

# Greek, Latin, and Digital Philology in Germany and the United States

Part 1 of 2 (part 2 is available [here](#)).

Gregory Crane

July 6, 2015

[gcrane2008@gmail.com](mailto:gcrane2008@gmail.com)

Alexander von Humboldt Professor of Digital Humanities  
Leipzig University

Professor of Classics  
Winnick Family Chair of Technology and Entrepreneurship  
Tufts University

**Abstract:** This is the first section of a two part essay. This part begins by briefly (and somewhat autobiographically) referencing the changing role of the German philological paradigm in Greco-Roman scholarship in the United States over the past forty years, then goes on by augmenting some published statistics about the decline in German publications cited in English language journals of Greco-Roman studies and concludes by providing some statistics for the size and composition of the German Professoriate in Greek and Latin Philology, Greco-Roman History, and Greco-Roman Archaeology (along with comparable data for Byzantine studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology and Assyriology). Part 2 describes the scale of Greco-Roman studies in the US, comparing and contrasting the two very different systems. Here, as elsewhere, my goal is to initiate discussion. All comments -- especially any corrections or information about how to interpret governmental statistics quoted below can be sent to [gcrane2008@gmail.com](mailto:gcrane2008@gmail.com).

## Summary

I have now released a draft for part 2 of Greek, Latin, and Digital Philology in the United States. This part includes some information about Greco-Roman studies in the US, with some comparisons with the situation in Germany, and then moves on with a very brief and preliminary start for suggestions as how Germany can make itself an (even more) attractive location for a research career in this field.

Tables 20 and 21 address the basic size of Greco-Roman studies in the United States. There were, according to one survey, 276 departments of Classical Civilization in the US in 2012, with 1,410 tenured or tenure track faculty. There are 276 US departments of Classical Civilization, while the 52 universities in Germany that have chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History or Classical Archaeology would be equivalent to 208 departments (if Germany had the same proportion of universities and had a population of 320, rather than 80, million). But even if we factor in the differing populations, the 200 chairs for Greco-Roman studies in Germany are only equivalent to 800 in a US-sized population, whereas there are 1,410 tenured and tenure-track positions in Departments of Classical Civilization in the US. In absolute terms, the 290 tenure-track positions (presumably assistant professors) outnumber the 200 chairs in Germany. A Professor Doctor in Germany is different, of course, than an Assistant Professor who still needs to earn tenure but the American system offers more points of entry into the tenure system than there are chairs in Germany. There are, I think, a good number of middle level positions in Germany but most of these positions offer a guarantee: after six years, you're out and you need a new job. Bad as the the long term job market is in the US, it looks a lot better to me when I look closely at the situation in Germany.

Tables 22-25 attempt to identify the business model upon which Greco-Roman studies depends in the United States. Table 22 clearly identifies at least one feature upon which Greco-Roman studies does not materially depend: there are only 1.6 graduating seniors per faculty member (perhaps 5 majors, assuming a few second semester first year students declare per faculty member). Anyone who teaches in a US Department of Classical Civilization knows that larger classes, aimed at non-majors, provide the basis upon which we depend to justify our positions. I have, however, found no statistics on the size of these courses overall -- and this deserves a major study if we want to understand the current health and future prospects of Greco-Roman studies in the US.

At the same time, the Modern Language Association (MLA) (Tables 23-25) provides us with statistics for enrollments in Greek and Latin: there were in fall 2013 still 40,109 students reportedly enrolled in courses of Greek or Latin -- 28.4 such students for each of the 1,410 tenured and tenure track positions. We need to be cautious in assessing these numbers -- there are almost twice as many institutions that reported enrollments in Greek or Latin as there are departments of Classical Civilization (the MLA states that 512 institutions reported enrollments in Greek and/or Latin but 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (AASHD) identified only 276 departments of Classical Studies), but even if we assume that half the students of Greek and Latin are in institutions without departments of Classical Civilization, we get about 15 students of Greek and Latin for every tenured and tenure-track professor. This reflects a discipline-wide commitment to keeping the study of the languages alive.

The MLA numbers also told two stories. First, there was a precipitous drop in enrollments between 2008 and 2013 -- about 20% for both Premodern Greek and Latin (when different ways

of classifying Premodern Greek are taken into consideration). I think that this surely reflects anxiety about the practicality of undergraduate study after the financial crisis of 2008. Whether we can reverse these losses or whether this is the new normal remains to be seen. But if we consider the figures from 1968 through 2009, we see substantial (to me, amazing) resilience: despite the crises and changes that followed the 1960s, there are about as many people studying Greek and Latin in 2009 as there were in 1968. This was a huge achievement and something for which the study of Greco-Roman culture in the US should take pride. I do think that we will need new ideas and new methods to maintain this resilience but I personally think that we are poised to grow and expand if we are determined, fearless, and judicious. We are poised to reinvent the study of Greek and Latin at every level -- but that must remain, for now, an assertion and await another venue for further discussion. More than 75% of all historical language students in the US study Greek or Latin (Table 26) -- if smaller historical languages (e.g., Aramaic, Akkadian, Sanskrit, Classical Chinese) are to flourish, the students of Greek and Latin must design a general infrastructure that serves many other languages as well.

Table 27 turns to question of where tenured and tenure-track professors of Classical Civilization in the US got their PhDs. I analyzed the public web pages for 575 US Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in this field. Among 206 faculty at institutions without a PhD program, the national composition was very similar to the Professor Doctors of Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology in Germany. In non-PhD departments in the US, 95.6% of the faculty (198 of 206) had US PhDs, while 95% (190 of 200) of the German chairs had PhDs from German institutions. When we considered PhDs from other Anglophone and German-speaking universities, we accounted for 98% of the faculty in both the US (203 of 206) and Germany (196 or 200). If you want to become a Professor Doctor in Germany or a tenured/tenure-track Professor at a non-PhD US program, you had better get a PhD in the US or Germany. You might get one of these positions if you get a PhD in an English-language or German-language program but I would not count on it.

If we look at the departments of Classical Civilization with (by one ranking: <http://www.phds.org/rankings/classics>) the top-10 PhD programs, we find a very different population. Just under two-thirds of the Assistant, Associate and full Professors in these departments received their PhDs from US programs (64.5%, 102 out of 158 faculty where I could determine the PhD institution) -- adding the three Canadian PhDs would get us to almost exactly two thirds (66.5%, 105 out of 158). Thus, fully one third of all these faculty received their highest degree (there was one faculty member who seems only to have received an MA) outside of North America. Most of these (33 out of the overall 158, 21% of the total) came from the UK while two came from Australia.

More than 11% (18 of 158) of these faculty received their PhDs from outside the Anglophone world. With 10 departments, this means that each department has, on average, one or two faculty members who were trained outside the Anglophone world, reflecting a very different scholarly tradition and (often) maintaining deep ties with colleagues in the nations where they were trained. For me, the importance of such international faculty cannot be overstated -- when

I was a student, I benefited constantly from working with faculty who had not come through the US system. Some may view the fact that fully one third of the faculty at the highest ranked departments do not have US PhDs as a sign of weakness -- there are not, in this view, enough good Americans to fill the positions. I see this diversity as a strength of the US system. This strength may only be practical because the highest ranked departments are also the biggest and each can afford to take a chance on one or two faculty who might not necessarily flourish in the US system (I know of at least one instance where a big department brought a big scholar in, knowing he would never fit in -- they felt they could afford it).

Table 28 looks quickly at gender balance. The American Academy of Sciences report (from which many of the data are drawn) reports that 40% of the Classical Civilization faculty are women while women accounted for 38% of 582 US faculty members whom I analyzed. The rate for full Professors is lower -- 33% -- but that 33% is still 50% higher than the 22% of female Professors Doctors in Germany.

The final table (Table 29) summarizes where the faculty I identified got their PhDs. I was most interested in the rates for Assistant Professors -- PhD programs have changed substantially since current Assistant Professors chose where to get a PhD, but those departments have changed even more since most Associate and full Professors got their degrees.

The final section provides some partial, preliminary, and perhaps provocative comparisons between Germany and the US in Classical studies. Any student, with a choice of beginning their career in Germany or the US and who can manage either German or English, should consider the following: data reinforces the more general impression that English language scholarship no longer cites non-English scholarship at the same level as even a generation ago; there are more permanent jobs in the US; the most highly ranked departments have between 15 and 22 faculty members and are, arguably, better suited structurally to support a more generalized *Altertumswissenschaft*; if the student does manage to get a tenure track job (no easy task), then that person immediately becomes a critical member of a(ny rational) department; there is very little evidence that people from outside the German speaking world are going to win one of two-hundred or so coveted chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology in Germany.

## **Main text**

To study Greek and Latin is to participate in a cultural space that maps to no modern nation state or region. Ultimately, we need to develop a model whereby we can support the study of historical languages on a global scale -- Classical Chinese in North America, Classical Latin in India, Sanskrit in Europe, Classical Arabic in South America. Such exchanges must be mutual -- if I want to encourage people to read Herodotus or Plato in Tehran, I need to be prepared to read Hafez in Leipzig and Boston. In my own research group, we have begun to take concrete steps in this direction, with a particular eye towards support for Classical Arabic and Persian.

In this essay, however, I focus more particularly upon the study of Classical Greek and Latin in Germany and the United States. My goal is to develop an understanding of how the study of these two languages functions in these two particular countries. Here I write for several reasons.

First, I write in my capacity as an Alexander von Humboldt Professor, because Humboldt Professors are “expected to contribute to enhancing Germany's sustained international competitiveness as a research location.”<sup>1</sup> I am thus, quite literally, an American citizen who is a “paid agent of a foreign power,” a title that I happily embrace because I see the role of the Humanities as advancing the intellectual life of humanity as a whole and encouraging respectful dialog across boundaries of language and culture. Germany occupies a strategic position intellectually, being both a superpower in Europe and a kind of gigantic Scandinavian country in the world as a whole. The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, which administers the Humboldt Professorships, is dedicated to creating constructive intellectual and social ties between researchers in Germany and around the world. If I can help Germany become a more attractive center for research in the Humanities and thus, in turn, provide pressure on Anglo-American universities to adapt, then I see myself as contributing to both sides.

But while my PhD is in Classical Philology and while I am a professor of Classics at Tufts University in the United States, I am an Alexander von Humboldt Professor of Digital Humanities, not of Greco-Roman studies, and my position is in the Department of Computer Science at Leipzig. I am thus institutionally independent of any one field in the Humanities and that independence is something that I am expected to exploit. I nevertheless have chosen to concentrate the research activities in my chair upon the study of the Greco-Roman world in general and Greek and Latin philology in particular.

This is not the place to discuss the research strategy of our group in detail but the goal is to use a concentrated focus upon Greek and Latin, in close contact with colleagues who work with other historical languages (e.g., various forms of Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian, Sanskrit, Coptic, Syriac, Classical Arabic and Classical Persian) and with the material record (above all, our colleagues at the German Archaeological Institute), to model the study of various antiquities within a digital space. All three of the current senior full-time members of the chair, Dr. Monica Berti, Dr. Giuseppe Celano, and Dr. Thomas Koentges, focus upon complementary aspects of the same strategic challenge, redefining the ways in which we represent our understanding of textual data so as to support the intellectual life of society as broadly and deeply as possible. Thomas Koentges works on the challenge of reinventing traditional editorial work within a digital space (and one where we sometimes wish to reconstruct a single original version of a work and other times wish to treat all surviving versions as equally important). Monica Berti focuses on the editions that are fundamentally hypertextual, such as editions that integrate quotations, paraphrases and citations in works that do survive that shed light on works that do not survive (e.g., Plutarch quoting a lost play of Euripides) as well as editions that include source texts about a particular topic (e.g., sources on Ancient medicine) -- the latter is a critical genre as

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.humboldt-foundation.de/web/alexander-von-humboldt-professorship.html>.

scholars, especially scholars at publicly funded institutions, strive to open their scholarship to the world at large and to make the evidence behind their conclusions transparent. Giuseppe Celano focuses upon the problem of rethinking the ways in which we represent our textual data based upon the possibilities afforded by a generation of research in Corpus Linguistics, Computational Linguistics and various applications in machine learning and text mining. In September, we expect to add a fourth collaborator, Dr. Maxim Romanov, whose expertise lies in text mining and visualization, with a particular strength on modeling the history of Islam by analyzing billions of words Classical Arabic. Everyone in the chair is focused not simply on how to impress specialists but on how to change the relationship between established specialists and members of society both beyond the academia and beyond traditional networks of Western European and North American higher education.

The focus on Greek and Latin has several justifications. Of course, my own training lies in Greek and Latin and I do have a particular fondness for these two languages, but I certainly did not find this a compelling motivation by itself. About fifteen years ago I began to focus on what I would now call the Big Humanities because I felt that was the best way to advance the Humanities in a Digital Age. But after four or five years of focusing primarily on subjects such as Shakespeare and Early Modern English Literature, the history and topography of London, and the American Civil War, I returned to Greek and Latin for several reasons.

**First**, Greek and Latin may never be the flagship subjects for any one nation state but that is because Greek and Latin are the shared cultural heritage for many nations. Certainly, Greek and Latin are fundamental to any nation where a Romance language is spoken and/or Judaeo-Christian culture has played a major role, whether or not the institutionalized educational system has yet recognized the importance of Greco-Roman culture. (We should not forget that most of the Greek and Latin sources that survive through c. 600 CE, beginning with the Greek New Testament, reflect the development of Christianity.)

**Second**, Greek and Latin are superset subjects that entail much of what goes into the Big Humanities. If we wish to study Homer or Vergil fully, we will need to work with quotations of both authors in later Greek and Latin, with Greek papyri, with medieval manuscripts, with learned commentaries produced over hundreds of years, with their literary and cultural influence (including adaptations such as Purcell's *Dido and Aeneas* or film versions of the Homeric epics as well as written fiction), as well as with scholarship about both authors of every kind. If we turn to Aristotle and Galen, then we must include as well translations and scholarship in Syriac and Arabic. If we consider Christian authors, then we also need to consider Classical Armenian and Georgian. Bach and Shakespeare may loom larger and play more prominent roles in the Big Humanities of Germany and the English speaking world, but Greco-Roman culture runs through cultural DNA over thousands of years.

**Third**, Greek and Latin can be treated not as the only two Classical languages but rather as two Classical heritages among many. I feel comfortable referring to my Department at Tufts as a Department of Classics because my colleague Anne Mahoney there teaches Sanskrit, my

colleague Steve Hirsch teaches about Ancient China and Ancient Greece, because I have myself taught a course integrating Greek, Latin, and Classical Arabic and because we have now hired a tenure-track faculty member to work on Greek and Classical Arabic. At Leipzig, we have begun working on a Learning Environment for Classical Greek that supports Farsi and an Open Persian project (to complement our Open Greek and Latin Project). If we want people to read Herodotus and Plato in Tehran, we need to be prepared to read Hafez and Rumi in Leipzig and Boston. By treating Greek and Latin as two among a growing network of Classical languages (rather than as the only two Classical languages), we cultivate a dialog across traditional boundaries of language and culture and, in so doing, foster what I, at least, consider to be a fundamental contribution that the Humanities can make.

**Fourth**, Digital Greco-Roman studies has produced the most dynamic, collegial, far-sighted and international community of digital humanists with which I am familiar and has, as a community, done as much as any group to produce tangible models for a truly digital ecosystem. This activity remains a relatively small effort when compared to the field as a whole -- in going over the research at US departments with the top ten-ranked graduate programs in Classics, I had an opportunity to see how scholars in these departments hand over their work in the form of articles and monographs in print formats (i.e., PDF documents) to commercial publishers that, in turn, reach audiences of specialists and enrolled students. But a growing community of researchers has begun to think seriously about how to reimagine the study of Greek and Latin within a truly digital space. My colleagues and I can sit in a room with more than a dozen researchers, drawn from Europe and North America, who have spent more than a decade combining broad analysis and the critical practical work that gives their broader analysis depth and power.

**Fifth**, Greek and Latin remain by far the most widely studied historical languages, at both the secondary and university levels, in those countries of the developed world for which we have been able to gather statistics. I will return to this point later in analyzing the situation in Germany and the United States more closely, but for now I would make two observations. First, no field of ancient studies in the European and North American university world outside of Greco-Roman studies is big enough to create a sustainable, state-of-the-art infrastructure for its work. A small group of collaborators may be able to create a state-of-the-art infrastructure for a smaller discipline, but maintaining that infrastructure after one or two grant cycles is a very different proposition. Second, Greco-Roman studies is itself not big enough to support its own infrastructure. Cultural heritage languages must work together and Greco-Roman studies must play a leadership role in that coalition -- and a leadership role entails a sustained effort to work with all fields. This means that we all need to think beyond the assumptions that may (or may not) be adequate for our own fields and be prepared to do more work in the short run to develop an environment that is sufficiently general and well designed to be supportable over time.

## German Philology and the study of Greco-Roman Culture in the United States

Before I go further, I will explain some of the reasons why I focus upon Germany and the United States. Of course, I have appointments in Germany and in the United States, that dual career is not so much a cause as it is the effect of historical connections between the study of Greek and Latin in Germany and the United States that were still present when I entered college forty years ago but that have, I think, largely faded from consciousness in both Germany and the United States. And while I hope (among other things) to be able to contribute to the study of Greek and Latin, to the Digital Humanities and to the Humanities in general, I hope also to contribute to a new and revitalized partnership, one that reflects both the changes that have taken place on both sides of the Atlantic over the past century<sup>2</sup> and the work to be done in the century to come.

There are historical and personal reasons, as well as pragmatic reasons for me to focus upon the relationship between the study of Greek and Latin in Germany and the United States.

In June 1815, exactly two hundred years from the time when I began writing this essay, Edward Everett and George Ticknor had recently arrived in England on the second ship after the War of 1812, and they were waiting in London for what would be the Battle of Waterloo so that they could travel on to Goettingen. Everett and Ticknor were (as far as they knew) the first two Americans to study in Germany -- Everett had been appointed to the first chair of Greek at Harvard College and asked permission to spend two years in Germany preparing himself to teach the subject of which he had been named a professor. But if Everett and Ticknor were the first, they would not be the last -- a stream of Americans would travel to Germany over the next hundred years to get their advanced degrees. German models of scholarship would reshape not only the American university system as a whole but also the study of Greek and Latin in particular.

Forty years ago, in the fall of 1975, when I began as a first year student in college, four of the senior faculty were products of the German university system -- Ernst Badian, Herbert Bloch, George Maxim Anossov Hanfmann, and Albert Henrichs. Albert Henrichs would become the Eliot Professor of Greek, assuming the same professorship that sent Everett, after he had been named to this (funded but not yet named) first chair of Greek in the United States, off to spend years in Germany. Of these, the first three were born in very different places -- Badian in Vienna, Bloch in Berlin, and Hanfmann in St. Petersburg -- but all three were among those who were fortunate enough to escape Nazi Germany in the 1930s and were among the many émigrés who helped transform Anglo-American universities into the most highly ranked universities in the world.

---

<sup>2</sup> Americans should reflect on the fact that just over a hundred years ago -- on February 18, 1915 -- Woodrow Wilson hosted a showing of the *Birth of a Nation*, which depicted the Ku Klux Klan as the savior of the American South, revitalizing the Klan and abetting thousands of lynchings in the coming years. London Melvyn, D.W. Griffith's the Birth of a Nation (Oxford 2007) p. 111: available on Google Books at [https://books.google.ie/books?id=fGJFpiTjbKwC&pg=PA111&lpg=PA111&dq=%22operators+wearing+full+evening+dress+utilized%22&source=bl&ots=AOFjf60Rc\\_&sig=GJ-f9FVH8MfOtgznzJLQV\\_3l-DU&hl=en&sa=X&ei=\\_m5hUMf9JI-whAfz6oCQAg#v=onepage&q=%22operators%20wearing%20full%20evening%20dress%20utilized%22&f=false](https://books.google.ie/books?id=fGJFpiTjbKwC&pg=PA111&lpg=PA111&dq=%22operators+wearing+full+evening+dress+utilized%22&source=bl&ots=AOFjf60Rc_&sig=GJ-f9FVH8MfOtgznzJLQV_3l-DU&hl=en&sa=X&ei=_m5hUMf9JI-whAfz6oCQAg#v=onepage&q=%22operators%20wearing%20full%20evening%20dress%20utilized%22&f=false)



I did not need to depend upon the German members of the senior faculty to understand what we owed to German *Altertumswissenschaft*. Werner Jaeger's picture loomed down upon us as we sat in the departmental library and we would regularly pass the imposing Goettingen PhD diploma of Herbert Weir Smyth mounted on a dark wall in the windowless back-room stacks. In the fall of 1975, Cedric Whitman quoted August Boeckh's definition of philology to us (philology was the *scientia totius antiquitatis*, "the study of antiquity in its entirety," though later I could only discover the slightly different, but very similar, phrase *cognitio universae antiquitatis*). At some later point in my undergraduate career, Wendell Clausen broke off his discussion of Vergil to explain that American institutions such as Harvard had been little more than secondary schools until faculty began training in Germany and adopting the German model of the research university within the United States. Johns Hopkins, founded in 1876 on the German model, was, as I understood it at the time, the first American research university, with its Ivy League predecessors playing catch up. Ancient anecdotes were still alive -- I remember one where Friedrich Wolf declared a fashionable New York preacher a liar if he said he read Aeschylus without a dictionary and decades later I discovered that this anecdote accurately reproduced a written memoir. When I entered college, I immediately began to study German and, as soon as I graduated, I supplemented my three semesters of German with two months at a Goethe Institute in Kochel am See in Upper Bavaria (not a place where one heard, at least in 1979, Hochdeutsch on the street).

But the currents of cultural influence in the United States had already changed. The Marshall and Rhodes Scholarships were only two among a number of scholarships that pointed the most ambitious American students to the United Kingdom if they wished to advance their study in Europe. Cambridge and Oxford had in the 1970s -- and even now, despite major cuts -- by far the biggest concentration of scholars working on Greco-Roman culture. If we thought of developing careers as Greek and Latin philologists, the other graduate students with whom I spent my time thought of publishing editions and commentaries with Cambridge and Oxford University presses. Of course we knew about, and constantly used, Teubner editions but I do not recall that we considered Teubner when we imagined where to aim potential research projects. The only other Classicist in my cohort that I knew who actually spent time in the German speaking world was Neel Smith, now a professor of Classics at Holy Cross and a pioneer in Digital Classics, who spent a year as a Fulbright Scholar in Zurich.

The shift in emphasis was both national and intellectual. When I was a graduate student, it was quite reasonable to imagine a career producing editions, commentaries and scholarship about Greek and Latin language. Even though such a career path was ultimately not suited to me, I remember distinctly thinking and talking about it. But my undergraduate and graduate career also corresponded with the rise of literary theory, first in English and then more generally in the Humanities. George Ticknor -- the other American who traveled with Edward Everett, Eliot Professor of Greek, to Goettingen in 1815 -- did as much as anyone to establish the Modern Languages as an academic subject in the United States. When George Lyman Kittredge (1860-1941), who would emerge as a dominant figure in the Harvard English department, got married, he spent his honeymoon in Germany, informally studying at Leipzig and Tübingen -- he

had, of course, already learned German in the United States.<sup>3</sup> German was the language to know a century before I entered college.

## A Precipitous Decline in the Use of German Scholarship?

In the 1970s, however, American literary scholars began to focus upon literary theory and to shift their focus to French scholarship -- a shift that has been dramatic and almost complete: in the 2002 issues for the *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, a flagship journal for literary studies in North America, 15.9% of the citations pointed to non-English publications. Of these, almost three quarters (11.7% of all citations) pointed to publications in French. By comparison, only 0.3% of the publications cited were in German. While broader analysis might reveal a more complex landscape, this study certainly reinforces my own experience. Where, a century before, at least some Professors of English such as Kittredge had, as a matter of course, mastered German whether or not they traveled to Germany, German had vanished as a language of scholarly discourse in North American literary studies of the early twenty-first century.

A similar wave rolled over Greek and Latin studies in North America in the 1980s and there were at least two dimensions to this. First, there was a shift away from traditional philological research -- even if faculty describe themselves as doing work in the philological tradition or on areas such as the grammatical tradition, this scholarship typically produces articles and monographs, rather than commentaries or editions. I don't know of any professor producing such traditional forms of scholarship under the age of 60 in a major Classics PhD program in the US. A younger colleague in the United States who does have a commitment to editing and wants to start up a new series of editions lamented to me that US programs simply do not train people to be editors.

Second, whether or not there has been a more general shift away from the German tradition and from German scholarship (or, perhaps, the authority of German scholarship), there does seem to have been a striking shift away from the reliance upon scholarship published in the German language. By analyzing back issues of journals in JSTOR, Project Muse and various publisher portals, we could now do a very thorough study of citation patterns over the previous decades, but even the relatively cursory analyses already available paint a consistent picture, one that initial (but still very partial) analysis on my part reinforced.

Classical Studies stood out in two articles analyzing which languages US Classics Journals cited. First, a 2005 study of leading US journals in eight different humanities fields found that the

---

<sup>3</sup> Clyde Kenneth Hyder, *George Lyman Kittredge, Teacher and Scholar* (Kansas 1962), the main source for Kittredge's biography, is available at <https://archive.org/details/georgelymankittr002359mbp>.

2002 issues of *American Journal of Philology* cited German publications at a higher rate than any of other US humanities publications.<sup>4</sup>

	Non-English	French	German	Italian	Latin
<i>American Journal of Philology</i>	19.5%	3.6%	10.5%	2.9%	2.4%
<i>Journal of Religion</i>	15.3%	3.3%	8.7%	0.2%	3.1%
<i>Art Bulletin</i>	34.7%	6.8%	6.7%	11.1%	0.8%
<i>Journal of the American Musicological Society</i>	28.0%	10.9%	4.6%	8.9%	0.8%
<i>American Historical Review</i>	19.5%	3.6%	2.1%	1.0%	1.7%
<i>Language</i>	10.4%	2.8%	3.4%	0.5%	0.0%
<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association</i>	15.9%	11.1%	0.3%	0.3%	1.3%
<i>Journal of Philosophy</i>	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
2008-2012 average in Elsevier	23%	7.1%	4.2%	2.4%	N/A

<sup>4</sup> "Citation Analysis for Collection Development: A Comparative Study of Eight Humanities Fields", Jennifer E. Knievel and Charlene Kellsey, *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (April 2005), pp. 142-168 Published by: The University of Chicago Press Article DOI: 10.1086/431331

Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/431331>; the 2008-2012 figures come from Daphne van Weijen, "Publication Languages in the Arts & Humanities," Research Trends (March 2013): <http://www.researchtrends.com/issue-32-march-2013/publication-languages-in-the-arts-humanities-2/>. The figures reported by van Weijen come from *Scopus*, a database of abstracts maintained by the Dutch Publisher Elsevier that (as of June 2015) boasts 55 million records for 21,915 titles, covering books, journals and conference proceedings from 5,000 publishers (<http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus>).

Scopus Arts and Humanities Database					
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 1: relative frequency of citations in US Humanities journals in 2002 to non-English sources with figures for overall frequency of Arts and Humanities publication language in Elsevier's Scopus database for 2008-2012.**

If we start from the figures in Elsevier's Scopus database, American journals demonstrate a minimal bias towards English language publications: 23% of the Arts and Humanities publications in Scopus over 2008-2012 were not in English while 21.5% of the citations in the eight journals analyzed pointed to non-English sources. *The American Journal of Philology* (AJP) cited German publications c. two and half times more often than the general average of German publications (10.5% vs. 4.2%), just a bit more often than in *the Journal of Religion*. In this study, at least, students of Greco-Roman culture cite publications in German more than any other discipline.

A 2013 study by Gregory Crawford,<sup>5</sup> however, provided evidence for a systematic decline in the absolute number and percentage of citations to German sources in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (TAPA) from 1956+1957 (52.4% of all citations were to non-English sources and 32.5% of all citations pointed to German) to 1986 (where 32.3% of citations pointed to non-English and 24% to German) to 2006 (where non-English citations had fallen to 15.5% and German to 8.5%).

I found the trends sufficiently striking that I augmented the published results by doing my own analysis. First, I analyzed 181 citations in the first 10 articles of AJP 1986 and found essentially the same distribution of languages as was reported for TAPA 1986.

---

<sup>5</sup> Gregory Crawford, "A Citation Analysis of the Classical Philology Literature: Implications for Collection Development," *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* (February 2013): <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/18598/15201>.

	<b>TAPA1956+1957</b>	<b>TAPA1986</b>	<b>AJP1986</b>
English	47.6%	67.3%	67.2%
French	11.8%	6.3%	7.5%
<b>German</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>22.4%</b>
Italian	8%	2.5%	2.9%
Spanish	0.1%	0%	0%

**Table 2: Citations in TAPA 1956+1957, TAPA 1986 and AJP 1986 by language. The figures from TAPA 1956+1957 and TAPA 1986 come from Crawford 2013 (see notes); the figures for AJP 1986 were from a quick survey that I conducted of 181 citations in the first 10 articles in AJP 1986.**

Knievel 2005 and Crawford 2013 provided very similar percentages of language citation for AJP 2002 and TAPA 2006. I supplemented their work by analyzing 941 and 913 citations in the “works cited” lists in the 2014 issues of AJP and TAPA, respectively. Curious to see whether a similar pattern would emerge in a British journal, I analyzed 415 citations in the notes for the first ten articles of the 2015 volume of *Classical Quarterly* (CQ). These are all relatively small numbers but the convergence is striking.

	<b>AJP2002</b>	<b>TAPA2006</b>	<b>AJP2014</b>	<b>TAPA2014</b>	<b>CQ2015</b>
English	82.2%	84.5%	83.6%	79.6%	81.9%
French	3.9%	3.4%	2.9%	5.7%	5.1%
<b>German</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
Italian	3%	3.4%	4.3%	3.8%	2.7%
Spanish	0	0.3%	0.7%	0%	0%

**Table 3: Citations in AJP, TAPA and CQ by language. The figures for AJP 2002 and TAPA 2006 come from Knievel 2005 and Crawford 2013. I analyzed 941, 913, and 415 citations from AJP 2014, TAPA 2014 and CQ 2015, respectively.**

In all five journals, German accounted for between 8 and 10.9% of all citations. The data suggests a substantial decline in the use of German language publications from 1956 to 1986 and then to c. 2000, where it levels off.

In reviewing the citations, I thought that many of the references to German scholarship pointed to earlier publications. Because I had done the citation analysis for AJP 1986 and 2014, TAPA

2014 and CQ 2015, I was able to analyze citations to publications in the thirty years before each journal issue had been published.

	AJP1986	AJP2014	TAPA2014	CQ2015
English	74.2%	87.2%	84.1%	88.2%
French	6.45%	2.8%	4.7%	2.9%
<b>German</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
Italian	2.4%	4.6%	3.3%	2.9%
Spanish	0	0.7%	0%	0%

**Table 4: Citations in AJP, TAPA and CQ by language of materials published in the previous 30 years.**

In each case, the journal articles tended to cite German publications from the previous 30 years at an even lower rate. TAPA 2014 cites recent German publications less than half as often as did AJP 1986. TAPA 2014 cites recent German publications just over a third as often and AJP 2014 less than a third as often as did AJP 1986.

There are a number of caveats to bear in mind. First, the analyses are based on relatively small numbers (although the consistency of the patterns across journals suggests that more analysis would reveal much the same patterns). Second, I only analyzed one UK Journal. I wanted to see if the same pattern would emerge as in the US journals. A broader analysis might detect different trends (although that would not surprise me since there seems to be growing cross-over of authors from the UK, US, Australia, New Zealand and others writing in English. Third, the trends above detect patterns in English language journals -- usage will surely differ in publications that are themselves in German, French, Italian, Spanish or some other language. Fourth, these figures only track citations by language -- they do not track the usage of scholarship by German speakers who publish in English or some other language. Thus, German researchers surely produced some of the English language publications cited. That said, a survey of publications by German Professors found that, for publications in German or English, 90% of publications by Professors of Greek, Latin, and Classical Archaeology were in German and 10% in English. When I looked at German and English publications by German Professors of Ancient Historians, I found that just over 97% were in German.

In addition, I know that some cries of “O tempora! O mores!” will emerge, with the implication that English language Classical Scholarship has declined since the 1950s when more than half the citations in at least one journal pointed to non-English scholarship. But that certainly is not how it looks to me or to my colleagues. Graduate education in the United States became much more competitive and professionalized after the Second World War. There was major hiring in the 1950s and 1960s as universities expanded -- and then the job market for professors

crashed in the 1970s and has not come back. Thus, there was often tension in the 1980s and 1990s between recently hired Assistant Professors, who were expected to publish early and often, and more senior professors, hired in the 1960s, who had received tenure with very slender publication records and often little post-tenure research publications. Virtually all of the scholars who published in the 2014 and 2015 journals analyzed above got their jobs (those who are lucky enough to have gotten jobs) during the forty years of a depressed job market. They are, almost certainly, a far more professionalized and disciplined, indeed brutally disciplined in a ruthless Darwinian space, cohort than those who were publishing in 1985 or 1957. I suspect that the same is true for all Greco-Roman studies faculty in the Anglophone world. If they are citing less German scholarship, it is not because they are less talented or less disciplined than their predecessors. If members of this population felt that they could achieve a competitive advantage by citing more scholarship in German, I believe that they would do so.

One change in the past generation may account for part of the decline in citations of German scholarship. One colleague with extensive experience in the publishing industry informed me verbally that the number of copies printed for a standard German monograph had declined from c. 800 copies in the 1980s to 120 copies in 2015. Another colleague from the library community cited, in background information for a conference, 120 as a typical print run for German monographs. In part, this reflects, I was told, the increased efficiency of institutions such as interlibrary loan and shared collections (e.g., all libraries in one German state buying only one copy rather than one for each library). But even if the distribution network is more efficient, reducing the number of browsable copies must have some impact. And it may well be that budgetary pressures have reduced the purchase of German monographs outside the German-speaking world.

It would be interesting to see what the impact would be if an increasing percentage of German publications shift to Open Access publications.

## **Greco-Roman studies in Germany**

### **The Economic Foundation for the study of Greco-Roman Language, Literature and History**

In Germany, the study of Greco-Roman culture at the university level owes its existence, in its current scope, to the need for training primary and secondary school teachers of Latin and of History.<sup>6</sup> Without the service functions of Greco-Roman studies exists at its current scale because of its role in training primary and secondary school teachers of Latin and of History (since Greco-Roman History is particularly important in a European context). Research in Greco-Roman Studies does not command the kind of support that the life sciences or the

---

<sup>6</sup> The summary for Greek and Latin Philology at Freiburg makes this explicit: "Die Gräzistik und Latinistik sind in erster Linie Lehramtsstudiengänge. Die Absolventinnen und Absolventen aller unserer Studiengänge können als Spezialisten und Spezialistinnen für die Antike auch im Verlagsbereich, im Bibliothekswesen oder im Bereich der Kulturvermittlung arbeiten." <http://www.altphil.uni-freiburg.de/>.

STEM/MINT<sup>7</sup> disciplines can expect. The service function subsidizes the ability to conduct research, but university administrations have answered this by replacing permanent, senior professorships with short-term academic appointments, in effect deprioritizing senior research and investing instead in the training of primary and secondary school teachers of Latin and History.

A 2012 report on “small departments at German universities” and its particular focus on “traditional departments and new disciplines, between growth and downsizing”<sup>8</sup> reports that during the period of 1999 to 2011 the number of chairs in “ancient languages and cultures” declined from 200.5 to 157 -- a loss of 43.5 chairs (22%). Greek and Latin suffered significant, but less devastating cuts. Latin chairs declined from 57 to 48.5, a loss of 8.5 (15%), Greek from 39.5 to 32.5, a loss of 7 (18%). The other ten areas lost 28 of 104 chairs (27%). Of these ten, three related to Greek and Latin suffered minimal losses: Papyrology held steady with 3 chairs, while Byzantine Studies lost just one chair (declining from 8 to 7) and Medieval Latin just 2 (declining from 13 to 11). The remaining seven fields (Celtic Studies, Coptic Studies, Ancient American Studies, Egyptology, Assyriology, Semitic Studies, and Indo-European Studies) lost almost one third of their positions (26 of 80 chairs, 32.5%).

---

<sup>7</sup> STEM stands for “Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.” MINT is the German counterpart: “Mathematik, Informatik, Naturwissenschaften und Technologie.”

<sup>8</sup> Small Disciplines report: “Kleine Fächer an den deutschen Universitäten interdisziplinär und international,”

[http://www.hrk.de/fileadmin/redaktion/hrk/02-Dokumente/02-10-Publikationsdatenbank/EVA-2012\\_Kleine\\_Faecher.pdf](http://www.hrk.de/fileadmin/redaktion/hrk/02-Dokumente/02-10-Publikationsdatenbank/EVA-2012_Kleine_Faecher.pdf), p. 30



<b>Fachgruppe: Alte Sprachen und Kulturen</b>	<b>Professuren 1997</b>	<b>Professuren 2007</b>	<b>Professuren 2011</b>	<b>Entwicklung seit 1997</b>
Papyrologie	3	3	3	0
Keltologie	2,5	1,5	2	-0,5
Koptologie	2	1,5	1,5	-0,5
Byzantinistik	8	7	7	-1
Altamerikanistik	6	4	4	-2
Mittelalterin	13	12	11	-2
Ägyptologie	18	14,5	14,5	-3,5
Altorientalistik	21	16	16	-5
Semitistik	8,5	5	3,5	-5
Gräzistik	39,5	33,5	32,5	-7
Indogermanistik	22	16	13,5	-8,5
Latinistik	57	48,5	48,5	-8,5
<b>Gesamt</b>	<b>200,5</b>	<b>162,5</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>-43,5</b>
Professurenentwicklung in der Fachgruppe Alte Sprachen und Kulturen seit 1997				

**Table 5: The statistics above track the decline from 1997 through 2011 of chairs of the disciplinary cluster ancient languages and cultures. The year 1997 reflects the fact that new departments had been created after East Germany was absorbed in 1990 and universities in the “New Lands” were reorganized.**

I made my own analysis of the declines in selected chairs by looking at more recent data from the Website on Small Disciplines in Germany (<http://www.kleinefaecher.de/>). Doing so involved clicking through to web pages covering each university and then checking to see if the professors listed were still in office -- this represented an initial survey and surely not exact but I doubt that the results will change significantly.

	current total	Cut since 1987/1997	Added	Net change	decline as percent
Classical Philology	84	30	5	-25	21.93%
Ancient History (+ 2 open chairs)	73	14	6	-8	9.20%
Classical Archaeology	45	7	3	-4	7.69%
	202	51	14	-33	14.62%

**Table 6: Net change in chairs for Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology since 1987 (setting aside the creation of chairs from the integration of the former East Germany).**

Where the *Kleine Fächer* (KF) website did not list a prior holder of the chair, I marked the position as “added.” Where the KF website listed a position as “gestrichen,” I added it to the list of cut positions.

### Downsizing Ancient Languages and Cultures and Greek, Latin, and Ancient History

	<a href="http://www.kleinefaecher.de/graezistik/">http://www.kleinefaecher.de/graezistik/</a>			
1	Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität	Bonn	gestrichen	davor: Adolf Köhnken
2	Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität	Frankfurt am Main	gestrichen	davor: Herbert Eisenberger
3	Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität	Greifswald	gestrichen	davor: Michael Weißenberger [Klassische Philologie/Gräzistik], Martin Hose
4	Universität	Hamburg	gestrichen	davor: Klaus Alpers
5	Ruprecht-Karls-Universität	Heidelberg	gestrichen	davor: Herwig Görgemanns
6	Universität	Köln	gestrichen	davor: Michael Gronewald
7	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität	München	gestrichen	davor: Dieter Bremer
8	Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität	Münster	gestrichen	davor: Horst-Dieter Blume
9	Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität	Münster	gestrichen	davor: Kjeld Matthiessen

10	Universität	Regensburg	gestrichen	davor: Hans Gärtner
11	Eberhard-Karls-Universität	Tübingen	gestrichen	davor: Konrad Gaiser

**Table 6a: Dead chairs in Greek.**

	<a href="http://www.kleinefaecher.de/latinistik/">http://www.kleinefaecher.de/latinistik/</a>			
1	Universität	Augsburg	gestrichen	davor: Marion Lausberg [Klassische Philologie, insbesondere Latein]
2	Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität	Bonn	gestrichen	davor: Willy Schetter
3	Heinrich-Heine-Universität	Düsseldorf	gestrichen	davor: Reinhard Häußler
4	Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität	Frankfurt am Main	gestrichen	davor: Herbert Eisenberger
5	Albert-Ludwigs-Universität	Freiburg	gestrichen	davor: Ulrich Eigler, Eckart Schäfer
6	Justus-Liebig-Universität	Gießen	gestrichen	davor: Vinzenz Buchheit
7	Georg-August-Universität	Göttingen	gestrichen	davor: Carl-Joachim Classen
8	Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität	Greifswald	gestrichen	davor: Gregor Vogt-Spira
9	Universität	Hamburg	gestrichen	davor: Joachim Dingel, Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers
10	Ruprecht-Karls-Universität	Heidelberg	gestrichen	davor: Glenn W. Most
11	Ruprecht-Karls-Universität	Heidelberg	gestrichen	davor: Hans Armin Gärtner
12	Friedrich-Schiller-Universität	Jena	gestrichen	davor: Volker Riedel [Klassische Philologie/Latinistik]
13	Universität	Konstanz	gestrichen	davor: Peter Lebrecht Schmidt
14	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität	München	gestrichen	davor: Joachim Gruber, Siegmund Döpp
15	Universität	Potsdam	gestrichen	davor: Peter Riemer [Klassische Philologie]
16	Universität	Regensburg	gestrichen	davor: Hans Gärtner

17	Universität des Saarlandes	Saarbrücken	gestrichen	davor: Peter Steinmetz
18	Eberhard-Karls-Universität	Tübingen	gestrichen	davor: Ernst A. Schmidt

**Table 6b: Dead Chairs in Latin.**

	<a href="http://www.kleinefaecher.de/alte-geschichte/">http://www.kleinefaecher.de/alte-geschichte/</a>			
1	Freie Universität	Berlin	gestrichen	davor: Peter Spahn [Antike Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte], Hans-Joachim Gehrke [Alte Geschichte]
2	Freie Universität	Berlin	gestrichen	davor: Volker Fadinger [Alte Geschichte]
3	Technische Universität	Berlin	gestrichen	davor: Werner Dahlheim [Alte Geschichte]
4	Technische Universität	Berlin	gestrichen	davor: Klaus Meister [Alte Geschichte]
5	Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina zu	Braunschweig	gestrichen	davor: Helmut Castritius [Alte Geschichte]
6	Technische Universität	Dortmund	gestrichen	davor: Lampe
7	Universität	Duisburg-Essen	gestrichen	davor: Justus Cobet [Alte Geschichte und Didaktik der Geschichte]
8	Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität	Greifswald	gestrichen	davor: Egon Flaig [Alte Geschichte]
9	Universität	Hamburg	gestrichen	davor: Joachim Molthagen [Alte Geschichte]
10	Universität	Hamburg	gestrichen	davor: Dietrich Hoffmann [Alte Geschichte]
11	Universität	Hamburg	gestrichen	davor: Rainer Bernhardt [Alte Geschichte]
12	Philipps-Universität	Marburg	gestrichen	davor: Robert Malcolm Errington [Alte Geschichte]
13	Universität des Saarlandes	Saarbrücken	gestrichen	davor: Robert Franke [Alte Geschichte]

**Table 6c: Dead Chairs in Ancient History.**

	<a href="http://www.kleinefaecher.de/klassische-archaeologie/">http://www.kleinefaecher.de/klassische-archaeologie/</a>			
1	Albert-Ludwigs-Universität	Freiburg	gestrichen	davor: Luca Giuliani
2	Universität	Mannheim	gestrichen	davor: Reinhard Stupperich, Wolfgang Schiering
3	Eberhard-Karls-Universität	Tübingen	gestrichen	davor: Friedhelm Prayon, Gerhard Neumann
4	Freie Universität	Berlin	gestrichen	davor: Wolfram Hoepfner [Antike Baugeschichte]
5	Philipps-Universität	Marburg	gestrichen	davor: Heide Froning-Kehler, Bernhard Schmaltz
6	Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität	Greifswald	gestrichen	davor: Thomas Schäfer, Wulf Raack
7	Friedrich-Schiller-Universität	Jena	gestrichen	davor: Uta Kron [Klassische Archäologie]

**Table 6d: Dead chairs in Classical Archaeology.**

The KF Website apparently uses two starting points: 1987 for universities in the former West Germany and 1997 for universities in the former East -- a sensible approach, since departments on Ancient Languages and Cultures needed to be rebuilt after 1989. Thus some of the positions that appear as “gestrichen” were probably cut between 1987 and 1997 -- hence the number of chairs lost is substantially larger in the count above. I became an Assistant Professor in 1985 and began active work on the Perseus Digital Library in 1987, so the period of 1987 to the present has a personal impact on me: during the course of my career, we (by which I mean all of us anywhere who study Greco-Roman culture) lost 33 chairs in Germany.

Some of the losses were made up as new chairs were opened in the reintegrated East -- I had the moving privilege of giving a lecture in 2014 during the twentieth anniversary of the reconstitution of the Philological Seminar at Leipzig and the results of this rebuilding process are particularly tangible for me. But the creation of new chairs in the former East did not increase the relative size of the field with respect to the population of Germany as a whole. More chairs were added but the population of a united Germany was obviously bigger also.

The figures that I found show that cuts have been particularly severe outside of Greek, Latin, and Ancient History.

	current total	Cut since 1987/1997	Added	Net change	decline as percent
Byzantine Studies	7	3	0	-3	30.00%
Medieval Latin	10	3	1	-2	15.38%
Egyptology	13	7	0	-7	35.00%
Assyriology	15	9	0	-9	37.50%

**Table 7: Net change in chairs for Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology and Assyriology.**

The report on small departments offers one very explicit reason to explain why Greek and Latin have suffered relatively less than other ancient languages and cultures: Greek and Latin derive some protection, we hear, from the fact that these departments are needed to train primary and secondary school teachers for these languages.<sup>9</sup> A look at other statistics backs this conclusion.

There were, in 2012/13, 740,000 students of Latin in German primary and secondary schools,<sup>10</sup> as well as 12,800 students of Classical Greek.<sup>11</sup> Teaching this many students requires c. 9,000 Latin teachers,<sup>12</sup> a figure that would require roughly 250 to 300 new Latin teachers every year. Anecdotal evidence suggests that Latin teachers are very much in demand and that those who study Greek and Latin have very good prospects for a career as a primary or secondary school teacher -- a position that normally belongs to the civil services, pays well, and provides a life-long pension.

Ancient History weathered the period from 1999 to 2011 remarkably well -- the number of chairs for Ancient History barely changed, declining from 79 to 77. The Small Disciplines report states that the integration of Ancient History in the training of primary and secondary school history teachers protected it from larger losses -- Greco-Roman History plays -- and must play -- a

<sup>9</sup> See the Small Disciplines report, p. 30: "Die klassischen Schulfächer Latein und Griechisch verfügen unter den Altphilologien über die meisten Professuren und genießen durch die Lehramtsausbildung noch einen gewissen Schutz vor einem vergleichbaren Abbau."

<sup>10</sup>

[https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Schulen/BroschuereSchulenBlick0110018149004.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Schulen/BroschuereSchulenBlick0110018149004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)

<sup>11</sup>

<http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article126437070/Wozu-ueberhaupt-Latein-und-Altgriechisch-lernen.html>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.circe.be/content/view/132/346/lang.de/>

bigger role in European curricula than it does in the US.<sup>13</sup> Assessing the number of students focusing on Ancient History is not easy.

	<b>Students - 2013/2014</b>	<b>Chairs - 2011</b>	<b>Students per Chair</b>
Ancient History	345*	77 (19)*	4.5 (18.2)*
Egyptology	535	14.5	36.9
Greek	592	32.5	18.2
Latin	4268	48.5	88.0
Greek and Latin (combined)	4860	81	60.0

**Table 8: Students per chair for Ancient History, Egyptology, Greek and Latin.**

According to statistics from Statistisches Bundesamt,<sup>14</sup> there were 345 students of Ancient History in 2013/2014. If we compare this with the number of Ancient History chairs reported in 2011, we would have 4.5 students per chair. But most universities that have chairs in Ancient History do not have explicit programs in Ancient History. When the degrees reported for universities with chairs in Ancient History at <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/alte-geschichte/>, I found only 19 universities that had degrees that contained the phrase “Alte Geschichte.” The ratio of students to such programs is the same as the ratio of students reported for Classical Greek to chairs of Greek (18.2).<sup>15</sup>

If we combine the Small Disciplines report, data on student enrollments and data on the number of academic specialists employed in Classical Philology,<sup>16</sup> we find a dynamic that contrasts strikingly with the decline in chairs:

	<b>1997</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2011</b>
Academic Personnel in Classical Philology	355	351	411

<sup>13</sup> “Die Fächer Alte Geschichte und Landesgeschichte bleiben offenbar durch ihre Einbindung in das Lehramt vor größeren Stellenverlusten bewahrt.” The figures and comment come from p. 31 of the KF Report.

<sup>14</sup> Available as a spreadsheet for download at <https://www.govdata.de/web/guest/daten/-/details/destatis-service-21311-0003-test-test>; available as HTML at <https://www-genesis.destatis.de/genesis/online?sequenz=tabelleErgebnis&selectionname=21311-0003&regionalschlüssel=>

<sup>15</sup> The federal statistics also reported 591 students of Classical Philology. It is not clear whether these students are the same as the 592 reported to study Greek. If they are an entirely separate group, then aggregate for Greek, Latin and Classical Philology would 5,451, with 67.3 students per chair.

<sup>16</sup> “Hauptberufliches wissenschaftliches und künstlerisches Personal an Hochschulen,” downloaded from <https://www.govdata.de/daten/-/details/destatis-service-21341-0002-test-test>.



Greek Philology Chairs	39.5	33.5	32.5
Latin Philology Chairs	57	48.5	48.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>96.5</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>81</b>
(Figures as of the German Winter Semester)	<b>1998/99</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2011/12</b>
Students of Greek and Latin	3,524	3,782	4,555
<b>Ratio of Students to Academic Personnel</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>11.1</b>
Ratio of Students to Chairs	36.5	46.1	56.2

**Table 9: Ratio of students to academic personnel and to chairs. The number of chairs has gone down but the number of students has gone up. Universities have responded by expanding the so-called Mittelbau, the academic staff hired on limited term contracts (now normally limited to six years except where third party money is available).**

The number of chairs may have declined, but the number of students has gone up. To meet this demand, German universities have increased their academic positions as a whole. The only reliably permanent academic positions are chairs -- the new hires, as I understand it, consist of appointments that are limited in term (normally capped at six years) and that get paid less than professors.<sup>17</sup> Professors do still have to retire in Germany, so a chair is not the chronologically open-ended commitment that it is elsewhere, but it is easier to replace a member of the so-called Mittelbau serving on short term contracts than professors who typically serve 20 to 30 years.<sup>18</sup> German hiring policy certainly does not show a desire to use increased enrollments to subsidize new chairs and the senior research in Greek, Latin, and Ancient History that chairs would bring.

The source that provides statistics for Academic Personnel in Classical Philology does not provide those statistics for the number of Academic Personnel in Ancient History or Classical Archaeology.

	<b>Greek and Latin (2011)</b>	<b>Ancient History (2011)</b>	<b>Classical Archaeology (2015)<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>
Academic Staff	411	340 (est.)	228 (est.)	<b>979 (est.)</b>

<sup>17</sup> Contracts can be extended beyond six years if third party funding is available. And there are a limited number of other long term positions such as Akademische Räte that support teaching and that are similar to long term lecturers in US departments (non-tenure stream but often permanent positions for faculty who are paid for teaching and not for research).

<sup>18</sup> Birthdates of German professors often appear in their online CVs and in their Wikipedia entries. I found only a handful of the 200 Professor Doctors in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology to be under 40. Very few professors serve 30 years and most closer to 20. Professorships can be extended in some circumstances for a few years after 65 but only if the university agrees to the extension.

<sup>19</sup> The 2011 numbers for Greek, Latin, and Ancient History come from the Kleine Fächer data in Table 5 (above) while the figure for professors of Classical Archaeology is based on my own survey using the Klein Fächer website.

Professors	81	67	45	193
Other Long term Staff	50 (est.)	45 (est.)	30 (est.)	125
<b>Total Long Term</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>318</b>

**Table 10: Extrapolated number of Academic Staff for Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology.**

If the ratio of professors to academic staff is the same in Ancient History and Classical Archaeology as in Greek and Latin (a very dubious assumption), we can estimate the overall number of German academic staff in Greco-Roman Studies at c. 1,000, about 20% of whom are professors with permanent positions and 80% of whom are in the so-called Mittelbau (the mid-level) between students and professors. Of this 80%, between 15% and 18% are typically on long-term contracts (i.e., contracts that can extend beyond 6 years)<sup>20</sup> and I use 16.5% to estimate the actual number.

**Conclusion:** The figures above suggest at least one very important aspect of the study of Greek and Latin in Germany. While faculty may pride themselves on their research, the number of chairs on, and the overall study of, Greco-Roman history, literature and language, depend upon the training of primary and secondary school teachers. Without that service function, the number of chairs would be much smaller -- and probably a fraction of their current number. Conversely, the number of chairs in Greek, Latin, and Ancient History bears a partial (if any) relation to the actual quality and originality of the research on Greek and Latin language, literature and history. Certainly, I would not agree that scholarship on Assyriology, Egyptology or Indo-European -- three fields that lost a substantial number of chairs -- are in any way inferior to that on Greco-Roman language, literature or history.

### **Where Professors in Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology received their PhDs**

I decided to analyze the composition of German chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology. As above, I used data from the Website on Small Disciplines in Germany (<http://www.kleinefaecher.de/>) as a starting point.<sup>21</sup> For Greek and Latin Philology, my collaborator Maryam Foradi and I began by searching the websites of individual departments. These results differ marginally from those that I got by looking up the chairs, university by university, in the various pages under <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/>. For all other disciplines, I started with the Small Disciplines website, looked up every chair, and then looked for the online web pages for each professor to determine additional data. Almost all of the professors of

<sup>20</sup> This figure comes from the ICE database queries to the Statistisches Bundesamt as reported on p. 93 of *Empfehlungen zu Karrierezielen und -wegen an Universitäten*, Drs. 4009-14 Dresden, November 7, 2014.

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/graecistik/>; <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/latinistik/>; <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/alte-geschichte/>; <http://www.kleinefaecher.de/klassische-archaeologie/>.

Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Philology had fairly elaborate entries in German Wikipedia, a few in English Wikipedia as well.

	<b>Chairs</b>	<b>PhD DE</b>		<b>+AT/CH</b>		<b>Other</b>		
Philology	84	78	92.86%	4	97.62%	2	2.38%	0
Ancient Hist.	71	70	98.59%	0	98.59%	1	1.41%	0
Class. Arch.	45	42	93.33%	2	97.78%	1	2.22%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>95.00%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>98.00%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 11: The “PhD DE” column counts professors who received their PhDs in Germany. The “+AT/CH” column adds those professors who received their PhDs in Austria or in a German speaking university of Switzerland. Of the four PhDs under “other,” two were from countries adjacent to Germany (Leiden in the Netherlands and Aarhus in Denmark) and two were from the UK (Oxford and Cambridge). None came from outside of Europe.**

I found that 95% of those holding chairs in these fields had received their PhD from a German institution.<sup>22</sup> I found two philologists with degrees from Austria and two from Switzerland, and one Classical Archaeologist with a degree from Austria and one from Switzerland. Thus, faculty who received their PhD in one of the German-speaking countries hold 196 of 200 chairs (98%). (The patterns in US Classics Departments, at least those granting PhDs, are substantially different, on which see below.)

Of the remaining four professors who had received their primary PhD from outside of the German-speaking world, two were German nationals who pursued their graduate work at Oxford and Cambridge respectively.<sup>23</sup> All of the German Professors of Ancient History (as far as I could tell) are German nationals and all but one completed their education in Germany. The only philologist I could find from outside the German-speaking world came from the Netherlands (another Humboldt Professor, like myself, and thus brought into the German system by an extraordinary process), and the only Classical Archaeologist came from Denmark and is probably due to retire in the relatively near future.

I did not specifically track the citizenship of serving professors but I did not detect any faculty who had come to Germany from outside the German speaking world and acquired a PhD at a German university. By contrast, in Germany 10% of the scientific personnel in higher education as a whole and in the Linguistic and Cultural Disciplines in particular come from outside of the German speaking world -- if the same pattern held for Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology, we would expect to see c. 20 of the 200 professors from outside the

<sup>22</sup> While I do think that it is important to think about the composition of the professoriate I am not comfortable singling out colleagues on the basis of the nation where they received their degrees. This does make it harder for people to point out errors and oversights on my part but I do hope that individuals will contact me directly if they can think of more people than those whom I have mentioned.

<sup>23</sup> In addition, at least one chair has a joint PhD between Paris-Sorbonne and Heidelberg.

German speaking world.<sup>24</sup> The vast majority of those holding German chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology went to the same network of schools and belong to the same networks of scholars.

Going through the various web pages, I was not surprised to find that many of my colleagues specifically mentioned spending periods of time studying outside of the German speaking world (often in the UK or North America) -- I saw this in 22% of the pages for philologists and suspect that this understates the international experience of the professoriate. Anyone can, I believe, deliver a lecture in English at any of the two hundred chairs and expect to be understood whereas only a small minority of Anglophone Classicists would, I believe, be able to follow a lecture in German. German Classical scholars address the challenge of internationalization by investing far more time in developing their linguistic skills and in spending time abroad than do their Anglophone colleagues (here I have not done a survey but I doubt that such a survey would contradict my impression).

Several of the smaller Ancient Language and Cultures disciplines had a slightly different profile (though not so different here as we will see in other features).

	Chairs	PhD DE		+AT/CH		EU		Other	Chairs
Byzantine Studies	7	7	100.00%	0	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Medieval Latin	10	7	70.00%	1	80.00%	1	10.00%	1	10.00%
Egyptology (occupied chairs)	12	10	83.33%	1	91.67%	1	8.33%	0	0.00%
Assyriology (occupied chairs)	13	12	92.31%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>85.71%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>92.86%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.76%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.38%</b>

**Table 12:** Where Professors in Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology and Assyriology got their PhDs.

<sup>24</sup> According to data from [https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Hochschulen/PersonalHochschulen2110440137004.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Hochschulen/PersonalHochschulen2110440137004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile), pp. 190f, there were 369,370 “Wissenschaftliches und künstlerisches Personal” as a whole and 49,531 in “Sprachund Kulturwissenschaften” (I excluded in these calculations the relative handful of personnel where the nationality was uncertain). Of these, 331,373 (89.7%) and 43,887 (88.6%) are German. If we add Austrians and all Swiss citizens (not all of whom are German speakers), the totals are 334,395 (90.5%) and 44,391 (89.6%).

One reason for the composition of the German Professoriate is the need to train teachers who will teach Latin or History in German schools. Thus, we can see the difference in the level of foreign students in those disciplines where many students will become primary and secondary school teachers and those where such teaching is not a major option.

Even a brief survey of postdoctoral members of chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology turned up researchers from many different countries (Russia, the United States, Greece, etc.) but, given the current composition of the professoriate, it is unclear what their long term prospects are in Germany.

	German students	International	Percentage of International
History	33,029	2,510	7.06%
Latin	4,143	125	2.93%
Greek	482	110	18.58%
Classical Philology	502	89	15.06%
Ancient History	309	36	10.43%
Egyptology	469	66	12.34%

**Table 13: Statistics of German and International Students in Winter Semester 2013/2014. This source did not provide separate figures for Assyriology, Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, or Classical Archaeology.**

The relatively lower percentage of international students in History may reflect the number of students who are focused upon teaching in the German school system. The strikingly low number of international students in Latin surely reflects this -- there are almost as many international students of Latin as there are of Greek, even though Latin students outnumber Greek more 8.5 to 1.

Among the 200 professors, I found only two (one from Spain and one from Greece) who had grown up in another country, received their academic training in Germany and then moved on to acquire a chair. Likewise, as Table 13 above shows, substantial numbers of students come from outside of Germany to study Greek, Classical Philology and Egyptology but it is not clear what the future holds for them in Germany. Put another way, roughly 10% of the students in Germany come from abroad but only 1% of the current Professoriate are German-trained students from abroad.

To conclude this section, I add a table illustrating the institutions from which two or more current German professors have received their PhDs. Of the 200 professors that I was able to identify, 80 (40%) come from the first four programs (Heidelberg, Freiburg, Munich, and Cologne).

Total		Class. Phil.	Anc. Hist.	Class. Arch.
22	Heidelberg	4	8	10
21	Freiburg	10	10	1
19	Munich	8	4	7
18	Cologne	10	6	2
12	Bonn	5	2	5
12	Münster	6	3	3
11	FU Berlin	3	4	4
9	Göttingen	4	3	2
8	Tübingen	6	1	1
7	Marburg	0	6	1
6	Bochum	1	2	3
5	Mainz	3	2	0
4	Hamburg	1	2	1
4	Kiel	1	2	1
4	Würzburg	2	1	1
2	Basel	1	0	1
2	Bern	1	0	1
2	Erlangen-Nürnberg	2	0	0
2	Frankfurt	1	1	0
2	Gießen	2	0	0
2	Konstanz	2	0	0
2	Passau	0	2	0
2	Trier	0	2	0
2	TU Berlin	0	2	0

**Table 14: Universities from which two or more current Professors are known to have received their PhDs. The top four universities account for 40% (80 out of 200) chairs but readers should remember that virtually all of the professors who supervised these PhDs are now retired. Thus the implicit ranking does not directly reflect the current status of departments in Germany.**

### **Gender Balance among Professors of Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology**

The percentage of chairs held by women remains relatively low. I only identified 11 chairs in Ancient History held by women (15.5%), while the percentage in Classical Philology was higher (18 of 84, 21.4%) and higher still in Classical Archaeology (15 of 45, 33%).

	<b>Chairs</b>	<b>Held by Women</b>	<b>Percentage held by women</b>
Classical Philology	84	18	21.43%
Ancient History	71	11	15.49%
Classical Archaeology	45	15	33.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>22.00%</b>

**Table 15: Percentages of female professors in Classical Philology, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology.**

A survey of four other small disciplines show wide variation (among very small numbers) but a very similar overall percentage.

	<b>Chairs</b>	<b>Held by Women</b>	<b>Percentage held by women</b>
Byzantine Studies	7	2	28.57%
Medieval Latin	10	1	10.00%
Egyptology (occupied chairs)	12	3	25.00%
Assyriology (occupied chairs)	13	3	23.08%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21.43%</b>

**Table 16: Percentages of female professors in Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology, and Assyriology.**

But if the percentages seem low, we need to consider changes in the percentage of women among those who continue on to build careers in fields such as Greco-Roman studies in Germany. If we return to the Statistisches Bundesamt statistics of those serving as academic personnel in departments of Classical Philology quoted in Table 9 above and consider the gender breakdown, we find the following:

<b>Academic Staff in Classical Philology Depts</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>
Men	274	238	250	280
Women	81	113	161	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>22.82%</b>	<b>32.19%</b>	<b>39.17%</b>	<b>39.65%</b>



**Table 17: Percentage of female academic staff in Classical Philology.**

Some of the youngest among the professors whom I surveyed were still middle level academic assistants in 1997 and the percentage of women in Classical Philology (22.8%) then is just barely above the percentage of women who now hold chairs in Greek or Latin (21.4%). With almost 40% of all academic staff being women, the percentage of female chairs should presumably increase as the current cohort begins moving into professorships -- assuming, of course, that professors are replaced with professors.

### **The Language of Publication**

In an earlier section, I published data that suggested a precipitous decline in the rate at which at least some English-language journals cite scholarship in German. One possible reason for this decline could be a shift by German faculty to publishing in English. I therefore set out to collect preliminary data about the degree to which German scholars publish in English.

In this exploratory survey, I took up to 10 publications from each chair that I identified. I limited my evaluation to 10 publications per chair because I wanted an overview of the field as a whole and did not want to have a few highly productive scholars skew the results. I searched the public websites for faculty and began counting German and English publications. I made no attempt to randomize the publications but began at the beginning -- thus monographs (which start most bibliographies) are better represented than articles. I did not track publications in languages other than English -- a class that was particularly noticeable among the archaeologists. I only focused upon those publications that professors had published on their websites (sometimes as PDF files) or Wikipedia pages, and thus I did not find 10 publications for every professor.

Students of Greco-Roman culture fell into two clear groups.

	<b>German Pubs</b>	<b>English Pubs</b>	<b>% German (vs. English)</b>
Classical Philology	596	64	90.30%
Ancient History	426	13	97.04%
Classical Archaeology	389	41	90.47%
Total	1411	118	92.28%

**Table 18: Choice of German vs. English as a language of publication in Classical Philology, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology.**

For Philologists and Archaeologists, 90% of the publications that I found were in German and 10% were in English. For Ancient Historians, 97% of the publications that I identified were in German.

When I applied the same procedure to Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology and Assyriology, the numbers were not large but the patterns were suggestive.

	German Pubs	English Pubs	% German (vs. English)
Byzantine Studies	52	13	80.00%
Medieval Latin	81	13	86.17%
Egyptology	84	34	71.19%
Assyriology	80	29	73.39%

**Table 19: Choice of German vs. English as a language of publication in Byzantine Studies, Medieval Latin, Egyptology, and Assyriology.**

Medieval Latin shows a slightly greater rate of English, a rate that is more pronounced among the Byzantinists. Egyptology and Assyriology stand out with very similar rates of English publication (28% and 26% respectively).

[End of Part 1. A summary of Part 2 is available [here](#). The full text of Part 2 is available [here](#).]