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

Part 2 (of 2, Part 1 is here).
Greek and Latin in the United States and Germany

Gregory Crane
gcrane2008@gmail.com

Alexander von Humboldt Professor of Digital Humanities
Leipzig University

Professor of Classics
Winnick Family Chair of Technology and Entrepreneurship

Summary:
This second 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

At this point, I shift to Greco-Roman studies in the United States. The two systems are substantially different and rarely lend themselves to simple tabular comparisons. Thus, I will compare, as possible, what I understand to be the case in Germany as I move through various figures for the United States. Where I drew primarily upon data from the Statistisches Bundesamt (SB) (www.destatis.de/) and Mainz University site on small departments (KF) (http://www.kleinefaecher.de/), I draw here primarily upon data from a 2012-2013 American Academy of Sciences report survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions (AASHD)[1] and the 2013 edition of the Modern Language Association's (MLA) regular report on "Enrollments in Languages Other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education" (MLA2013).[2] In addition, my collaborator Maryam Foradi and I went through websites for 31 US Classics Departments with ranked PhD programs. When I try to compare the size of some figure in Germany, I simply (and very very roughly) multiply it by four to account for the fact that the population of the US is c. 320 million and that of Germany c. 80 million -- obviously a rough model, given the different demographics and educational systems of the two nations, but one that can at least serve as an initial step at comparison.

Number of Departments and Faculty in Classical Studies

We begin with the basic metrics for the number of departments and faculty in Classical Studies (which typically includes Greek, Latin, Greco-Roman[3] History and/or Archaeology and which can be Departments of Classics, Classical Studies or other variations).

---

[1] Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko, *The 2012–13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions* (College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014; sponsored by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences): www.humanitiesindicators.org/binaries/pdf/HDS2_final.pdf.

[2] *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2013* David Goldberg, Dennis Looney, and Natalia Lusin, Web publication, February 2015: http://www.mla.org/pdf/2013_enrollment_survey.pdf.

[3] In try to use Greco-Roman rather than Classical where Classical means "Ancient Greek and Latin" or Greco-Roman, but the sources I quote use "Classical" and thus this essay tends to shift back and forth.

Highest Degree	Depts.	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Total	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Total	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Bachelor's	195	560	160	**720**	160	**880**	180
Master's	24	100	40	**140**	40	**180**	30
Doctorate	57	460	90	**550**	50	**600**	50
Totals	**276**	**1,120**	**290**	**1,410**	**250**	**1,660**	**260**

Table 20: Number of tenured, tenure-track, full-time and part-time appointments in 276 Departments of Classical Studies in the US (AASHD Table CL2, p. 175).

To appreciate the number of departments, consider the following table.

Four Year+ Postsecondary Institutions[4]	**1,797**	
English Departments - BA/MA/PhD (AASHD)	1,064	59.20%
Classical Studies Departments (AASHD p. 175)	276	15.36%
Institutions reporting enrollments in Ancient Greek (MLA2013 p. 68)	512	28.49%
Institutions reporting enrollments in Latin (MLA2013 p. 68)	590	32.83%

Table 21: Number of Classical Studies Departments in the context of all postsecondary institutions, English Departments (the largest traditional Humanities field in the US) and the number of institutions reporting enrollments in Ancient Greek and Latin.

There are four times as many departments of English as of Classics (if anything surprises me, it is that the ratio is not larger). Only 60% of four year+ institutions in the US have an English Department -- a rather chastening figure to anyone in the Humanities in the US. But if there are Departments of Classical Studies in only 15% of universities, somehow twice as many institutions have reported actual enrolments in Greek (28.5%) and in Latin (32.8%). This reflects the dedication of the faculty as well as the interest of the students to keep the study of these languages alive.

By comparison, with data from KF, I found 52 universities in Germany that have chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History or Classical Archaeology -- the equivalent of c 210 universities if Germany were as large as the US. Of these 52, 50% (26) had chairs in all four areas, while six had chairs in three, five had chairs in two and eight had a chair in just one of the four areas. Where universities only had one chair, the field represented was Ancient history seven times and Classical Archaeology once.

Direct comparison with US Departments of Classical Studies is difficult for several reasons. First, German universities are, in terms of perceived prestige and quality, far more evenly balanced than in the US -- Bavaria invests a lot more money in its universities than does

[4] The number comes from MLA2013 page 1: The MLA has 2662 institutions in its database and assumes that two thirds (1,797) are four year (or more) institutions (i.e., they offer at least a BA, rather than only an AA, an Associate of Arts, often earned after two years of study).

Saxony and that makes a difference but Germany does not have the hyper-elite system of the Anglophone world. Second, the big American Classics Departments may include Hellenists, Latinists, Archaeologists and Historians while German chairs in these areas may appear in different faculties (e.g., philology vs. history) and be quite far apart from each other. American programs rarely conform to this structural ideal (it was a 10 minute walk to get from Widener Library to the Fogg Art Museum Library when I was a graduate student and that difference by itself made it cumbersome, though by no means impossible, to knit together the material and textual record) and there are plenty of affiliated faculty hived off in History, Art History, or Philosophy or Political Science or some other area, but I think it probable that American departments are structurally better suited to place professors of Greek, Latin, History, and Archaeology in one floor of a building. This physical proximity fosters more traditional (and still fundamentally important) face-to-face -- people simply run into each other more often and can walk down the hall for quick conversations.

The vast majority (70%, 195 of 276) of US Classical Studies departments offer only a BA and almost four-fifths do not offer a PhD of any kind (79.3%, 219 of 276). Of the 57 departments that offer PhDs, it is unclear how many have very active programs. Later I will review data about 31 PhD granting departments that appeared in one ranking and this set represents just over one tenth (11%) of the whole.

Of the full time positions in Departments of Classical Studies in the United States, 85% (1410 of 1660) are permanent positions (tenure or tenure track) -- exactly the reverse of the situation in Germany, where Professors accounted in 2012 for 14% of all full-time academic positions.[5] In Table 10 (in part 1[6]), I estimated (based on extrapolating from partial data) the number of full time positions in Germany, with c. 200 Professors and 800 additional full-time staff, so the percentage of professors (20%) would be a bit higher in Greco-Roman studies than normal but still fairly close.

Summary: Adjusting for population size, there are more jobs in Germany than in the US: even if there are only 800 positions in German chairs of Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology (rather than the c. 1000 I tentatively suggested), that would still give Germany the equivalent of 3,200 full time positions if it were the size of the US. At the same time, 1,410 tenured and tenure track US positions exceed the 200 German chairs (equivalent to 800 if Germany was as big as the US) not only in absolute but in relative terms. There are 40% more Assistant Professors (positions that normally last six years until -- hopefully -- transforming to tenured Associate Professors) than there are Professorships in Germany (280 vs. 200).

The economic base of Classical Studies in the US (hint, it is not educating majors)

[5] Figure from the Statistisches Bundesamt: Fachserie 11 / Row 4.4, as reported on p. 94 of *Empfehlungen zu Karrierzielen und -wegen an Universitäten*, Drs. 4009-14 Dresden, November 7, 2014.

[6] Part 1 is at http://tinyurl.com/nsbmegf.

Department	BAs in 2011-2012 (AASHD p.16)	Tenure(d/-track) Faculty (various AASHD tables)	BAs to Professors
Art History	4660	1930	2.4
English	45780	15100	3.0
History	34780	11300	3.1
Linguistics	2970	1110	2.7
Religion	5010	3030	1.7
Classical Studies	2240	1410	1.6

Table 22: The ratio of students who received a BA to tenured/tenure-track faculty in Classical Studies and (for comparison's sake) several other Humanities disciplines.

Departments of Classical Studies do not pay the bills (or at least keep their deans relatively happy) by producing large numbers of majors. If you assume that, for each graduating senior, there is a 2nd year and 3rd year concentrator, you triple the numbers -- but the numbers are not large.

The figures above serve to make concrete something that every American humanist knows: we support ourselves by teaching courses, large and small, primarily taken by non-majors. In Classical Civilization, these courses may be big lecture classes on subjects such as Greek Mythology, Ancient Athletics or the Ancient World in Film as well as big survey courses on Greco-Roman history or archaeology, etc. Depending on the institution, these classes may have hundreds of students (with graduate students or even student graders assisting) or may be capped at 30 or 50. The point is that these are the courses that bring in the tuition income to pay for our salaries. I have not been able to find any statistics on such courses -- something I am surprised that the Society for Classical Studies does not consider. Our relative success at maintaining and developing these courses determines our economic (if not our intellectual) standing. No one who cannot manage such teaching can -- or should -- survive: the departments need this. The big courses not only support the department but they also allow us to teach smaller, more specialized courses, especially on Greek and Latin.

But if we do not have the crucial data about the size and nature of these courses upon which Departments of Classical Civilization depend, we do have rather remarkable data from the Modern Language Association (MLA) about what students of Greco-Roman culture have been able to accomplish. The period from 2009 to 2013 was strikingly bad for postsecondary enrollments of Greek and Latin in the US but this drop must be set in context with the resilience of enrollments in these languages since at least 1968. Whatever else they have done, American professors of Classical Studies kept alive the study of Greek and Latin after the cultural changes of the 1960s, even as secondary school enrollments collapsed.[7]

[7] Some of the following material is reused from an earlier posting: http://sites.tufts.edu/perseusupdates/2015/05/19/bad-news-for-latin-in-the-us-worse-for-greek/.

According to statistics published by the Modern Language Association in February 2015, between fall 2009 and fall 2013, enrollments in Ancient Greek and Latin at US postsecondary institutions suffered their worst decline since 1968, the earliest year for which the MLA offers such statistics. The number of enrollments in Greek and Latin declined from 52,484 to 40,109, a drop of 24%.[8] This was the first period when enrollments in both languages underwent significant decline -- between 1968 and 1980, a 15% increase in Greek partially offset the disastrous 26.6% in Latin, while a rebound of 12.6% in Latin enrollments during the 1980s offset a 25.8% decline in Greek. When Latin suffered an 8% drop between 1990 and 1995, Greek essentially remained unchanged, while Latin remained stable over the 2006 to 2009 period when Greek enrollments declined by 12.2%. The years 2009-2013 were the first time in the 8 intervals recorded since 1968 that both languages suffered significant declines.

	Greek	Change	Latin	Change	Total	Change
1968	19,178		**34,084**		53,262	
1980	22,132	15.40%	25,019	**-26.60%**	47,151	-11.47%
1990	16,414	-25.84%	28,178	12.63%	44,592	-5.43%
1995	16,272	-0.87%	25,897	-8.09%	42,169	-5.43%
1998	16,381	0.67%	26,145	0.96%	42,526	0.85%
2002	20,376	24.39%	29,841	14.14%	50,217	18.09%
2006	**22,831**	12.05%	32,164	7.78%	54,995	9.51%
2009	20,040	-12.22%	32,444	0.87%	52,484	-4.57%
2013	12,917	**-35.54%**	27,192	-16.19%	40,109	-23.58%

Table 23: Enrollments in Greek and Latin from 1968 to 2013.[9]

A second category reinforces the unsettling figures about Ancient Greek in particular. The number of institutions that reported enrollments for Latin remained essentially unchanged between 2002 (when 571 reported enrollments for Latin) and 2013 (when the number rose slightly to 590). For Greek, the number declined precipitously from 656 in 2002 to 512 in 2013 -- a decline of 22% over just over a decade. Put another way, there were 144 fewer institutions in 2013 offering Greek than in 2002. It would be worth determining why institutions stopped having classes in Ancient Greek (although the survey data may be confidential, making this a bit difficult).

[8] As far as I know, the newly rechristened Society for Classical Studies does not provide data on enrollments in Greek and Latin or on Greek mythology, Ancient Athletics, Greek and Latin literature in English translation or any of the standard large scale courses upon which the study of Greco-Roman Culture now depends.

[9] https://www.mla.org/enroll_survey13: figures for Latin, p. 23; for Ancient Greek p. 24

The apparently catastrophic decline in Greek enrollments may reflect in part changing categories by which institutions could report figures.

Table 1c
Language Enrollments and Percentage Change for Arabic, Premodern Greek, and Hebrew, All Variants Combined

	2002	2006	% Change, 2002–06	2009	% Change, 2006–09	2013	% Change, 2009–13
Arabic*	10,584	24,010	126.9	35,228	46.7	33,520	–4.8
Greek, Premodern**	20,376	22,842	12.1	21,476	–6.0	17,014	–20.8
Hebrew***	14,183	14,147	–0.3	14,355	1.5	13,171	–8.2

*Includes enrollments reported under Arabic, Classical Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Gulf Arabic, Iraqi Arabic, Levantine Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, Qur'anic Arabic, and Sudanese Arabic.
**Includes enrollments reported under Ancient Greek, Biblical Greek, Koine Greek, New Testament Greek, and Old Testament Greek. Excludes enrollments reported under Greek because they may include Modern Greek.
***Includes enrollments reported under Hebrew, Biblical Hebrew, Biblical and Modern Hebrew, Classical Hebrew, and Rabbinic Hebrew.

Table 24: Enrollments with various forms of Premodern Greek aggregated

When the MLA merges various subcategories of Premodern Greek together, the declines from 2006 to 2009 and from 2009 to 2013 are not as dramatic -- the 20.8% decline from 2009 to 2013 is much closer to the 16.2% decline in Latin. Both declines are serious and the combined decline doubly problematic. The 144 institutions no longer reporting enrollments in Ancient Greek will reflect, at least in part, institutions that now can identify themselves as teaching Biblical or Koine or New Testament Greek etc. But the institutions that did report enrollments are struggling: 57% of Greek programs and 54.5% of Latin reported that they were decreasing in 2013, with only 26% and 32% respectively indicating that their enrollments were increasing.

But if the period from 2009 to 2013 was bad, we also have to emphasize that, miraculously to my mind, there were as many students studying Ancient Greek and Latin in 2009 as there had been in 1968 (20,040 in 2009 vs. 19,178 in 1968 for Greek; 32,444 in 2009 vs. 34,908 in 1968 for Latin), during the height of the turmoil, but before the long-term institutional effects, of the social upheavals in the 1960s. The situation did change as fewer students entered with training in Greek or Latin from secondary school -- the deeply conservative institution where I received my BA finally gave up on demanding that its undergraduate majors in Greek and/or Latin cover a set reading list and take translation exams before graduating. The argument was that there were just not enough students in a position with enough initial Greek and/or Latin to cover the material. But, if students started late, there were as many studying Greek and Latin in 2009 as there were forty years before -- a remarkable achievement, especially to anyone who lived through that period.

Most of the students are, of course, enrolled in introductory courses, but MLA2013 also includes the ratio between introductory and advanced students. Thus there were still nearly 2,000 advanced students of Greek and 3,246 advanced students of Latin, even in the down year of 2013.

2013	Introductory	Advanced	Ratio	Percentage of advanced	Total
Greek, Ancient	8,033	1,961	4.10	19.62%	9,994
Latin	23,009	3,246	7.09	12.36%	26,255

Table 25: the number of advanced students in Ancient Greek and Latin according to MLA2013 Table 7a. I am not sure why the total numbers given here are smaller than those offered in table 23 above (perhaps they did not have introductory/advanced figures for all students).

Greek, in particular, held a substantial number of its introductory students through till they became advanced -- a fact that should surprise no one who has been privileged to teach Greek in the US. The students who get to advanced Greek and Latin generally want to be there very much and they are a wonderful population with whom to work.

I end this section with some very detailed statistics about which historical languages are studied in the United States: 22 such languages had reported enrollments of 10 or more in 2013. Greek and Latin have consistently accounted for c. 75% of all historical language enrollments. When we add Premodern Hebrew, we reach c. 95%. The “big three” of early modern humanism remain dominant among historical languages, at least in the US.

	2006	2009	2013
All Historical Languages	**72,776**	**71,076**	**59,789**
Premodern Greek	22,781	22,720	17,757
Latin	32,169	32,588	27,204
Subtotal	**54,950 (75.5%)**	**55,308 (77.8%)**	**44,961 (75.2%)**
Premodern Hebrew	14,095	13,753	12,589
subtotal	**69,045 (94.9%)**	**69,061 (97.1%)**	**57,550 (96.2%)**
Other Historical Languages			
Aramaic	2,556	562	1,069
Sanskrit	616	481	347
Chinese, Classical	108	205	185
Akkadian	96	128	109
Arabic, Classical	4	235	98

Japanese, Classical	30	22	66
Sanskrit, Vedic	5	16	65
Norse, Old	0	0	53
Egyptian, Middle	30	16	45
Sumerian	10	21	28
Coptic	28	19	23
Syriac	39	25	21
Egyptian, Ancient	0	0	19
Chinese, Premodern	0	0	16
Slavonic, Old Church	0	0	14
German, Middle High	9	65	13
French, Old	0	0	12
Hittite	0	12	10
All Other	200	208	46
Subtotal	**3,731**	**2,015**	**2,239**

Table 26: Enrollments in Premodern Greek, Latin, Premodern Hebrew and other historical languages in the US.

I personally do not believe that the distribution of enrollments above reflects the actual distribution of potential interest. The distribution reflects, instead, the economic realities of brick-and-mortar higher education, where each institution must have a minimum local population (at Tufts, that means 6 or more students per class, but the minimum number is higher elsewhere). If there are potentially 4 students for Akkadian in university X, university X will not officially support courses in Akkadian (professors may teach it as an extra task, an "overload").

We need a generalized infrastructure for the study of historical languages, one that can be used by many languages and that can support students at multiple institutions so that we can generate for many more languages a critical mass of interest, even if that critical mass is spread across institutions. The Sunoiksis national consortium of Classics Programs (http://wp.chs.harvard.edu/sunoikisis/) and the newly founded Sunoikisis Digital Classics (http://sunoikisisdc.github.io/SunoikisisDC/) provide a great deal upon which such a system can draw. And Greek and Latin, because of their predominant enrollments, take a leading role, never forgetting that their language infrastructure should serve Aramaic, Sanskrit,

Classical Arabic, Classical Chinese, Syriac etc. (and always trying to coordinate with Premodern Hebrew, with its strong numbers).

The Composition of the Professoriate in US Departments of Classics

I was particularly conscious throughout my education that many -- often most -- of the faculty with whom I worked were not originally from the United States and brought with them fundamentally different perceptions of the world and of the field. To some degree, this reflected the nature of the time -- three of my professors should probably have been teaching in the German-speaking world but had had to flee as young men in the 1930s because they were no longer viewed as German. Aside from the staggering human tragedy involved, this was part of a more general shift that sent a wave of talent across the Atlantic and, when it was over, left the hyper-elite Anglophone universities dominating every major ranking of world universities. One analysis of US dominance in Nobel Prizes points out the degree to which the US has been able to attract talent: 32% of its Nobel Laureates are foreign born, including 15 Germans, 12 Canadians, 10 British, 6 Russians and 3 Chinese. In Germany, 11 out of 65 Nobel Laureates (17%) were born outside of German territory (including territories that are no longer part of Germany). Germany is not the most inward focused nation: according to this analysis, none of the 9 Japanese Nobel Laureates were born outside of Japan.[10]

I have my position as an Alexander von Humboldt Professor of Digital Humanities for two reasons. First, Germany has established the Alexander von Humboldt Professorships as one instrument by which to reverse the brain drain of the 20th century. Second, the Alexander von Humboldt Professor refuses, as a point of fundamental principal, to prioritize the STEM (Science/Technology/Engineering/Mathematics) Disciplines over the Humanities. As its President has asserted in various occasions, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation focuses on excellence and has no quotas between the Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and the Humanities. Thus, I enjoy far more research support as a Humanist than I could expect in the English speaking world. where the Humanities are distinct from the Sciences. It's all Wissenschaft on this side of the German border.

From the standpoint of a Humanist, the fact that 17% of German Nobel Laureates were not born in Germany is quite impressive. I have not analyzed the German professoriate in the Big Humanities but I have written about the inherently inward, if not explicitly national, focus that shapes -- and must always shape -- the Big Humanities: the national language, the national literature, the national history, and such foreign languages as are needed to help the nation conduct international trade.[11] Greco-Roman studies (and other scholarly fields not tied to any one European nation state, such as Egyptology and Assyriology) provide a more appropriate area of activity for me as a Humboldt Professor because these disciplines are, by their tradition and by their nature, more transnational.

---

[10] http://flowingdata.com/2011/10/10/nobel-laureates-by-country-and-prize/

[11] http://sites.tufts.edu/perseusupdates/2015/06/08/the-big-humanities-national-identity-and-the-digital-humanities-in-germany/

I was nevertheless struck to discover quite how homogeneous the German Professoriate was in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Archaeology. Non-Germans might join the so-called Mittelbau to do their habilitation[12] and they might earn the title of Professor Doctor if they brought their own funding, but when I went through the list of regular professorships listed by the KF study, I found 200 active chairs in Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology.[13] I found that 190 of these (95%) had received their PhD in Germany, six in Austria and German-speaking Switzerland (cumulatively, 98% of all professors). Of the remaining four, two were Germans who had completed their graduate work at Oxbridge (one in each). Of the other two, one was a Dane (and has hit the official German retirement age) and the other, a scholar from the Netherlands, was another Humboldt Professor (who was not on the Small Disciplines list) and thus brought to Germany as part of an extraordinary process.

The vast majority of German Professors in these disciplines have well-developed German Wikipedia pages (to me a bit surprisingly well-developed, given the nasty comments that I regularly hear about Wikipedia from some of my colleagues here: where English-speakers talk about having their cake and eating it too, these German scholars are “washing their fur while keeping dry”, *Wasch mir den Pelz, aber mach mich nicht nass*). Of the Professors with PhDs from Germany, Austria and German-speaking Switzerland, I was able to find only two who had come to Germany as a student and then become a professor: one an Ancient Historian close to retirement age and another an archaeologist. Other than these two instances (2 out of 200) professorships of Greco-Roman studies in Germany have gone to Germans, very occasionally to members of the German speaking world.

I then set out to compare the practices as best I could in Departments of Greco-Roman Studies in the United States. Since I was comparing the composition of Professor Doctors in Germany, I focused my study in the US only on Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the US -- the system is not the same, but with the exception of a handful of departments, Assistant, Associate, and full Professors are all part of the tenure system. When most departments of Greco-Roman Studies get a tenure track faculty line, they can’t afford to hire someone who fails to get tenure -- if that happens, they may well not get a new line and some other department may get the line (the same general idea is very much true, perhaps even more so, in Germany, where retirement often leads to the question of whether that position should be replaced -- at Leipzig we lost Indo-European and are losing Archaeology). I use the term faculty to describe Assistant, Associate, and full Professors.

---

[12] The habilitation is, in effect, the “second book” after the PhD dissertation. Junior faculty (in Saxony they are *Akademische Assistanten*, elsewhere they are *Akademische Räte*, and there may be other names) serve up to six years (one three year term, once renewable) to produce their habilitation project and this is comparable to the book that assistant professors are expected to produce in the six years before they come up for tenure.

[13] Details in Table 10 in Part 1 of this essay. I collected data by drilling down from four top-level web pages and the looking up the professors listed as current chair holders. http://www.kleinefaecher.de/graezistik/; http://www.kleinefaecher.de/latinistik/; http://www.kleinefaecher.de/alte-geschichte/; http://www.kleinefaecher.de/klassische-archaeologie/.

I separated out three groups: (1) 160 faculty in the top 10 PhD programs according to the default settings of one, rather arbitrarily chosen, ranking system,[14] which had 160 faculty;[15] (2) the other 21 PhD granting departments in this ranking, which proved to have 211 faculty; (3) 43 departments that do not have PhD programs, with a collective 206 faculty. I assembled the final list by looking at Liberal Arts Colleges ranked by US News and World Report and by identifying other departments of which I was aware until I had come up with a dataset of 206 faculty (roughly the same size as the 21 "other" PhD-granting departments. If we use the 2012 figures as an initial basis for calculation, these 64 departments account for 23% of all departments (64 of 276) but 40% (575 of 1,410) of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The sample is thus skewed towards the best funded and most highly ranked programs: the remaining 215 departments contain (assuming that the 1,410 figure has not changed significantly since 2012) 835 faculty, almost exactly 4 per department and 60% of the actual positions in US Greco-Roman studies. A more general study must focus upon these. My procedure was to go through departmental websites to identify the rank, gender, and PhD institution of each Assistant, Associate or full Professor. In some cases, I noted where faculty had come from outside of the English speaking world to study in the US or the UK. Here I did not keep careful statistics but the number of such professors was clearly above the 1% I observed in the German sample.

	Top 10 PhD		**21 Other PhD**		**43 Non-PhD**		**Total**	
PhD Country Known	**158**		**211**		**206**		**575**	
US/Canada	**105**	**66.46%**	178.5	**84.60%**	**198**	**95.65%**	481.5	**83.59%**
USA	102	64.56%	173.5	82.23%	195	94.20%	470.5	81.68%
Canada	3	1.90%	5	2.37%	3	1.45%	11	1.91%
Other Anglophone	**35**	**22.15%**	**18**	**8.53%**	**5**	**2.42%**	58	**10.07%**
UK	33	20.89%	18	8.53%	5	2.42%	56	9.72%
Australia	2	1.27%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.35%
Anglophone PhDs (total)	**140**	**88.61%**	**196.5**	**93.13%**	**203**	**98.07%**	**539.5**	**93.66%**
Non Anglophone PhDs	**18**	**11.39%**	**14.5**	**6.87%**	**3**	**1.93%**	36.5	**6.34%**
Austria	1		1		0		2	
Belgium	1		0		0		1	

[14] http://www.phds.org/rankings/classics.
[15] Here I owe thanks to my colleague Maryam Foradi, who did the initial analysis of the top 10 departments.

France	1		3.5[16]		0		4.5	
Germany	5		3		1		9	
Greece	2		0		0		2	
Italy	5		2		2		9	
Netherlands	1		3		0		4	
Spain	2		1		0		3	
Switzerland			1		1		2	
Unknown	**2**		**3**		**0**		**5**	

Table 27: The countries where faculty earned their PhDs at (1) the top-10 ranked PhD-granting Classics Departments (http://www.phds.org/rankings/classics), (2) the other 21 PhD-granting departments in the same ranking, and (3) 43 non-PhD granting departments (enough so that I could come up with a set of 200+ faculty). Data was collecting by consulting departmental websites and then by doing supplementary research to fill in gaps (e.g., missing information about the PhD institution).

Several patterns emerge. First, the more prestigious departments are obviously bigger. The departments with the top-10 ranked PhD programs contain on average 16 assistant/associate/full professors each, the next 21 PhD-granting departments contain about 10 such faculty, while the 43 non-PhD departments contain about 5 faculty apiece. The remaining 835 tenured and tenure-track professors (60% of the whole) are distributed an average of 4 per department in the remaining 215 departments.

Second, we see two clearly different populations of faculty. On the one hand, the national composition of the non-PhD granting US Classics departments most closely resembles the composition of German departments of Greek, Latin, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology: about 95% received their PhDs in the US or Canada, and Anglophone PhDs account for 98% of all faculty in these programs. Because these programs are smaller and because these programs must attract undergraduates to flourish in the short run and to survive in the long run, they cannot take chances hiring faculty who may not be able to understand and support American students. My department hired one of the four faculty with a non-Anglophone PhD, but I do not think we could have done so if that candidate had not already demonstrated that he could teach successfully -- and enjoy teaching -- in an American university. In this, the non-PhD programs in the US are similar to German institutions which must be sure that the one (and usually the only) Professor Doctor that they will have in Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Classical Archaeology can support their local students. When the time comes for a Professor Doctor to retire, the Rectorate is always

[16] One faculty member listed a joint US/French PhD and I listed her as .5 from each country. Since I was trying to see how many faculty came to the US without a US PhD, I probably should have just counted her as a US PhD pure and simple. The addition of a .5 position for France has, however, no significant impact on the picture that emerges.

looking to see if that position is better shifted elsewhere (e.g., to Bioinformatics or somewhere else in the insatiable Life Sciences).

At the same time, the top 10 departments reflect a very different set of priorities, emphasizing the importance of attracting the best talent from the international community. More than a third of its faculty come from outside of North America and I suspect that the difference in academic culture between the UK, perhaps even Australia, and the US is substantially greater than that which separates Germany from Austria and German-speaking Switzerland. The UK faculty have, in my personal experience, provided a very different perspective from that of their US-trained colleagues. In addition, of the 158 faculty members for whom I could determine the PhD, 18 (11.4%) received their PhDs from institutions outside the English-speaking world. Every one of these departments has one or two faculty who come from an academic system outside the English-speaking world. The fact that a third of all faculty were trained outside of North America has, I believe, a tangible and positive effect upon the collective intelligence of each department.

Of course, more people study English than study German and this has something to do with this relatively high number but more than 10% of the students in Classical Philology in Germany come from abroad and (without actively looking for non-German PhDs) I noticed members of the German Mittelbau with PhDs from Virginia, Harvard, Austin, Rome, Pisa, Moscow and Florence. I also know speakers of Ukrainian, Italian and other languages who have come to Germany to teach in German on short term contracts. There are, therefore, non-Germans in German departments: they just have not acquired Professorships.

I should also emphasize that a focus on the PhD masks substantial diversity within the faculty: I did not collect precise figures but a noticeable percentage of faculty came to the US from elsewhere to get a PhD and then earned a tenure-track or tenured position.

Gender among the Professoriate

I would begin this brief section by qualifying the simplistic male/female categorization: the 575 faculty referenced include people who have more complex views of their gender identity than such a stark binary can capture and more nuanced analysis is essential if we are to show our community the respect it deserves. I begin with this binary classification because I want to begin somewhere and because I wish to provide a point of comparison between Germany and the US. I would be delighted to move on to a more nuanced model.

AASHD reports (Table CLS3) that women accounted for 40% of the faculty members in the 276 departments for which it has figures. This certainly reflects the figures I found in analyzing 575 assistant, associate and full professors in Classical Studies.

	Assist.			**Assoc.**			**Full Prof.**			**Total**		
	Female	**Tot**		**Fem.**	**Tot**		**Fem.**	**Tot**		**Fem.**	**Tot**	

First 10 PhD	10	26	38.46%	16	36	44.44%	38	98	38.78%	64	160	40.00%
Next 21 PhD	19	39	48.72%	27	63	42.86%	28	113	24.78%	74	215	34.42%
Non-PhD	15	43	34.88%	31	64	48.44%	38	100	38.00%	84	207	40.58%
	44	108	40.74%	74	163	45.40%	104	311	33.44%	222	582	38.14%

Table 28: Gender balance among 582 US tenured and tenure track faculty in Classical Studies.

I see no major surprises. The percentage of female full professors at the second set of PhD-granting classics departments is lower (25%) than that at the top 10 or the non-PhD programs (both about 38%). I suspect that the fluctuation among assistant professors may reflect the smaller sample size, with the overall average (41%) providing a better model. A second version of this overall study must, obviously, address sample size and statistical probabilities.

Where did these Classical Civilization faculty get their PhDs?

I add below a summary of where 582 faculty in these institutions got their final degree (in one case, the final degree seems to be an MA). I have sorted the list by where current Assistant Professors got their PhDs -- the numbers for Associate Professors and especially for Full Professors reflects departments that were very different than they are now (and even the Assistant Professor list reflects who decided to go to which program a decade or more ago). The emphasis on recent hires shows a shift in effectiveness, with Stanford being far more effective over the past six or seven years than it had been historically (which is no surprise to those of us who think that Stanford is the strongest current program).

The list is a bit flatter than when I just calculated where faculty at the 31 ranked PhD programs had gotten their PhDs. Then four PhD programs had accounted for 40% of those who received jobs, as opposed to here, where the top four account for just 34%. Seven programs account for just over half of all hires.

I do not endorse any of these programs. Anyone contemplating a PhD in Classics in the summer of 2015 probably won't hit the job market until 2022 or 2023 -- I have no idea how that situation will compare to that which current assistant professors faced in 2010 or 2013, when they applied for jobs. The most interesting program to me in many ways, the new PhD program at the Institute for Advanced Study of the Ancient World, does not even register on this list but I was very pleased to see a Fulbright scholar chose a PhD at ISAW over an offer from one of the established programs. You can see my reservations on current programs here.

	Assist.	Assoc	Full	Total

Harvard	12	16	40	**68**
Stanford	9	4	11	**24**
Princeton	8	10.5	33	**51.5**
Berkeley	8	13	33	**54**
Yale	7	4	17	**28**
Michigan	7	15	25	**47**
Penn	6	7	6	**19**
Brown	5	7	6	**18**
Chicago	5	11	4	**20**
Texas	4	2	5	**11**
Oxford	4	9	10	**23**
Columbia	3	2	7	**12**
Washington	3	2	3	**8**
Cambridge	3	4	23	**30**
UCLA	3	5	1	**9**
Pisa	2	2	1	**5**
UNC	2	4	8	**14**
McGill	2			**2**
Cincinnati	1	1	3	**5**
Madrid	1	1		**2**
NYU	1	1		**2**
St Andrews	1	1		**2**
Illinois	1	2	1	**4**
Toronto	1	3	4	**8**
Berne	1			**1**
Edinburgh	1			**1**
FU Berlin	1		1	**2**
Florida	1			**1**
Georgia	1			**1**
Heidelberg	1			**1**
Missouri	1		1	**2**
Rome	1		2	**3**
Wisconsin	1		3	**4**

Duke		6	5	**11**
Virginia		4	1	**5**
Bryn Mawr		3	7	**10**
Indiana		2		**2**
Minnesota		2	1	**3**
Amsterdam		1		**1**
Barcelona		1		**1**
Boston University		1	2	**3**
Boulder		1		**1**
Cornell		1	7	**8**
Greifswald		1		**1**
HU Berlin		1		**1**
Iowa		1		**1**
KCL		1		**1**
Kiel		1		**1**
Leuven		1		**1**
Munich		1		**1**
Northwestern		1		**1**
OSU		1	4	**5**
Penn State		1		**1**
Sydney		1	1	**2**
Tübingen		1		**1**
USC		1		**1**
Vienna		1	1	**2**
Sorbonne		0.5	1	**1.5**
unknown			7	**7**
Buffalo			3	**3**

Leiden			3	**3**
Brandeis			2	**2**
École des Hautes Études			2	**2**
JHU			2	**2**
Thessaloniki			2	**2**
UCL			2	**2**
Besançon			1	**1**
Catholic University			1	**1**
Cologne			1	**1**
Hamburg			1	**1**
Loyola			1	**1**
McMaster			1	**1**
Notre Dame			1	**1**
Pontifical Salesian University			1	**1**
Southampton			1	**1**
Zurich			1	**1**

Table 29: Where US faculty analyzed in this study got their PhDs.

Conclusion: "Germany's sustained international competitiveness as a research location"[17]?

As I said at the beginning of this long and still very preliminary essay, I write in my capacity as an Alexander von Humboldt Professor with an obligation to advanced "Germany's sustained international competitiveness as a research location." This initial and partial analysis of the current situation constitutes one step in that direction.

We have our work cut out for us, at least if our goal is to make Germany attractive as a long-term location for the study of Greco-Roman culture.

---

[17] Quoted from http://www.humboldt-foundation.de/web/alexander-von-humboldt-professorship.html; the German talks abou the need "*zur internationalen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit des Forschungsstandortes Deutschland nachhatig bei[zu]tragen*."

First, there are substantial strengths already in place. Germany is a wonderful place to live -- the infrastructure certainly seems far better taken care of and general political discourse feels much more constructive than in the US. The cost of living is modest (especially in the East) and the country is so compact that no one can be very far away from a big bustling metropolis (if a city of 100,000 to 500,000 is not enough for you). If you long for the great plains or the ability to escape civilization, Germany is probably not the place to be but if you like your nature within easy reach of a shower, Germany is a good bet.

A comparison of graduate education in the US and Germany deserves a separate treatment. Certainly, the big, integrated US PhD-granting departments, with 15 to 22 tenured and tenure track faculty, may well have a structural advantage (and at least some of my German colleagues have suggested that this may be the case) because they are designed but I would want to explore this hypothesis more fully (there is plenty of fragmentation across departments in the US). Certainly, German Greco-Roman studies is shaped by the very large primary and secondary school enrollments in Latin and still substantial enrollments in Greek.[18] Universities can expect a steady stream of students with substantial training in Greek or Latin and Chairs of Greek and Latin can support themselves by helping maintain the 9,000 primary and secondary school teachers of Latin (and occasionally) Greek. Ancient History and Classical Archaeology likewise benefit from this large pool of students with language training and, I suspect, from the relative prominence of Greco-Roman culture in primary and secondary school education. The US has developed a collections of post-baccalaureate and (linguistically) remedial MA programs to address the shortfall in linguistic training.

In an ideal world, I personally would like to see every German PhD candidate spend a year in the English-speaking world and ideally in the US system (because the US system does not participate in the Bologna process and provides a rather different model from that in European universities). I would in particular like to see those students spend time helping to teach the large, outreach courses aimed at non-majors by which US departments support themselves. I actually think that this is one of the most intellectually challenging and helpful aspects of getting a PhD in the US and would challenge German students to think about how to present our field intelligently to a broader audience. I believe that such experience, if challenges us always to ask what we are doing and why, can profoundly strengthen the most specialist scholarship, training us to think about how that scholarship might be used in new ways and by audiences that we have not anticipated. Conversely, I would like to see every US graduate student spend at least one year embedded in a program outside the English-speaking world. If necessary, this might take place in an English-language research group (typical at Max Planck Institutes in Germany) but ideally the US student would be pushed to function in a purely -- or at least primarily -- non-English space. Germany would be a prominent center for such years abroad but so would not only France and Italy but also Spain and any country where Greco-Roman studies has a potential future (Brazil would be high on my list). This attitude is frankly and pragmatically asymmetric because of the prominence, if not the hegemony, of English. My goal is to think about how students can best

[18] Data about German enrollments is available at http://sites.tufts.edu/perseusupdates/2015/05/19/bad-news-for-latin-in-the-us-worse-for-greek/.

flourish in the world in which they will spend their careers. Everyone is, of course, free to choose their own course.

In Germany, if you can get a permanent job here and become a civil servant, then the German system does plan to push you out and make you retire. At the same time, you do get a lifelong pension (and hopefully the demographic challenges looming over Germany do not undermine that pension when your turn comes -- I would save as much as possible and not trust the state too much). There is lots of red tape and frustrating bureaucracy -- you *will* need administrative help far more than in the US -- but you will figure out the pitfalls and avoid annoying surprises after a bit, learning what the system does and does not do well.

The problem is getting a permanent job. I only found 200 Professorships and Professorships are by far the most desirable positions to get. If we multiply by four to model this for a population like that of the US, we would only have 800 permanent professorships, as opposed to 1,410 tenured and tenure-track positions in the US. There are quite a few full-time academic jobs (the Statistisches Bundesamt claimed 411 for Classical Philology) but most of these are limited in term (sometimes just contracts to teach for a semester or even just a course or two, at least no longer than six years on hard money). About 15% of the non-professorial positions in German higher-education remain long term (much like senior lectureships in the US) but there is pressure to reduce the number of long term positions in academia and this percentage is likely to sink. Instead of becoming an Assistant Professor, you become an Academic Assistant (there are various terms) or even Junior Professor with an chance to aim for a permanent job but regulations prevent you from easily staying past your six years. With just 200 or so professorships, the numbers are not good. It is much easier, I think, to go farther and find yourself with your career much farther along in your life here in Germany than in the US -- the US system is harsher up front but most people move on at an earlier stage when it is easier to restart.

And, of course, the number of professorships has been trending down. In Tables 5-9, I listed data about declining size, not only of Greek and Latin, but of all Ancient Languages and Cultures in Germany, including Egyptology, Assyriology, and Indo-European. Enrollments have gone up even as the number of chairs has gone down -- universities just hire more cheap labor and keep the ratio of full-time instructors to students the same (about 1 to 10), even as the ratio of professors to students grows (from 1 professor for 36.5 students in 1997 to 1 professor for 56 students in 2011). I suspect that this is the disadvantage of a system where students do not pay tuition. Only 15% of US higher education institutions have Departments of Classical Civilization and these surely skew to the higher end of the market, where tuition is very high.[19] I know that my administration is very sensitive to the need for students who pay staggeringly high tuition to work, as much as possible, with tenured and tenure-track faculty.

[19] This is a pessimistic assessment and bases itself on the observation that Greco-Roman studies draws disproportionately (though not exclusively) from upper middle class students of European heritage. A recent article, provocatively titled, “Rich Kids Study English,” provides data to substantiate the view that members of the upper middle class are more likely to study the Humanities. If rich kids study English I suspect that even richer kids (currently) study Greco-Roman Studies. Such a phenomenon offers a challenge, arguably a grand challenge, to those of us who teach Greco-Roman Studies.

And, of course, the fact is that 98-99% of the regular professorships in Germany go to Germans. You can get your PhD in Germany. You can do your habilitation in Germany. But there is very little evidence to suggest that you will get a professorship if you are not German and certainly if you do not originate from the German-speaking world. A large percentage of German professors spend time studying abroad at some point and virtually everyone can follow a lecture in English (something we cannot say in the US). They thus attack the problem of providing diverse points of view by traveling abroad and then coming home, rather than systematically bringing senior colleagues from abroad. Surely, the fact that few non-German classicists could teach in German accounts for this, at least in part, but the results are the same whatever the causes: you have a tiny group of about 200 professors who have known each other for decades and who live, on a day to day basis, within a comparatively homogeneous intellectual community.

This also raises the sensitive question of language. My colleagues love German, and I do as well. For centuries, the language of publication and of instruction in Germany was Latin but that changed in the 19th century and the use of German plays a deep and very personal role in German academic identity. But the trends that I discovered reinforce the perception that English-speakers at least are making progressively less use of German language scholarship. Those who wish to establish a career that will extend decades into the future need to decide how much time they will invest (if any) in their ability to express themselves in English. Anyone who begins their career in Germany should do so with knowledge that, at least in Greco-Roman studies (and in contrast to the natural sciences) this is the place to learn how to publish in German. If young scholars have a chance to establish their careers either in a German or an English-speaking environment, there are obvious advantages in 2015 to the English-language environment. Will that situation change over the forty or so years to which young scholars can now look forward? If it does change, what will change look like? Will we need to make more room for Spanish (a vast linguistic space with a clear connection to Greco-Roman culture) or great world languages such as Mandarin or Arabic? Or will Greco-Roman studies remain a comfortable regional discipline where the community can be expected to read English, French, German, and Italian?

If I were to recommend one feature of the American system, it would be the tenure track Assistant Professorship. This institution has already begun to appear in Germany (my department of Computer Science at Leipzig is planning one and I know of others). I have two academic assistants (the equivalent of assistant professors with a fixed six year term) who report to me at Leipzig and will (as of Sept 1) have two tenure track assistant professors in my department at Tufts. I support all four equally. But at Leipzig, the two academic assistants are born to leave -- they must look elsewhere for permanent positions when their time is up. When they get (as I hope and expect they will) wonderful jobs, the whole department and university will look good and get some sort of credit. At Tufts, however, the Assistant Professors are protegées of the whole department. If they do not do well enough to earn a recommendation for tenure, that recommendation will not be forthcoming, whether because the department does not provide the support or because the university wide committee objects or even (in rare instances) because the administration objects. Such an outcome is deeply problematic and every rational professor knows it: if one of our assistant professors

were to fail to earn tenure, there is an excellent probability that we would lose the position and that that tenure line would go to some other discipline (quite possibly one of the STEM departments).

The tenure-track assistant professor system is structured to give every single senior member of a department very strong motivation to mentor and foster the career of every assistant professor. Of course, it does not work that way always and in every department -- sometimes junior faculty are simply not a fit and sometimes senior faculty are self-destructive -- but system is designed to encourage senior faculty to take an interest in and help the development of every junior faculty member. And this system pushes forward the normal make-or-break point by six years. If, after a probable period of one-year fill-in positions, you don't get a tenure track position, it is time to move on. In Germany, you can write your habilitation and then support yourself with short-term positions from third-party funding (e.g., on a grant-funded project) until you find yourself with no position at all in your forties or even fifties.

Before I conclude, I think that it is important to give the field of Greco-Roman studies in the US credit for keeping itself alive -- I have criticized it before, and with good reason,[20] but strengths of Anglo-American Greco-Roman studies have become clearer to me as I have prepared this long essay. Enrollments in Greek and Latin remained surprisingly resilient from 1968 through at least 2009 and we will see now if the big declines after the crash are a new normal or can be reversed. As I went over the faculty in the top programs for Greco-Roman studies in the US, I was struck by how similar they were in size to what I remember when I was starting out my career in the 1980s. The big departments may be down one or two slots (17 instead of 19, 15 instead of 16) but I don't perceive big changes. I don't have data to back this up and I know that we have lost programs and even departments, but I don't see the same devastation as I see in Germany. Oddly -- perhaps not so oddly -- I hear a great deal more discussion of the need for change in the US and a great deal of pride in tradition in Germany -- after talking to most colleagues and hearing about how wonderful the situation was for the Humanities in Germany, I could scarcely believe it as I started to see how much had been cut. (Here my colleagues, Reinhard Foertsch, now IT Director for the German Archaeological Institute, and Professor Charlotte Schubert, the holder of the Chair in Ancient History at Leipzig offer particular exception and have worked for a decade to find ways by which Greco-Roman studies can adapt to flourish within a digital world).

All of us who study the Greco-Roman world in Germany, the United States and everywhere in the world face serious challenges but first we need to reflect on what those challenges are, both locally and globally, and then we can begin to act. Our goal in the Alexander von Humboldt Chair of Digital Humanities is to help in any way that we can and this essay constitutes one partial contribution to this much larger and inevitably long-term effort.

---

20 http://www.dh.uni-leipzig.de/wo/so-you-want-to-become-a-professor-greek-andor-latin-think-hard-about-a-phd-in-digital-humanities/