprache*: 1764–77*Seminarium philologicum seu scholasticum*: 1777– (state)statutes: *Acta historico-ecclesiastica* (ref. 51), 608–22.

directors:

1764–1815: G. C. Harles(s) (oEP)  
1816–1816: J. J. Stutzmann (Gymnasium Rector)  
1817–1826: L. Heller (oCP/P)  
1827– : L. Doederlein (oE/CP)

co-director:

1827– : J. Kopp (eCP)

**FREIBURG IM BR.***Philologisches Seminar*: 1830– (state)statutes: *Statut ... Freiburg im Br.* (ref. 106).

directors:

1830–1835: K. Zell (oCP)  
1836– : A. Baumstark (oCP)

co-directors:

1830–1835: A. Baumstark (Gymnasium)  
1836– : F. A. Feuerbach (oCP/Aw)

## 138 · WILLIAM CLARK

## GIEßEN

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1812– (state)

statutes: in *Großherzoglich ... Regierungsblatt* (ref. 77), 425–30.

directors:

1812–1827: J. E. C. Schmidt (oT)

1827– : F. G. Osann (oG/L)

co-directors:

1812–1814: F. G. Welcker (oCP/Ar)

1812–1827: H. F. Pfannkucke (oG/O)

1812–1824: F. K. Rumpf (oEP)

1816–1833: H. C. M. Rettig (PD)

## GÖTTINGEN

*Seminarium philologicum*: 1738– (state)

statutes: in *Evangelische Schulordnungen* (ref. 54), iii, 359 note, 426ff.

*Schulordnung ... Braunschweig-Lüneburgische* (ref. 54), 209–22.

directors (overlap seems to imply directorial equality):

1738–1761: M. Gesner (oE)

1762–1763: J. D. Michaelis (oO)

1763–1812: C. G. Heyne (oE)

1815– : C. W. Mitscherlich (oE)

1815–1816: F. K. Wunderlich (eCP)

1815–1837: G. L. Dissen (oCP)

1816–1819: F. G. Welcker (oAr)

1819– : K. O. Müller (e, oCP)

*Philologische Gesellschaft*: 1811–1815 (private)

source: Martin Hertz, *Karl Lachmann* (Berlin, 1851), 9–11.

president:

1811–1815: G. L. Dissen (oCP)

## GREIFSWALD

*Gesellschaft für die Philologie*: 1820–1822 (private)

*Gesellschaft für die Philologie*: 1822– (state)

statutes: in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 718ff.

directors:

1820–1824: M. H. E. Meier (eP)

1824– : G. F. Schömann (oCP/Aw)

co-directors:

1823–1824: G. F. Schömann (oCP/Aw)

## HALLE

*Seminarium praeceptorum*: 1695–[1785] (state)

source: Otto Frick, *Das Seminarium praeceptorum* (Halle, 1883).

directors of humanities section:

1702–1707: C. Cellarius (oEp)

1707–1747: H. Freyer (Inspector at pedagogicum)

*Societas latina*: 1736–[?] (private)

statutes: in *Pierides sive Latinum literarum* (ref. 40), 9–34.

president:

1736–? : M. H. Otto (oP)

*Humanistisches Sektion, Theologisches Seminar: 1765–78*

*Theologisches-Pädagogisches Seminar: 1804– (state)*

source: C. G. Schütz, *Nachricht von der bey dem königl. theologischen Seminarium zu Halle neu errichteten Erziehungsinstitute* (Halle, 1778).

directors:

1765–1769: G. B. Schirach

1769–1778: C. G. Schütz

1804– : A. H. Niemeyer

*Erziehungsinstitut: 1778–1783 (state)*

sources: *Neue Hallische Gelehrte Zeitungen*, 1779, 719. *Hallische Gelehrte Zeitung*, 1781, 62.

co-directors:

1778–1783: J. J. Semler

1778–1779: C. G. Schütz

1779–1783: E. C. Trapp

*Philologisches Seminar: 1787– (state)*

statutes: Arnoldt, *Wolf* (ref. 52), i, 245ff. Also see *ibid.*, 95f., 102ff., 177ff. As reorganized, in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 775ff.

directors (overlap seemingly implies joint directorship):

1787–1804: F. A. Wolf (oE)

1806–1828: C. G. Schütz (oEP)

1817–1824: J. F. A. Seidler (oG)

1824– : M. H. Meier (oG)

1828– : G. Bernhardt (oCP)

*Societas: 1824–1829 (private)*

source: Ribbeck, *op. cit.* (ref. 76), i, 37f.

president:

1824–1829: C. Reisig (oCL)

## HEIDELBERG

*Philologisches Seminar: 1807– (state)*

sources: “Intelligenzblatt”, *Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, xxix (issue of 15 April 1807), 227ff.

directors:

1807– : G. F. Creuzer (oCP/CL)

co-directors:

1807–1822: H. Voß (oG)

1809–1810: A. Boeckh (e, oCP)

1823– : J. C. F. Bähr (oCP)

## HELMSTEDT

*Philologische-pädagogisches Institut: 1779–1810 (state)*

statutes: in *Braunschweigische Schulordnungen* (ref. 60), viii, 462ff.

director:

1779–1809: F. F. Wi(e)deburg (eP, oEP)

## 140 · WILLIAM CLARK

## JENA

*Societas latina*: 1733/34–1817 (private)

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1817– (state)

statutes: *Exercitationes Societatis latinae* (ref. 41), unpaginated.

directors:

1734–1734: J. H. Kromayer (oP)

1734–1750: F. A. Hallbauer (oEP)

1750–1751: C. H. Eckhard (oEP)

1752–1778: J. E. I. Walch (oEP)

1778–1799: K. F. Walch (oJ)

1800– : H. K. A. Eichstädt (oEP)

co-directors:

1818– : F. G. Hand (oG)

1821–1825: F. G. Osann (eCL)

1825– : K. W. Götting (e, oCP)

## KARLSRUHE

*Societas latina*: 1766–[1816] (private)

statutes: *Acta Societatis Latinae Marchico-Badensis*, ed. by G. A. Tittel (Karlsruhe, 1767–70), i, 5–10.

director:

1764–c. 1816: G. A. Tittel (Gymnasium)

## KIEL

*Königliches Philologisches Stipendium*: 1777–1810 (state)

*Philologisches Institut*: 1810–1820 (state)

*Philologisches Seminarium*: 1820– (state)

statutes: in *Systematische Sammlung* (ref. 51), iv, 568, 577ff.

directors:

1777–1788: J. A. Cramer (oT)

1789–1808: S. G. Geysler (oT)

1809–1818: K. F. Heinrich (oCP) (1813–18 de facto vacant)

1818–1820: A. Twesten (eT) (provisional)

1820–1825: E. W. G. Wachsmuth (oCP/E)

1825–1827: A. Twesten (eT) (provisional)

1827– : G. W. Nietzsche (oCP/E)

## KÖNIGSBERG

[*Philologisches Gesellschaft*: (1806/07?–)1809/10–1822 (private) ?]

[*Pädagogisches Seminar*: 1810–1822 (state) ?]

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1822– (state)

statutes: in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 850ff.

directors:

[1806–1809: J. C. Süvern? (oCL)]

1809–1813: K. G. A. Erfurdt (oCL)

1813–1814: F. A. Gotthold (Gymnasium)

1814– : C. H. Lobeck (oAw/E)

## LANDSHUT

[*Philologisches Seminar*: 1805 (not listed in lecture catalogue)]

source: Johann Herrmann, *Friedrich Ast als Neuhumanist* (Diss. phil., Munich, 1912), 20, 29.

director:

1805– : G. A. F. Ast (oCL)]

## LEIPZIG

*Philologische Gesellschaft*: 1784–1809 (private)

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1809– (state)

statutes: Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), *passim*, esp. 56ff.

directors:

1784–1834: C. D. Beck (oG/L)

1834– : G. Hermann (oE)

co-director:

1834– : R. Klotz (eP)

*Societas Graeca*: 1798– (private)

sources: *Acta Societatis Graecae*, ed. by A. Westermann (2 vols, Leipzig, 1836–40).

Köchly, *op. cit.* (ref. 118), 79, 84, 246, 257.

director:

1798– : G. Hermann (oE)

## MARBURG

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1811– (state)

statutes: “Intelligenzblatt”, *Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, lxiv (issue of 28 Sept. 1811), 506f.

directors:

1811–1812: K. F. C. Wagner (oE), J. F. L. Wachler (oH), A. J. Arnodi (oT)

1812–1813: [above three, plus] G. L. Dissen (eCL)

1813–1815: K. F. C. Wagner (oE), J. F. L. Wachler (oH), A. J. Arnodi (oT)

1816–1817: K. F. C. Wagner (oE), D. C. Rommel (oL)

1817–1818: F. A. H. Börsch (oP)

1818–1819: E. Platner (oJ), W. G. Tennemann (oP)

1819–1820: D. C. Rommel (oL)

1820–1820: C. H. Koch (eG/L)

1821–1821: F. A. H. Börsch (oP)

1821–1822: F. A. H. Börsch (oP), K. F. C. Wagner (oE)

1822–1822: E. Platner (oJ)

1822–1824: F. A. H. Börsch (oP), K. F. C. Wagner (oE)

1825–1833: K. F. C. Wagner (oE)

1833– : K. F. Hermann (oCP)

(While the directorship revolves, the following are teaching in the seminar: Koch, 1815–23, Rommel, 1816–20, Wagner, 1811–33, Platner, 1818–25. After 1825, only Hermann is teaching with Wagner.)

## MUNICH

*Societas Philologorum Monacensium*: 1811–1826 (state)

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1826– (state)

## 142 · WILLIAM CLARK

statutes: “Decretum Regium de Seminario Philologio factum”, *Acta Societatis Philologorum Monacensis*, ed. by F. Thiersch, i/2 (1812).

directors:

1811– : F. W. Thiersch  
(Bavarian Academy, oE/CL)

co-director:

1827– : L. Spengel  
(Lyceum, eP)

## MÜNSTER

*Pädagogisches Seminar*: 1824– (state)

statutes: “Einrichtung eines philologisch-pädagogischen Seminars in Münster”, *Allgemeine Schulzeitung*, ii/3 (1825), 211–13.

directors:

1822–? : ? Nadermann, ? Esser

## ROSTOCK

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1829– (state)

statutes: *Statuten ... Rostock* (ref. 77).

director:

1829– : F. V. Fritzsche (oEP)

## TÜBINGEN

*Philologisches Seminar*: (1827–29)–1838– (state)

*Reallehrer Seminar*: 1838– (state)

statutes: in *Regierungs-Blatt* (ref. 77), 332–5, and in *Vollständige ... Gesetze* (ref. 104), xi/2, 717–23.

directors:

1838– : C. L. F. Tafel (oCP), C. Walz (oCP) and the Lyceum Rector

## VIENNA

*Philologisch-Historisches Seminar*: 1850– (state)

statutes: *Zeitschrift* (ref. 77), 855–61.

## WITTENBERG

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1768–1771 (private)

*Philologisches Seminar*: 1771– (state)

statutes: *Wittenbergisches* (ref. 102), 130–2, 158; *Neues Wittenbergisches* (ref. 77), 243–50.

directors:

1768–1791: J. F. Hiller (oE)

1791–1806: J. J. Ebert (oMa)

1806–1815: K. H. L. Pölitz (oH)



## WÜRZBURG

[*Philologisches Seminar*: planned 1805

sources: “Projekt eines philologischen Seminars” (*Blatt* 411), in *Materialen zur Geschichte der Universität Würzburg*, Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg, Handschriften-Abteilung; Carl Ludwig Ulrichs, *Die philosophische Fakultät an der Universität Würzburg (Festrede: Würzburg Universitätsreden)* (Würzburg, 1886), 16f.

directors:

1805– to be J. H. Voß, then G. F. Creuzer.]

## REFERENCES

1. Mme de Staël, a most sympathetic observer, found the Germans utterly incapable of ‘conversation’. See her *D’Allemagne* (1813), part 1, chap. 11. On the few fora for non-academic, intellectual life, see Deborah Hertz, *Jewish high society in Old Regime Berlin* (New Haven and London, 1988). Her work focuses on the salon-culture in Berlin, c. 1780–1806, but much reference to the general literature is there. On the character of the intellectuals toward the end of the eighteenth century, see Henri Brunschwig, *La crise de l’état Prussien à la fin du xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle et la genèse de la mentalité romantique* (Paris, 1947), 176ff. On the professional class in the eighteenth century, see W. H. Bruford, *Germany in the eighteenth century: The social background of the literary revival* (Cambridge, 1935), 235ff., esp. 247ff.
2. On the origins of the modern research university, see Joseph Ben-David, *The scientist’s role in society: A comparative study* (Chicago, 1971/1984), 108ff. See also R. Steven Turner, *The Prussian universities and the research imperative, 1806 to 1848* (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1972/73), 1ff., esp. 4ff. Also see his “The growth of professional research in Prussia, 1818 to 1848 — causes and context”, *Historical studies in the physical sciences*, iii (1971), 137–82. See esp. 145ff. Also his “The Prussian universities and the concept of research”, *Internationales Archiv für die Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, v (1980), 68–92. And his “University reformers and professorial scholarship in Germany”, in *The university in society*, ed. by Lawrence Stone (2 vols, Princeton, 1974), ii, 495–532. See, finally, Charles McClelland, *State, society and university in Germany, 1700–1914* (London, 1980).
3. *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (1515/16), lib. II, epis, lviii & xlvi. The translation is from Francis Stokes’s edition: *Epistolae obscurorum virorum: The Latin text with an English rendering* (New Haven and London, 1925), 508f., 485f. The *Epistolae* are satire; but, as with all satire, are founded on truth. Cf. *Urkundbuch der Universität Leipzig von 1409 bis 1555*, ed. by Bruno Stübel (*Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae*, 2. Hpt., xi (Leipzig, 1879)), 280f. The document here, written between 1502 and 1537, corroborates the portrayal given in the *Epistolae*.
4. On the dissolution of the collegiate and corporate university in the Germanies, see William Clark, *From the medieval universitas scholarium to the German research university: A sociogenesis of the Germanic academic* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1986), 286ff., 325ff., 362f. This work must be consulted with care, since, besides being poorly written, it contains numerous misstatements.
5. Laurence Veysey, *The emergence of the American university* (Chicago, 1965/70), 125ff., describes the diffusion of the German model in America. On the importance of the German model in general, see Ben-David and Turner, *op. cit.* (ref. 2). The forthcoming book by Kathryn Olesko, *Physics as a calling: Discipline and practice in the Königsberg*

*Seminar for physics*, will be, to my knowledge, the first published, detailed study of this influential research institute, founded in 1834, and preceded, therefore, only by the natural sciences seminar at Bonn, founded in 1825. See also her doctoral dissertation, *The emergence of theoretical physics in Germany: Franz Neumann and the Königsberg school of physics* (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1980). On the issue of ‘institute-building’ in chemistry, see R. Steven Turner, “Justus Liebig versus Prussian chemistry: Early institute-building in Germany”, *Historical studies in the physical sciences*, xiii/1 (1982), 129–62. Robert Frank is currently engaged in research on the origins of the bio-medical research institutes in the Germanies.

6. The historiography began with the new genre of historical writings on individual German universities in the eighteenth century. With the appearance of biographies of eminent philologists, who were usually seminar directors, treatment of the seminars expanded in the nineteenth century. In a few cases, histories of the individual seminars appeared. Most of these biographies and seminar histories will be cited as sources below. Numerous, but scattered, materials on the history of the seminars lie in the late nineteenth century histories of classical philology and higher education. For example, in Conrad Bursian, *Geschichte des klassischen Philologie* (2 vols, Munich and Leipzig, 1883); and Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, 3rd edn (2 vols, Leipzig and Berlin, 1919–21). The first work on the seminar in general seems to be: Wilhelm Erben, “Die Entstehung der Universitäts-Seminare”, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, vii (1913), 1247–64, 1335–48. Gunner Thiele, *Geschichte der Preussischen Lehrerseminare* (*Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, lxii; Berlin, 1938), deals only with pedagogical seminaries/seminars for lower school teachers.
7. It was Turner’s work which seems to have reawakened interest in the philology seminars, and brought these issues to a wider audience. See Turner, *op. cit.* (ref. 2). Cf. McClelland, *op. cit.* (ref. 2), 60, 85, 111, 127f., and esp. 174ff. On the diffusion of the seminar system to the United States, see Veysey, *op. cit.* (ref. 5), 153ff. The most recent works on the philology seminars in the Germanies are: Anthony Grafton, “Polyhistor into philolog: Notes on the transformation of German classical scholarship”, *History of universities*, iii (1983), 159–92, and Robert Leventhal, “The emergence of philological discourse in the German states, 1770–1810”, *Isis*, lxxvii (1986), 243–60.
8. The determination of source-materials, and the fundamental concepts and methods for this project, come from my two teachers, Robert Westman and Norton Wise. My intellectual debts here are too great to be equated with a recitation of their publications; but let me mention a few particulars. From Westman’s work comes the idea of isolating and reconstructing academics *qua* personality-types — the notion that there is an academic personality-system, which changes over time, and within which there are both orthodox and deviant types. See, for example, Robert Westman, “The Melanchthon circle, Rheticus and the Wittenberg interpretation of the Copernican theory”, *Isis*, lxvi (1975), 165–93, and his “The astronomer’s role in the sixteenth century: A preliminary study”, *History of science*, xviii (1980), 105–47. From Wise’s work comes the idea of decoding German academic practices for their political discourse — not simply setting academic practices within a political context, but rather also the opposite: finding the political context itself within academic practices. (This should not be confused with the banal point that there is ‘politics’ in the academy.) See, for example, M. Norton Wise, “How do sums count? On the cultural origins of statistical causality”, in *The probabilistic revolution, 1800–1930: Dynamics of statistical development*, i: *Ideas in history*, ed. by L. Daston *et al.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 395–425. It is through the combination of these approaches of Westman and Wise that this analysis of research institutions differs from

that of Ben-David, Turner, and McClelland. Citations to their works are given *supra* (ref. 2).

9. References to the literature in Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 362ff. See also *ibid.*, 284ff.
10. See *ibid.*, 87ff., 363ff.
11. This section makes extensive use of three works by Ewald Horn: *Die Disputationen und Promotionen an der Deutschen Universitäten* (*Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft xi; Leipzig, 1893); *Kolleg und Honorar* (Munich, 1897); "Zur Geschichte der Privatdozenten", *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, ix (1901), 26–70. See also August Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (2 vols, Halle, 1853–54).
12. For details on the origin of the private collegium, see Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 220ff.; Horn, "Zur Geschichte" (ref. 11), 29ff.
13. The private collegia as disputational collegia derive from the nightly disputations of the colleges (*disputationes serotinae, quotidianae, domesticae, mensales, bursales*). The nightly disputations of the colleges went alternately through the circle of scholars (*per vices circulares*), each scholar being sole defendant for a turn, then one of the opponents, all conducted with a master or bachelor presiding (the *praeses*). See for example the *Manuale scholarium* (c. 1481), *cap. xii*, reprinted in *Die deutschen Universitäten im Mittelalter*, ed. by Friedrich Zarncke (Leipzig, 1857). Cf. also *Die Statutenbücher der Universität Leipzig aus den ersten 150 Jahren ihres Bestehens*, ed. by Friedrich Zarncke (Leipzig, 1861), 435f. After the Reformation, and the dissolution of the colleges, these nightly circular disputations continued as the *disputationes circulares*, and eventually the disputational collegia. On the *disputationes circulares*, see Horn, *Die Disputationen* (ref. 11), 30ff. Also see Georg A. Will, *Geschichte und Beschreibung der Nürnbergischen Universität Altdorf*, 2nd edn (Altdorf, 1801; reprinted, Aalen, 1975), 120, and Ernst Wolf, "Zur wissenschaftlichen Bedeutung der Disputationen and der Wittenberger Universität im 16. Jahrhundert", *450 Jahre Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg*, ed. by L. Stern (2 vols, Halle-Wittenberg, 1952), i, 335–44, esp. 337. See also *Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticae Societatis Jesu per Germaniae olim vigentes*, ed. by G. M. Pachtler (*Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica*, ii, v, ix, xvi; Berlin, 1887–94), v, 341; ix, 287, 357, 393.
14. See Horn, *Die Disputationen* (ref. 11), 39f.; *Kolleg* (ref. 11), *passim*, esp. 13f., 17, 20, 48ff., 57, 63, 73, 84f.; "Zur Geschichte" (ref. 11), 30ff., 36ff., 39f. See also Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 95.
15. I shall depart from Horn in my assessment of the relation of the private collegium to the seminar. Cf. Horn, *Die Disputationen* (ref. 11), 41, 94ff.; *Kolleg* (ref. 11), 17, 19f., 23, 50; "Zur Geschichte" (ref. 11), 47. Cf. also Paulsen, *op. cit.* (ref. 6), i, 271ff.; ii, 132ff.
16. I shall return to this point below. Another candidate to be rejected as originary locus for the seminar is the *Professorentisch*. On the *Professorentisch*, see Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 220ff., esp. 223ff. and 228. See also Horn, *Kolleg* (ref. 11), 149ff.
17. At Göttingen disputational collegia were rare by 1770. At Halle there were commonly a few each term up through the 1770s. At Leipzig many disputational collegia appeared through the 1780s (thirteen in Summer Semester 1780); they continued but declined in numbers by the turn of the century (six in Winter Semester 1800), and the institution fell into desuetude between 1810 and 1820. All these comments concern the arts faculty alone.
18. Indeed, far more than the disputational form, the enforcement of latinity may have been what led to the gradual abandonment of such collegia by most scholars. This is the judgement of Bonjour regarding why the disputational collegia, earlier well attended, disappeared at Basel by the mid-eighteenth century. See Edgar Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel, 1460–1960* (Basel, 1960), 275f.

19. See Horn, *Die Disputationen* (ref. 11), 31ff., 42ff. On the public circular disputations at Halle, see *ibid.*, 36f., 94f. For Göttingen, see *Die Privilegien und ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, ed. by Wilhelm Ebel (Göttingen, 1961), 61.
20. See Wilhelm Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrich-Universität zu Halle* (2 vols, Halle, 1894), ii, 491ff., esp. 496f. See also document from 1844, reprinted in *Das Unterrichtswesen des preussischen Staates: Eine Sammlung aller gesetzlichen Bestimmungen*, ed. by Ludwig M. P. von Rönne (2 vols, Berlin, 1855), ii, 515–19.
21. Most Protestant universities set up such convictoria. On the scholarship system in general, see *Enzyklopädie des gesamten Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens*, ed. by Karl A. Schmid (11 vols, Gotha, 1859), ix, 261ff. References to further sources are there. See also Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 206ff., 212; Paulsen, *op. cit.* (ref. 6), i, 224ff., 234, 237f., 239f., 243, 245f., 252ff. On Jena and Wittenberg in particular, see Otto Kius, “Das Stipendienwesen in Wittenberg und Jena unter den Ernestinern im 16. Jahrhundert”, *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, liii (n.s.: xxix; 1865), 96–150. On Marburg, *Unkundensammlung über die Verfassung und Verwaltung der Universität Marburg*, ed. by Bruno Hildebrand (Marburg, 1848), 13ff., 39ff., 47, 63ff., 69, 72ff. On Heidelberg, *Statuten und Reformationen der Universität Heidelberg von 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. by August Thorbecke (Leipzig, 1891), 147, 151, 211. On Tübingen, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Universität Tübingen*, ed. by Rudolf Roth (Tübingen, 1877), 195, 425ff., 441f.; and also Norbert Hofmann, *Die Artistenfakultät an der Universität Tübingen (Contubernium)*, xxviii; Tübingen, 1982), 11, 47, 51. On Greifswald, Johann G. L. Kosegarten, *Geschichte der Universität Greifswald* (2 vols, Greifswald, 1856–57), i, 209f.
22. On the lack of juridical personality of the scholarship funds in general in Germany, see Rudolf Sohm, *Institutionen, Geschichte und System des römischen Privatrechts*, ed. by L. Mitteis and L. Wenger, 17th edn (Leipzig, 1949), 204, note 3.
23. On the social order of the convictoria, see Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 207ff., 211ff. In particular, on Marburg, *Unkundensammlung ... Marburg* (ref. 21), 45, 47, 69, 72f. On Tübingen, *Urkunden ... Tübingen* (ref. 21), 429, 441, 446. On Heidelberg, *Statuten ... Heidelberg* (ref. 21), 136ff., 139, 151, 211, 213ff. On the relation to the civil service and the tendency of the convictoria toward the clerical estate, see Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 206ff., 216. In particular, see Kius, *op. cit.* (ref. 21), 115, 152; Kosegarten, *op. cit.* (ref. 21), i, 209; *Unkundensammlung ... Marburg* (ref. 21), 15, 40ff., 70.
24. See *Statuten ... Heidelberg* (ref. 21), 108f., 140, 149ff., 211f.; *Unkundensammlung ... Marburg* (ref. 21), 45f., 69, 72; *Urkunden ... Tübingen* (ref. 21), 440f., 444. On Luther’s role in preserving disputation, see E. Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 13), *passim*, esp. 339ff. On Melancthon’s role in the reform of the educational system, and especially in propagating Luther’s agenda, see Paulsen, *op. cit.* (ref. 6), i, 224ff., 234, 237f., 239f., 243, 245f., 252ff., 271ff.
25. On the matter of social origins, see Tholuck, *op. cit.* (ref. 11), i, 206, 212; Kius, *op. cit.* (ref. 21), 103.
26. See Bernhard Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* (4 vols, Freiburg im Br., 1907), i, 295ff., 315ff. Relevant documents in *Ratio studiorum* (ref. 13), ii, 322, 404f., 411ff., 417ff., 441; xvi, 236ff., 254ff., 258f., 261, 265.
27. Document reprinted in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. by J. Albergio *et al.* (3rd edn, Bologna, 1973). Canon xvii of the “Decreta super reformatione” is on pp. 750–3. On the history of the seminary antecedent to the Council of Trent, see Augustin Theiner, *Geschichte der geistlichen Bildungsanstalten* (Mainz and Vienna, 1835). See esp. 10ff., 15f., 28f., 66f., 103f., 106ff.
28. See Duhr, *op. cit.* (ref. 26), i, 551ff.; ii, 552ff.; iii, 278ff. Relevant documents are in *Ratio studiorum* (ref. 13), xvi, 175ff., 187ff., 254ff., 268ff., 310ff., 332ff.

29. See Thiele, *op. cit.* (ref. 6), *passim*, esp. 80ff., 130ff.
30. See Otto Frick, *Das Seminarium praeceptorum* (Halle, 1883), *passim*, esp. 1–10.
31. See Frick, *op. cit.* (ref. 30), 6.
32. Much is to be found in Immanuel Götz, *Geographica academica* (Nuremberg, 1789).
33. *Ratio studiorum* (ref. 13), v, 460ff.
34. *Ibid.*, 470.
35. See Johann D. Schulze, *Abriss einer Geschichte der Leipziger Universität*, 2nd edn (Leipzig, 1810), 177ff.
36. *Ibid.*
37. See Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 604ff.
38. See *ibid.*, 423ff.
39. On Leipzig, see Schulze, *op. cit.* (ref. 35), 215ff., 267.
40. *Pierides sive latinum literatum continens selectum elaborationum a membris Societatis latinae exhibitam*, ed. by Martin H. Otto (Halle, 1736), 15ff., 25, 28ff.
41. “Leges”, *Exercitationes Societatis latinae*, ed. by F. E. Hallbauer (Jena, 1741), pp. iii, xxxiii *et seq.* See also *Literarisches Museum für die Grossherzoglich Sächsischen Lande (Jenaischer Universitäts-Almanach f. d. J. 1816)*, ed. by Georg G. Güldenapfel; Jena, 1816), 271ff.
42. See Will, *op. cit.* (ref. 13), 151f.
43. Henceforth unreferenced remarks are to be understood as based on materials cited in the Appendix.
44. See Christian D. Beck, *De consiliis et rationibus seminarii philologici* (Leipzig, 1809), 4, and Wolf’s letter of April 1810 (#489) in *Friedrich August Wolf: Ein Leben in Briefen*, ed. by Siegfried Reiter (3 vols, Stuttgart, 1935), ii, 104.
45. The University at Würzburg was the only one not to possess a philological seminar, having failed to obtain it in 1805.
46. The exact data on this are in the Appendix.
47. For a cursory treatment of the problem of private societies and institutions, and their relation to the state, see Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 423ff., esp. 446ff. For a discussion in labyrinthine detail, see Otto von Gierke, *Rechtsgeschichte der deutschen Genossenschaften* (4 vols, Berlin, 1868–1913).
48. Definite budgets existed at Erlangen, Göttingen, Helmstedt, Kiel, Wittenberg, Halle, Berlin, Bonn, Greifswald, Königsberg, Freiburg im Br., Munich, Giessen, Marburg, Rostock, Tübingen and Vienna.
49. “Das philologische Seminar”, *Chronik der Universität Kiel a. d. J. 1855* (Kiel, 1856), 37. At Kiel the seminar was originally actually but a *Stipendienanstalt*, four scholarships having been set up in 1777 for students of philology and pedagogy. Some time after 1804 this became a *Philologisches Institut*.
50. Otto Stählin, *Das Seminar für klassische Philologie an der Universität Erlangen (Erlangener Universitätsreden*, i (Erlangen, 1928), 7, 10.
51. For Erlangen see *Acta historico-ecclesiastica nostri temporis*, iv (1777), 620. At Helmstedt there were reports from the commission overseeing the seminar at least since 1786. See document in Wilhelm Stalman, “Das herzogliche philologisch-pädagogische Institut auf der Universität zu Helmstedt (1779–1810)”, *Jahresbericht über das Herzogliche Gymnasium zu Blankenburg am Harz* (Blankenburg am Harz, 1899–1900), ii, 23f. For Kiel regular reporting seems to emerge only once some amount of control was invested in a commission at the university. See document of 1810 in *Systematische Sammlung der für die Herzogthümer Schleswig und Holstein erlassenen ... Verordnungen und Verfügungen* (Kiel, 1832), iv, 578ff.

52. See documents of 1788 in J. F. D. Arnoldt, *Friedrich August Wolf in seinem Verhältnisse zum Schulmann* (2 vols, Braunschweig, 1861), i, 256. On Wolf's problem with these reports, and his execution of them, see his letters between 1788 and 1805 in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 60, 63ff., 70ff., 75ff., 94f., 209ff., 280, 293ff., 313f., 343f., 348f.; iii, 20, 76, 122.
53. Regular reporting was also mandated for the seminars at Leipzig, Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Königsberg, Freiburg im Br., Munich and Rostock. I do not know about Jena, Dorpat, Heidelberg, Marburg and Tübingen. The 1827 regulations for the seminar at Giessen do not mention reporting, but paragraph 1 clearly puts the seminar under ministerial control.
54. See Johann M. Gesner, "Programma ... in scholis seminarii philologici ... [1737]", *Opuscula minora varii argumenti* (Breslau, 1743), i, 70f. See also the *Schulordnung für die Churfürstl. Braunschweig-Lüneburgische Lande* (Götha, 1738), 209f. Also see King George's "Anweisung" of 1737 reprinted in *Evangelische Schulordnungen*, ed. by Reinhold Vormbaum (3 vols, Gütersloh, 1860–64), iii, 358f., footnote. See Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 4, on the novelty of the Göttingen seminar.
55. There were exceptions to this in the eighteenth century, e.g. the pedagogical institutions at Halle and Wittenberg.
56. For the seminars at Bonn, Halle, Königsberg, and Münster, see *Die preussischen Universitäten: Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen*, ed. by Johann F. W. Koch (2 vols in 3 pts, Berlin, 1839–40), ii/2, 621ff., 624ff., 839ff., 846ff., 850ff., 855ff., 858ff.; and *Verordnungen und Gesetze für die höheren Schulen in Preussen*, ed. by Ludwig Wiese (2 vols, Berlin, 1867), ii/2, 30, 42, 45, 47ff. On the Leipzig physical institute, see Franz Eulenberg, *Die Entwicklung der Universität Leipzig in den letzten hundert Jahren* (Leipzig, 1909), 112; and Otto Wiener, "Das physikalische und das theoretisch-physische Institut", *Festschrift zur Feier des 500 jährigen Bestehens der Universität Leipzig, 1409–1909* (4 vols, Leipzig, 1909), iv/2, 24ff., esp. 33ff.
57. On how scholastic the resolution of this question can swiftly become, one can survey the discussion regarding when the *cabinet de physique* really did become an 'institute' for physical sciences at Marburg. See Heinrich Hermelink and S. Kaehler (eds), *Die Philipps-Universität zu Marburg, 1527–1927* (Marburg, 1927), 532, 757ff.; Rudolf Schmitz *et al.*, *Die Naturwissenschaften an der Universität Marburg, 1527–1977* (Marburg, 1978), 59. Cf. Wilhelm Lexis (ed.), *Die deutschen Universitäten* (4 vols, Berlin, 1893), ii, 25ff.
58. For all German universities, the seminars and institutes, along with their budgets in the early 1890s, are listed in *ibid.*, i, 619; ii, 174ff. On the departmentalization of the faculties in America, see Veysey, *op. cit.* (ref. 5), 153ff., 320ff.
59. The status of the members of the directorate is given in each case after their names in the Appendix.
60. See document of 1780, in *Braunschweigische Schulordnungen von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1828*, ed. by Friedrich Koldeway (*Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica*, i and viii; Berlin, 1886–90), viii, 467. See also Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 7, 10.
61. For Kiel, *Chronik . . . Kiel* (ref. 49), 37. For Göttingen see Johann Pütter *et al.*, *Versuch einer academischen Gelehrten-Geschichte der Georg-Augustus Universität zu Göttingen* (4 vols, Göttingen and Hanover, 1765–1838), ii, 274.
62. See Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 10.
63. See the description by Heyne, the director after 1763, in Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), i, 248ff. Also *ibid.*, ii, 273ff. On Heyne's selection of the seminarians, see Arnold Heeren, *Christian Gottlob Heyne: Biographische Dargestellt* (Göttingen, 1813), 251. On selection protocols, also see Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), ii, 274; iv, 168. Leventhal, *op. cit.* (ref. 7), 257, footnote 33, claims that the philology seminar first became "a royally funded institute" in 1784, citing the following as his source: "Ankündigung einer wirklich königlichen Stiftung des

Philologischen Seminars”, *Göttingsche Anzeige*, clxxxiii (1784), 1882. I have checked this source and am somewhat baffled. The few pages to which he refers (*ibid.*, 1881–84) actually concern “die Ankündigung einer wirklich königlichen Stiftung von vier jährlichen Preisen für die Studierenden” (*ibid.*, 1881; emphasis mine).

64. See Wilhelm Körte, *Leben und Studien Friedrich August Wolfs, des Philologen* (2 vols, Essen, 1883), i, 202ff., esp. 203. Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 246ff., esp. 246, 248, 251, 254f. See also Wolf’s letter of February 5, 1788, in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 63.
65. Kiel, *Chronik ... Kiel* (ref. 49), 37. The University at Helmstedt was closed in 1809, with no major changes seeming to have taken place in the seminar. At Erlangen the seminar appears to fall under the control of the director statutorily in 1827, though perhaps *de facto* as early as 1817. See Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 14ff. On the Wittenberg seminar, I have no knowledge on this point.
66. This is so for the seminars at Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Dorpat, Giessen, Greifswald, Königsberg, Leipzig, Tübingen, and appears to be so at Marburg. At Rostock the director admitted, with full members of the seminar having some voice in the matter. At Munich the director had to report to the ministry regarding the awarding of scholarships, though it is unclear whether this was only *pro forma*. At Freiburg im Br. admission came through the *Direktorium*, of which ministerial officials could conceivably have partaken. I do not know about Heidelberg.
67. More detail on these matters is in Section D *infra*.
68. See the lists of directors in Appendix.
69. Actually, three individuals: J. D. Michaelis was provisional director from 1762 to 1763.
70. These seminars, as noted, remained under ministerial control.
71. See Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 206. Here an *extraordinarius* as *Inspector* to the seminar is mentioned.
72. Such was also the case at Leipzig after 1848, and at the pedagogical seminar at Münster.
73. Hermelink, *op. cit.* (ref. 57), 695ff.
74. Sick of C. G. Heyne’s seminar, students instigated the foundation of a philological society in 1811 as a counter-institution to the seminar. Between 1813 and 1815 the official seminar collapsed. Upon its reconstitution in 1815, and Heyne having died, C. W. Mitscherlich, F. K. Wunderlich and G. L. Dissen became co-directors, all seeming to share equal power.
75. From the lecture catalogues, one can see that the two directors, K. F. Heinrich and A. F. Naeke, alternated in the Latin and Greek sections. Moreover, though F. G. Welcker did not officially teach in the seminar, the directors involved him as an equal in the supervision of the philology students.
76. C. Reisig founded a philological society as counter-institution to the seminar in 1824. Here students had to pay instead of being paid. See Otto Ribbeck, *Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl* (Leipzig, 1879–81), i, 37f.
77. On the pedagogical ends of the other seminars, see for example Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 53, 55; ii, 113, 117; *Neues Wittenbergisches Wochenblatt*, xxxi (issue of 2 August 1806), 243ff.; Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 56; *Systematische Sammlung* (ref. 51), 577, 580f.; *Sammlung der im Gebiet der inneren Staatsverwaltung des Königreiches bestehenden Verordnungen*, ed. by Georg Döllinger (20 vols, Munich, 1835–39), ix/1, 236; *Reglement für das nach 93–100 des Allerhöchst bestätigten Statuts der Kaiserlichen Universität zu Dorpat dasselbst eröffnete Pädagogisch-philologische Seminarium* (Dorpat, 1822), 3, 14; Carl Zell, *Programm ... Betrachtung über die Wichtigkeit und Bedeutung des Studiums der classischen Literatur ... nebst Nachricht über das an der hiesige Universität neu gegründete philologische Seminarium* (Freiburg im Br., 1830), 7, 37f.; “Bekanntmachung, die Statuten des philologischen Seminars zu Giessen [1827]”, *Grossherzoglich Hessisches Regierungsblatt*, xlv (issue of 26

- Sept. 1827), 426; Paul Friedländer, “Zur Geschichte des Altphilologischen Seminars”, in Hermelink, *op. cit.* (ref. 57), 695; *Statuten für das Grossherzogliche philologische Seminarium zu Rostock* (Rostock, 1829), 2; “Bekanntmachung, die Einrichtung von Seminarien für Lehramts-Candidaten and der Universität [Tübingen] betreffend [1838]”, *Regeirungs-Blatt für das Königreich Württemberg* (Stuttgart, 1838), 332; “Statuten des philologisch-historischen Seminars zu Wien [1850]”, *Zeitschrift für das österreichische Gymnasium*, i, (1850), 855f.
78. See Johann Schulze’s review of F. Thiersch’s *Über gelehrte Schulen*, in *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, i (1827), 92ff. The pedagogical ends are only implicit in the Prussian statutes. See for example paragraphs 8 and 13 of the 1812 statutes of the Berlin seminar, in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 560ff.
79. Sources for the following are often ambiguous as to whether the amounts given are per term, or per year.
80. On the (non-university) teacher training seminars for the schools below the *Gymnasia*, see Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 407, 409f.
81. At Bonn and Königsberg, 50 Rthlr for three students, and 40 Rthlr for five students; Freiburg im Br., 25 Fl. for ten, and two with nothing; Marburg, 200 Fr. for three, and 100 Fr. for four, plus four with nothing; Munich, 100 Fl. for eight, and 50 Fl. for four; Rostock, 20 Rthlr for five, and 25 Rthlr for one; Vienna, 60 Fl. for twelve; Dorpat 400 Rbl. for ten.
82. I have no information on the seminars at Heidelberg and Jena.
83. See Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 471ff.
84. See, for example, the Göttingen statutes in *Evangelische Schulordnungen* (ref. 54), iii, 359, footnote. For Freiburg im Br., see Zell, *op. cit.* (ref. 77), 37.
85. Heyne kicked out J. H. Voss and his lazy friend. See Wilhelm Herbst, *Johann Heinrich Voss* (2 vols, Leipzig, 1872–76), i, 73–76.
86. F. A. Wolf, letter of 6 Sept. 1787, in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 55f.
87. F. A. Wolf, cited in Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 255.
88. Although it is not in the statutes, Heyne at Göttingen had this power, since he did it. See Herbst, *op. cit.* (ref. 85), i, 76. See also Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), iv, 168. Wolf had the same power at Halle. See Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 56; Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 249; and Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 222. At the later Prussian seminars — Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Halle (reorganized), and Königsberg — power of expulsion is written into the statutes. The same is true at Erlangen, Freiburg im Br., Helmstedt, Kiel and Tübingen. I do not know about Dorpat, Geissen, Heidelberg, Jena, Leipzig, Marburg, Munich and Rostock.
89. So the Königsberg statutes. See document in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 853. The top three seminarians at Berlin and Königsberg get 50 Rthlr, while the other five get 40 Rthlr. At Freiburg im Br., the bottom two of the twelve get nothing, the other ten receiving 25 Fl. At Halle as reorganized (1829), the top four get 40 Thlr, with the remaining eleven getting 20 Thlr. This practice of differential amounts based on competition seems to have been pioneered earlier by Wolf at Halle. See Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 204, including footnote.
90. Christian F. Augustin, *Bemerkungen eines Akademikers über Halle und dessen Bewohner in Briefen* (‘Germanien’, 1795), 87.
91. On the professional status of the directors, see Appendix.
92. See Gesner, *op. cit.* (ref. 54), i, 70; Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 9.
93. The concept of the undergraduate major seems to emerge only in the late eighteenth century.
94. Notorious since in 1776/77 Heyne, the director of the Göttingen seminar, tried to talk F. A. Wolf out of registering as *philologiae studiosus*, entreating him instead, in his own best



interest, to register with the theology faculty. See Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 40ff., 46ff., 207, 217. But at Erlangen there had been philology majors since 1749. See Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 9. Even at Göttingen students had registered as philology majors prior to Wolf. See Table 1.

95. Table 1 was constructed from collating the list of seminarians with the matriculation register. The matriculation register is *Die Matrikel der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1734–1837*, ed. by Götz von Selle (*Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hannover*, ix; Hildesheim and Leipzig, 1937). The seminarians are listed in Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), ii, 275–8; iii, 494–7; iv, 169–71. The years given in the table are the year of matriculation of the seminarians, not the actual year of entry or in the seminar. Most students enter the seminar one or two years after matriculating. The period chosen (1764–1835) was a function of how the data were originally gathered. The breakdown into three year periods was made only for clarity's sake. Eighteen students are listed in Pütter, whom I was unable to find in the matriculation register; the table is, therefore, somewhat incomplete.
96. See the letters in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 53, 55f.; ii, 104. Friedrich Thiersch's visit to Wolf's seminar documented the same sentiment. See letter to Lange in Heinrich W. J. Thiersch, *Friedrich Thierschs Leben* (2 vols, Leipzig, 1866), i, 34.
97. Universitätsarchiv Halle, Rep. 3, Nr. 260 = *Acta*, iii, 1802–6. *Blatt* 46 has a list of seminarians for WS 1801/2; *Blatt* 75 has that for SS 1802. See also *Blätter* 168 and 196 for WS 1802/3 and SS 1803. See also Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 207.
98. See paragraph 2 of the statutes of the Berlin seminar, 1812, in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 560. The drift of most of the nineteenth century foundations is in this direction.
99. The case of the seminar at Erlangen is instructive. While the seminar had originally been founded (1777) for theology majors, the new statutes of 1827 stipulate preference for philology majors. See Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 9, 15f.
100. See Gesner, *op. cit.* (ref. 54), 72ff.
101. Heyne in Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), i, 249.
102. On Halle, see Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), 102ff., 248ff.; Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 53ff., 314. On Erlangen, *Acta historico-ecclesiastica* (ref. 51), 618; Johann G. V. Engelhardt, *Die Universität Erlangen von 1743–1843* (Erlangen, 1843), 151ff.; Stählin, *op. cit.* (ref. 50), 9, 15f. On Wittenberg, *Wittenbergisches Wochenblatt*, i/15 (1768), 131; *Neues Wittenbergisches* (ref. 77), 243ff. On Kiel, *Systematische Sammlung* (ref. 51), 578. On Helmstedt, documents of 1779/80 and 1780 in *Braunschweigische Schulordnungen* (ref. 60), viii, 463ff. In all seminars, including Göttingen and Halle, some practical experience in pedagogical matters continued with the philological.
103. Augustin, on his visit to Halle in the early 1790s, reports that Wolf gave his seminar such an assignment. Augustin saw no sense in the exercise. See Augustin, *op. cit.* (ref. 90), 86f.
104. Examples additional to the two cited *infra* are the following. On the Halle seminar, see Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 169f., 171, footnote; Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 103. But also *cf.* F. Thiersch's report on how Wolf ran the seminar in H. W. J. Thiersch, *op. cit.* (ref. 96), i, 33f. On the Leipzig society/seminar under its first director, see Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 61; Schulze, *op. cit.* (ref. 35), 253f. At Helmstedt, students did not seem to lead the lessons by turns, but rather collectively participated, presumably under the director as chairman. See Stalman, *op. cit.* (ref. 51), 14. On Tübingen, *Regierungs-Blatt* (ref. 77), 332; and "Bekanntmachung des akademischen Senats, die Einrichtung von Seminarien für Lehramts-Candidaten and der Universität betreffen [1838]", *Vollständige, historische und kritisch bearbeitete Sammlung der Württembergische Gesetze*, xii/2: *Gesetze für die Mittlere und Hochschulen*, ed. by A. L. Reyscher (Tübingen, 1847), 718. On Vienna, see *Zeitschrift*

- (ref. 77), 855f., 859. For the Prussian seminars, the manner in which the seminarial lessons are described in the lecture catalogue is telling. Summer Semester 1822 at Berlin: “Im philologischen Seminar wird Herr Prof. Böckh Mittwochs und Sonnabends von 10–11 Uhr den Euripides *erklären lassen* ...” (emphases mine), whereas a private collegium in the same catalogue reads: “*Die Republik* des Platons *erklärt* Hr. Prof. Böckh ...” (emphasis mine). Thus, in the private collegium the professor interprets the text, while in seminar the student does.
105. Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), ii, 273f. The remark concerns Heyne’s seminar at Göttingen.
  106. *Statut für das philologische Seminarium zu Freiburg* (Freiburg im Br., 1830), 3 (paragraph 16).
  107. On hearing of Wolf’s having tossed out a seminarian at Halle on just such grounds, Gottfried Hermann, Professor of Philology at Leipzig, made the sign of the cross. See H. W. J. Thiersch, *op. cit.* (ref. 96), i, 34.
  108. The Kiel seminar, for example, stands as a great exception when it mandates a formal examination after two years, passage of which is needed for continuation of scholarship. See *Systematische Sammlung* (ref. 51), 578f. (paragraph 9).
  109. Contra the imposition of examinations in seminar, see Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), ii, 113.
  110. Examination, either written or oral, and submission of written work was required by the seminars at Göttingen (at least under Heyne), Kiel, Helmstedt, Leipzig, Halle, Berlin, Bonn, and Königsberg. See Heeren, *op. cit.* (ref. 63), 252; *Systematische Sammlung* (ref. 51), 578f.; *Braunschweigische Schulordnungen* (ref. 60), viii, 465; Friedrich A. Wideburg, “Nachricht von dem auf der Julius-Carls-Universität zu Helmstedt errichteten philologisch-pädagogischen Institut”, *Gelehrte Beyträge zu den Braunschweigische Anzeigen*, October 1780, pts lxxix-lxxx, 618f.; Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 60; Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 246ff.; *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 561, 621f., 851. Dorpat, Giessen, Tübingen, Breslau, and Greifswald seem only to require an examination, while Freiburg im Br., Rostock and Vienna only a specimen of writing, sometimes also with submission of the *Maturitätsprüfung*. See *Reglement ... Dorpat* (ref. 77), 4f.; *Grossherzoglich Hessisches* (ref. 77), 426; *Regierungs-Blatt* (ref. 77), 333; *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 680, 719; *Statut ... Freiburg im Br.* (ref. 106), paragraphs 11 and 14; *Statuten ... Rostock* (ref. 77), 3f.; *Zeitschrift* (ref. 77), 859.
  111. By the time a seminar is founded in Vienna (1850), the standards for admission have become formidable. See *Zeitschrift* (ref. 77), 859.
  112. Statute of the Bonn seminar, 1819. In *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 623.
  113. Statute of the Königsberg seminar, 1822. In *ibid.*, 853.
  114. Cf. Leventhal, *op. cit.* (ref. 7), 257. He argues that the disputational form became attenuated over time.
  115. See *Schulordnung ... Braunschweig-Lünburgische* (ref. 54), 220. I find no mention of disputation, *qua* formal exercise, at Kiel or Wittenberg.
  116. See *Acta historico-ecclesiastica* (ref. 51), 618; also Engelhardt, *op. cit.* (ref. 102), 153.
  117. Wolf may have changed the seminar’s structure upon occasion, so producing conflicting reports on frequency of disputation. See documents in Arnoldt, *op. cit.* (ref. 52), i, 103f., 248, 255; Körte, *op. cit.* (ref. 64), i, 169ff., 210, 212, 220. See also Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 53, 55f., 75, 314; ii, 104. Also Wilhelm Süss, *Karl Morgenstern (1770–1852): Ein kulturhistorisches Versuch (Eesti Vabargiigi Taru Uelikooli. Acta et commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis)*, B. Humaniora, xvi and xix; Dorpat, 1928), i, 35, footnote. On Göttingen, see Heeren, *op. cit.* (ref. 63), 252f.; Pütter, *op. cit.* (ref. 61), iv, 169. On Helmstedt, see Friedrich A. Wideburg, “Nachricht von der Einrichtung des philologisch-pädagogischen Seminariums auf der Julius Karl Universität”, *Humanistisches Magazin auf das Jahre 1788*, ii [?] (Helmstedt, 1788), 289ff., esp. 295. See also

- Stalman, *op. cit.* (ref. 51), i, 14; and statutes in *Braunschweigische Schulordnungen* (ref. 60), viii, 465f.(paragraph vii). From Stalman it is clear that the above transpired weekly.
118. Such disputation was held at Bonn, Greifswald, Halle (reorganized) and Königsberg, usually every week; at Berlin and Breslau, every two weeks. See *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 561, 621ff., 681, 720, 776f., 852f. On Berlin, see also Rudolf H. Klausen, "A. Böckh's Biographie", *Lebensbilder berühmter Humanisten: Erste Reihe*, ed. by S. F. W. Hoffmann (Leipzig, 1837), 44. On Breslau, see also Ribbeck, *op. cit.* (ref. 76), i, 125. At Leipzig seemingly weekly: see Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 60f., 69f.; also Schulze, *op. cit.* (ref. 35), 253f. At Freiburg im Br., seemingly about once every two weeks: see *Statut ... Freiburg im Br.* (ref. 106), 1 (paragraph 5), 3 (paragraph 16), 5f. (Zu 5, ad 2 and ad 3). At Giessen, once a week: see *Grossherzoglich Hessisches Regierungsblatt* (ref. 77), 428f. At Munich, seemingly once a week: see Hans Loewe, *Friedrich Thiersch: Ein Humanistenleben im Rahmen der Geistesgeschichte seiner Zeit* (Munich, 1925), 364f. At Rostock, in two weeks out of every five: see *Statuten ... Rostock* (ref. 77), 5ff. At Tübingen, weekly: see *Regierungs-Blatt* (ref. 77), 332; *Vollständgie ... Gesetze* (ref. 104), 718. At Dorpat, probably once every one or two weeks: see Süß, *op. cit.* (ref. 117), ii, 162; *Reglement ... Dorpat* (ref. 77), 11. At Vienna, weekly: see *Zeitschrift* (ref. 77), 855f., 859. I do not know about Jena, Heidelberg and Marburg.
119. The modern academic conference, with its chairman, speaker(s) and commentator(s), is thus a further derivation from the model of the *collegium disputatorium*, frequently mirroring this version quite closely.
120. I know of only one case in which this was otherwise: the Leipzig society/seminar under Beck. See Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 60f.; Schulze, *op. cit.* (ref. 35), 253f. See also Wolf's critique of Beck's method: letter of April 1810 (#489), in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), ii, 104f.
121. *Schulordnung ... Braunschweig-Lüneburgische* (ref. 54), 220.
122. See Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 539ff.
123. Citations for this are mostly the same as those for the disputation, *supra* (ref. 118). The seminars at Helmstedt, Halle, Breslau, Königsberg, Vienna, Freiburg im Br. mention consultation with the director. At Leipzig, Erlangen, Göttingen, Berlin, Bonn, Greifswald and Giessen only the seminarian is mentioned, though one ought presume some consultation with the director. For Tübingen, *Vollständgie ... Gesetze* (ref. 104), 718, might be taken to imply selection of topic by director.
124. Statute of the Königsberg seminar, 1822, in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 852.
125. On the origins of the doctoral dissertation in the *Philosophische Fakultät*, see Clark, *op. cit.* (ref. 4), 539ff. This was a cursory treatment, and in need of correction. For provisions regarding publication as graduation dissertation of essays written in seminar at Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Halle, Königsberg, see *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 624, 681f., 721, 778, 853. For publication of essays at Leipzig, see Beck, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), 58; for Giessen, *Grossherzoglich Hessisches* (ref. 77), 429f.; for Munich, publication is implied in *Acta Societatis philologorum Monacensium*, ed. by F. Thiersch, iv/1 (1829), "Praefatio", p.v. The notion of publication of an essay written in seminar as graduation dissertation, as noted above, no doubt originated at Göttingen with Gesner. See *supra* (ref. 121). Following Göttingen, in the eighteenth century the seminars at Halle, Helmstedt and Erlangen anticipated publication of seminarial work, the implication being as graduation dissertation. See Wolf's letters in Wolf, *op. cit.* (ref. 44), i, 56, 75, 211; Engelhardt, *op. cit.* (ref. 102), 153; Stalman, *op. cit.* (ref. 51), i, 14; Wideburg, *op. cit.* (ref. 117), 289ff.
126. 1812 Statute of the Berlin seminar, in *Die preussischen Universitäten* (ref. 56), ii/2, 562.
127. See her *D'Allemagne* (1813), part 1, chaps. 2, 11 and 18. Because of its subtlety and incisiveness, her critique of German intellectuals, especially regarding their lack of

**Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System**