



- » JAAACS Home
- » Article Archive
- » Editorial Statement
- » Call for Manuscripts
- » Author Guidelines
- » Editorial Board
- » Review Board

- » Submit An Article
- » Contact JAAACS

How Language Teaching Started Afresh: Origins and Repercussions of the Reform Movement in German Foreign Language Teaching Curricula

Sabine Doff

Institute of English and American Studies
Department of English Language Education
Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt / Main

1 Introduction

This paper critically examines the origins and repercussions of the Reform Movement of teaching modern languages (*Neusprachliche Reformbewegung*) at the end of the 19th century which is generally considered the last thorough and extensive reorientation of language teaching in continental Europe. Focussing on Prussia which then served as a progressive example for many other German states it investigates on which basis, for which reasons and how such a substantial reform could succeed at this very time and by doing so argues for a close examination of the context of (curricular) innovations which have considerably influenced the selection, organisation and evaluation of knowledge and learning objectives in continental foreign language education up to the present day.

The *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung* is usually perceived as a reform *by* men (like, for example, Wilhelm Viëtor and Gustav Wendt) *for* their younger counterparts (i.e. for those learning modern languages at higher boys' schools). This makes perfect sense against the backdrop of the prevailing assumption at the time that learning and teaching were seen to be genuinely gender-specific. Thus in the 19th century (and beyond) the gender-related acquisition of knowledge and proficiency was considered absolutely natural. Consequently, a methodology emerged that allowed the teaching of the modern languages, mainly French and English, to be designed accordingly. Contemporaries pointed critically towards the gender-bound approaches as early as the beginning of the century, for instance Theodor von Hippel, one of the first radical German feminists. He was convinced that with regard to foreign language teaching women had a stronger tendency to include emotions whereas men were rather interested in "heroic methods" ("heroische Methoden", Hippel 1801: 86). That is one of the reasons why he encourages both sexes to learn from each other and profit from their complementary approaches which he describes as follows:

We [i.e. the male teachers] prefer to announce what we are going to say before we say it whereas women proceed straight to the point without delay: we make preludes, the women play the songtext immediately, we start languages by doing grammar, the women with speaking.ⁱ

In the following, two hypotheses will be investigated which contradict the interpretation widely accepted so far that tends to see the female tradition of teaching foreign languages as slowly adapting to the male-dominated regulated state school system during the last third of the 19th century.ⁱⁱ In order to provide the context, dominant methodological principles of teaching foreign languages at higher boys' schools mainly based on teaching Latin and Greek and considered "standard" for much of the 19th century are outlined (part 2). It will then be shown that evident overlappings between the "female" tradition of teaching foreign languages and the ideas of the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung* (discussed in part 3) suggest that the didactic principles of teaching modern languages which had been followed by women teachers for a long time (investigated in part 4) finally acquired a theoretical foundation by influential male reformers in the public debate at the end of the 19th century. Part 5 of this paper will make evident that the effects of this coupling phenomenon were strengthened by the parallel institutionalization of the German higher school system for girls from the 1870s onwards which can clearly be seen in curricular repercussions of the reformers' ideas in modern language teaching curricula for both sexes in the last quarter of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century in Prussia. In order to gain a broader perspective on how didactic reorientations and curricular reforms have originated and been carried out, the closing outlook (part 6) offers a plea for replacing the study of isolated big (and usually male) names by an understanding of the history of foreign language education as a complex contextual network of a substantially larger number of participants, a considerable number of whom happened to be female.

2 Dominant Methods for Teaching Languages at Higher Boys' Schools

For a large part of the 19th century, the teaching and learning of modern languages in higher schools in Germany followed gender-related approaches that differed significantly as far as, for example, methodology (and consequently goals) were concerned. In order to understand the "exception" (i.e. the female approach) it first has to be considered in more detail what was perceived as the rule (i.e. dominant methods for teaching languages at higher schools for boys).

During the second half of the century, the importance of the English language and as a result also of English as a school subject, was increasing dramatically in higher education due to a rapidly growing interest in English literature and to intensified trading relations, to mention only a few reasons (Regel 1897: 153ff.). The teacher training courses at university level (during the 19th century usually open to men only) still included, however, Latin and Greek as important mandatory constituents, and thus modern language learning at higher boys' schools was geared to the methodological approaches applied in the classical languages (Regel 1897).

Thus the predominant methodological concepts of teaching English to boys were usually grammar-based; two of the most important ones

being the grammar-translation method and what became later known as Meidinger's method, named after the man who first introduced it. iii As far as the presentation and the systematic (usually deductive) conceptualization were concerned, language was seen to consist primarily of grammar which was structured according to the Latin model. Although these approaches were criticized rather early, for instance with respect to their methodological implications, iv their "success story" continued throughout most of the 19th century. Contemporary alternatives like, for instance, the interlinear method or an approach first introduced by Seidenstücker v that followed the principle "inductive before deductive", as well as Karl Mager's vi so-called genetic method following this very principle, surfaced in expert debates about teaching and learning modern foreign languages, but neither of them succeeded in overcoming the grammar-based methodological roots on a large scale.

An analysis of the regulations for teaching and examining English at higher boys' schools in different German states between 1840 and 1882 (collected in Christ & Rang 1985) reveals that the predominant objectives are mainly to be found in the areas of pronunciation, reading and translation skills as well as a knowledge of grammar rules (Klippel 1994: 298f.). It is striking, however, that in these documents the one skill that had been at the very core of teaching and learning modern languages in the female tradition for a long time, i.e. speaking, only plays a negligible (if any) role with regard to methodological guidelines and exam regulations. This is analyzed critically by the author of an encyclopaedic standard work that takes a retrospective view at the beginning of the 20th century:

There has been a strong tendency in our circles not to consider speaking a part of the core of higher education [Bildung], which means the actual spoken performance in living languages; of course it was expected (yet often in vain) that after learning to read and write Latin for many years students would also develop basic speaking skills in this language as they went along. vii

The reasons why speaking had not become an integral goal of modern language teaching in the context of higher education for boys are explained by the same author as follows:

[...] there is a common and widespread belief that performance in spoken language is and remains the business of an intellectually lower group of waiters and the like, and as if it always meant a kind of mechanical training unworthy of members of a higher human class. This line of thought has not been followed in most other European countries. viii

The growing realization that on the one hand the boys' performance in the modern languages (particularly with regard to pronunciation and speaking) remained at a very low level and that learners nevertheless felt overburdened on the other hand, provided one of the main starting points for the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung* at the end of the 19th century. The following part of this paper focuses on the context and direction of this substantial reform that has massively influenced foreign language teaching not only in Germany, but also in Europe up to the present day (see, for instance, Hüllen 2005).

3 A Closer Look at the Success Story of the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung*

Ever since it first appeared under the pseudonym Quousque Tandem in 1882, Wilhelm Viëtors essay *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* ("Language teaching has to start afresh!") with the subtitle *Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage* ("A contribution to the debate about overburdening") in 1882 has been considered a milestone documenting the initiation of the Reform Movement in the field of teaching modern languages in Europe right from the start (see, for example, Tanger 1888, Junker 1904: 420). The reformers' programme put spoken language at the very top of the agenda of teaching English and French in higher education (regardless of the sexes). Their innovative suggestions turned out to be highly controversial in the public debate, for instance, at the *Neuphilologentage* (Wendt 1888/1889, 1900/1901; for a collection of the expert literature see Breymann 1895).

Generally speaking, their approach was diametrically opposed to the methodological dominance of teaching Latin at higher boys' schools, which up to that time had often just been transferred to English and French. In short, the reformers aimed at making practical language competence, i.e. its extensive, non-regulated use, the primary goal. The core of learning modern languages was no longer to be grammar, but its actual application in meaningful contexts. This meant that the role of speaking and listening skills as well as pronunciation had to be strengthened and that the importance of authentic texts increased significantly in the foreign language classroom. Grammar served the purpose of language use and should mainly be dealt with inductively (Junker 1904: 420).

Whereas the public dispute about the reformers' demands went on, practitioners' reports show that these ideas fell on fertile ground rather quickly in quite a number of modern language classrooms. Thus it became obvious in many higher boys' schools shortly after the turn of the century, for instance, that "[...] pronunciation skills [...] have improved significantly, that more and more drills and exercises are now set in meaningful contexts [...], that deeper insights into the foreign culture are fostered and that texts have gained significant importance". ^{ix} School programmes and the discussion in expert journals indicate that quite a number of teachers were eager to put the reformers' suggestions into practice (Regel 1897: 155).

The controversial yet striking success of the reformers' ideas can not be explained by the teachers' dissatisfaction with the results they had reached on the basis of the "traditional" methodology or with the problem of overburdening alone. Other decisive factors that contributed to this success story substantially were, for example, the parallel development of phonetics as a science and the facilitated transportation to Britain and France. The reformers' methodological innovations called for teachers with a high oral language proficiency, which explains why the state and also local governments started initiating grants for (male) teachers of modern languages to finance stays abroad, for example in summer schools particularly designed for this very purpose.

In this context it is well worth noting that the tradition of improving one's language skills by a longer stay in the target culture following the mostly theory-oriented training at a teachers' seminar had long been an established practice among female teachers of modern languages. However, they usually had to pay for this extra training

themselves, which is why they regularly started work at private colleges or as private teachers in families in Britain or France. The fact that after their return female teachers had on average a significantly higher oral proficiency in the target language than their male colleagues was repeatedly stated in the public debate. Their comparatively high language competence in English or French often provided female language teachers the only opportunity to become employed in higher state schools (also for boys) and can thus be interpreted as their gateway to higher education in Germany in general (Doff 2007).

Research on the overwhelming effects of the Reform Movement has so far neglected the striking phenomenon that a substantial part of the methodological innovations suggested by the reformers overlapped with the female tradition of teaching modern languages, which had been applied, implemented and revised in the context of higher education for girls for decades. This argument is strengthened against a backdrop of the many active reformers who often spent significant parts of their professional careers as modern language teachers at higher girls' schools. Among them are key figures like Julius Bierbaum, professor at the higher girls' school in Karlsruhe, Jakob Wychgram, director of the *Augusta Schule* in Berlin and author of the standard handbook for higher girls' schools (*Handbuch für das höhere Mädchenschulwesen*, Wychgram 1897) as well as the already mentioned "father" of the reform, Wilhelm Viëtor, who started his teaching career in the 1870s at a higher school for girls in Essen. Furthermore, influential politicians in the field of education belonged to this group, for example Stefan Waetzoldt who took office in 1900 as head of the ministry for higher education for girls in Berlin and who set the liberal tone for the reform of the higher girls' school in Prussia in 1908 (see Wychgram 1905).

In other words, before and also during the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung* which is generally assumed to stretch over the last two decades of the 19th century, quite a number of male reformers had been able to pilot their innovative ideas and methods concerning modern language teaching in the context of higher education for girls, which was spared extensive state regulations as far as, for instance, curricula were concerned for quite a long time in Germany. XAs a result of this rich experience, they were able to present their ideas in the last two decades of the 19th century with a high degree of self-confidence and professionalism, which doubtless contributed substantially to their success story.

The female teachers who had been working at higher girls' schools with the very same or similar methods long before anybody had ever heard of the Reform Movement or its male protagonists, did – partly due to the fact that they were women – not have the opportunity to make their voices heard in public and to put their ideas concerning modern language teaching into effect on a large scale, i.e. outside their classrooms. This was only feasible for the male advocates of the reform whose success thus has to be seen against the backdrop of the long tradition of teaching modern languages in higher female education which differed significantly from the male approach in several aspects as I will show in the following.

4 Salient Principles of Teaching Modern Languages in Higher Female Education

Before investigating in more detail the female tradition of teaching

modern languages that prevailed in higher education for girls in Germany during the 19th century and that had a long tradition reaching back as far as the early 18th century, two crucial aspects have to be taken into consideration. Firstly, in the line of argument presented here the broad tendencies with regard to content and methods in teaching modern foreign languages in higher female education are analyzed and have been compared to the ideas of the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung*. This is why in the following no distinction is made between teaching English and French nor between teaching modern languages at higher state or private schools for girls or in private schooling contexts. However, it is argued that the main distinctive aspects of this genuine approach to teaching modern languages that cover the whole field should be identified.

Secondly, when comparing content and methods in the context of higher education for both sexes in 19th century Germany it has to be kept in mind that female as well as male teachers of modern languages were relatively free as far as the design and practice of teaching modern languages at higher girls' schools were concerned. The implementation of far-reaching state regulations in the form of, for example, non-mandatory guidelines or suggestions for curricula only began in the 1870s (see, for example, Ackermann 1883: 218). These state regulations confirmed, however, in many instances the existing practice as far as, for example, content, methods and objectives were concerned (for more details see section 5 of this article).

A closer look reveals three outstanding distinctive principles which specify the female tradition of teaching modern languages when compared to dominant standard methodology of teaching language in the higher school system in Germany for boys (see part 2 of this paper), namely the important role of native speaker teachers, the oral principle and an utilitarian approach which will briefly be discussed in the following.

One of the most obvious features of a female language teaching tradition, particularly in private schools and in private surroundings, i.e. in families, is that the (usually female) teacher in many instances was a native speaker (often a governess, see Hardach-Pinke 1993), which of course had far-reaching consequences for the ongoing teaching and learning processes. It means, for example, that the input the girls received was usually extensive and authentic and that the direct contact with the target culture in the form of the teacher was an integral part of their English and/or French lessons. A further consequence of the teacher being a native speaker whose notoriously bad knowledge of German in the case of governesses was often criticized in the public debate, was that the girls were virtually forced to use the foreign language (and not their mother tongue) to make themselves understood to their teacher. The use of the target language, i.e. English or French, as the language of instruction in the classroom was often supported by the girls' parents, who were usually interested in their daughters obtaining the valued oral language proficiency in the foreign language (*Parlierfähigkeit*), which enabled them to conduct conversations in English and/or French. Furthermore, it could happen that the language of instruction in other subjects taught by the same teacher (for example geography or history) was English or French, too, as, for example, school programmes for a higher private school lead by the *Englische Fräulein* in Munich around the middle of the 19th century indicate (Winkler 1935).

Another crucial feature of the female approach to foreign language teaching was the outstanding predominance of the oral principle. Therefore, listening and speaking skills were strongly promoted in the modern language classroom (for an example see Johanna Schopenhauer 1839); accordingly, writing usually played a rather negligible role and well into the 19th century the reading of novels and magazines in English and/or French was considered a private activity reserved for the girls' spare time. Lessons in English or French concentrated primarily on the girls' conversational skills; grammar was usually taught to serve this very purpose, as were the lexical items which were supposed to be learned by heart and which often consisted of whole conversational chunks, as contemporary textbooks (e.g. Jorns 1882, Kameke 1892) demonstrate. The topics in these and other textbooks which were often designed exclusively for conversational training were in many cases gender-related as well, as titles of units like "The First Wedding", "At the Dressmaker's" and "Untidiness" indicate. To sum up: Parents, particularly in the context of private higher education, were often eager to make use of foreign language lessons exclusively for the purpose of their daughters' *Parlierfähigkeit*, i.e. their conversational oral proficiency.

This is why a utilitarian approach to foreign language learning in higher female education in general prevailed and the educational value (*Bildungswert*) of learning English and French remained largely neglected in this context for quite a long time. Critical voices repeatedly pointed out this monodimensional orientation (which in the following quotation is – remarkably for a contemporary critic – connected explicitly to the ideas of the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung*):

If paying parents were to be satisfied by tangible, visible and "real" results, then performance had to be put on top of the agenda. This is why, even before the reform, speaking had played a more important role in higher schools for girls than in those for boys. Moreover, this orientation was promoted by the fact that the chattering method in general suits girls better than boys. Xi

By the last third of the 19th century, however, there began a highly controversial discussion about the *Bildungswert* of modern languages particularly for girls (see, for example, Ackermann 1883), when English and French were to be established as school subjects in higher education for both sexes along with or in some types of higher state schools, even as substitutes for Latin and Greek. In this debate, experts for higher female education, the so-called *Mädchenschulpädagogen*, stressed repeatedly that modern foreign languages had an equal *Bildungswert* to the classical languages, which had dominated the higher school system in Germany since the Middle Ages. As a consequence, the role of English literature in the classroom was intensified and its appropriateness, particularly for the education of higher girls, was frequently emphasized (Doff & Klippel 2007).

A few of these distinctive features of the female tradition of teaching modern languages had already been implemented in official documents, for instance guidelines regarding the content and methodology of English and French as school subjects at higher girls' schools during the last third of the 19th century. These often served as starting points for the further curricular organization and institutionalization of higher female education for many German

states which was just about to begin. Prussia then often served as a progressive example for many other German states in this respect which is why in the following Prussian examples of modern language teaching curricula are analyzed in order to demonstrate the influences of the Reform Movement.

5 Repercussions of the Reform in Modern Language Teaching Curricula

The tendencies described in the previous section can be found, for example, in early drafts of state regulations for the curriculum of higher girls' schools from 1873 (discretionary methodological recommendations of the Berlin conference, quoted in Kreyenberg 1887) and 1886 (draft of the so-called Berlin curriculum which was never put into effect officially, see *Centralblatt* 1886). The first compulsory curricular regulations, which were passed by the Prussian government in 1894, the so-called *Maibestimmungen* (*Centralblatt* 1894) also show this distinctive signature with regard to the two modern languages English and French that had then been officially introduced to separate the higher from the middle school for girls (where only one foreign language was a mandatory subject). All three curricular documents reflect the utilitarian approach to learning and teaching a foreign language as well as the consequently subordinate role of grammar.

The official guidelines for higher girls' schools mentioned above illustrate among other points how the female tradition of teaching modern foreign languages was implemented parallel to the institutionalization process of the state school system for girls during the outgoing 19th century. At the beginning of the 1890s these tendencies stood in strong opposition to what was expected in modern languages at higher schools for boys. This is illustrated, for instance, in the Prussian guidelines for higher boys' schools from 1892, where the methodological regulations for French and English begin as follows:

The task of logical-linguistic instruction which at schools teaching Latin is predominantly performed by Latin grammar and the respective exercises, is to be carried out by French grammar and suitable exercises at schools without Latin.xii

This example illustrates clearly that contrary to what was happening in higher girls' schools at the same time the Reform Movement had not yet produced any strong repercussions in curricula in higher education for boys in the outgoing 19th century. In the latter context, innovations were nevertheless slowly but steadily becoming evident, as further examples of curricula, methodological guidelines, school programmes and textbooks for teaching modern languages show. They illustrate, for instance, the growing importance of speaking exercises, the stronger orientation towards language use as well as the increase of inductive methodological approaches in the fields of grammar and syntax (see, for example, Junker 1904).

However, it proved rather difficult to implement these innovative impulses at higher schools for boys, since they could not be connected to an existing tradition of teaching modern languages communicatively like the decades of experience at girls' schools. Many male teachers were simply not qualified for a teaching approach aimed at actual communication in the classroom, for

instance with regard to their own language competence. A number of examples indicate that a few of these male teachers eventually became outspoken opponents not only of the female tradition of teaching foreign languages but also of the Reform Movement. A female contemporary comments on this coincidence matter-of-factly in the following way:

The strongest opponents of French conversation with whom I have discussed have always demonstrated a poor command of the spoken language themselves. Popular buzz words like "French for waiters", "French tinsel" and "parrot language" leave me as cold as prejudices against women's emancipation. Furthermore, I'm still waiting to meet people for whom correct grammar has resulted in correct speaking or writing. Xiii

It has to be kept in mind that practical language teaching at higher boys' schools often lagged behind the rather traditional, i.e. less reform-oriented formal regulations anyway:

Modern language teaching practice [at higher boys' schools] remains, as far as I can tell, still far behind the official regulations up to the present day, even if there has lately been considerable progress in the field in other respects. [...] The fact that the role of speaking has gained in importance considerably in teaching foreign language at school during the past decade or so can undoubtedly be ascribed to the merits of the reformers who based their methodological innovations, which consequently demand speaking practice, on progress in phonetics. XIV

In other respects such as the predominant role of grammar in learning a foreign language, innovative suggestions by the reformers did not show any considerable effects in the context of higher education for boys at the time. What thus becomes evident is how much more flexible the less regulated higher school system for girls was with regard to didactic innovations.

Against this backdrop the distinctive female approach to teaching modern foreign languages remained unquestioned on the one hand during the outgoing 19th century, but was also under attack on the other hand, allegedly due to its superficiality and its lack of educational value. Furthermore, this didactic *Sonderweg*, manifest already in the early curricula and regulations, certainly caused some of the difficulties which the higher school for girls faced in the institutionalization process which aimed at positioning it next to the *Gymnasien* and *Realbildungsanstalten* as a higher yet Latin-less schooltype. Unexpectedly, this process was supported at the end of the 19th century by the Reform Movement, which the overlappings of their demands and the female language teaching tradition shown in detail in sections 3 and 4 of this paper have indicated. This connection is analyzed clearly by a contemporary expert:

The demands the reformers have made for these schools [i.e. higher Latin-less schools for boys] during the past 30 years have already been practiced at higher girls' schools for a considerable length of time. [...] it seems like the reformers have received their instruction from the so-called "higher

This led to a strong coupling phenomenon with extensive effects which a glance at examples of the next generation of curricula for higher school types for both sexes at the beginning of the 20th century demonstrates. A comparison of the compulsory curriculum for English put into effect in the course of the extensive reform of the higher girls' school in Prussia in 1908 (*Centralblatt* 1908: 920ff.) with contemporary guidelines for higher boys' schools (cf. Lehmann 1904: 131) illustrates that the substantial gender-related differences manifest 15 years earlier (see above) had not been abolished completely, yet they had levelled out considerably by the beginning of the 20th century. A closer look at these documents (Doff 2002: 469-478) reveals that the strong effects of the coupling of the female tradition of teaching modern languages and the approaches suggested by the reformers lead to a dominance of these innovative approaches over the formerly prevailing methods in higher schools for boys that taught modern languages like classical languages (and not vice versa).

6 Brief Outlook

The fresh start of language learning and teaching in late 19th and early 20th century Germany as requested and finally carried out by Viëtor and his colleagues illustrates that and how didactic (and thus also curricular) reforms can be successful provided the mainstream expectations in culture as well as in society match these new ideas, which furthermore need influential representatives and an appropriate institutional setting. The development investigated in this paper is an example of how curricular change, in this case a reorientation of learning objectives in foreign language teaching like, for instance, oral competence, can only take effect on a large scale provided they coincide with public expectations or what has been called the dominant mentality (Burke 1986) at least in important respects. Since the latter was the case at the end of the 19th century, the innovations suggested by the reformers were rather quickly implemented into modern foreign language teaching curricula in Prussia which functioned as a model for many other German states at the time. It would be highly interesting to compare the processes analyzed here in a new light with contemporary curricular innovations in other states in Germany, Europe and beyond. However, already this example shows that the approach that is often ascribed to the great male icons of the Reform Movement but that in fact had been practiced for decades in the context of higher female education (i.e. far away from the regulated mainstream) could only take effect via the detour of a male-dominated reform, which finally led to what is nowadays considered the last thorough reorientation of modern foreign language teaching in Europe.

This inevitably leads to the conclusion that the still young field of the historiography of learning and teaching foreign languages in Germany and Europe should take great care when approaching quasi-set "icons" of the field like, for instance, Wilhelm Viëtor or Gustav Wendt. This suggestion does not intend to diminish their or other (usually male) famous persons' importance. However, it seems so much more interesting and rewarding in this new light to take a closer look at where Viëtor actually "went to school", i.e. where, together with whom and under which circumstances and influences he and others created the opportunity to develop and implement innovative methods for the teaching of modern languages which eventually brought across a far-reaching reorientation with regard to

the selection, organisation and evaluation of knowledge and competences in foreign language classrooms and curricula. Thus a stronger consideration of the context, i.e. the social and intellectual conditions as well as the power relations in which the Reform Movement, its ideas and their curricular reflections unfolded in a network of participants seems more than appropriate in order to investigate what has been considered legitimate, i.e. officially desirable knowledge and thinking as a key element of understanding the development of foreign language learning and teaching today. Furthermore, in this case a more differentiated approach of this type to investigation will inevitably strengthen the role of a female tradition on the history of education as a welcome side effect.

Endnotes

1. Hippel 1801: 86f; author's translation. The original reads: "Wir (die Männer) sagen beim Unterrichte gern voraus, was wir sagen wollen, und ehe wirs sagen; wogegen die Weiber ohne diese Erschwerung gradezu zur Sache schreiten: wir präludieren, die Weiber spielen gleich das Textlied, wir fangen mit der Grammatik Sprachen an, die Weiber mit Sprechen".
2. The latter line of argument is taken, for instance, in the standard work "Handbook of German History of Education" (*Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte*), Küpper 1987: 186.
3. Johann Valentin Meidinger (1756-1822, Frankfurt am Main) was an influential German teacher of French and the author of one of the most popular grammar-based textbooks for learning French which was first published in 1783 under the title *Practische Französische Grammatik wodurch man diese Sprache auf eine ganz neue und sehr leichte Art in kurzer Zeit gründlich erlernen kann* ("Practical French Grammar by which this language can be learned thoroughly in a completely new and simple way within a short time"); by 1857 the book had been printed in its 37th edition and more than 250.000 legal copies had been sold (Historische Kommission 2007b).
4. For example by an author called Staedler (1879: 72ff.) in a paper on the role of method(s) and grammar in foreign language teaching ("Methode und Grammatik des fremdsprachlichen Unterrichts") which was published in a journal dedicated exclusively to the topic of female education (*Zeitschrift für weibliche Bildung*, which appeared from 1873 through 1901).
5. Johann Heinrich Philipp Seidenstücker (1765-1817, Lippstadt et al.) was another influential foreign language teacher, headmaster and scholar

who published a number of writings on teaching classical as well as modern languages (Historische Kommission 2007c). Among his most influential works was his textbook for elementary French published in two parts (*Elementarbuch zur Erlernung der französische Sprache. Erste Abtheilung 1811. Zweite Abtheilung 1813*).

6. Karl Mager (1810-1858, Berlin, Stuttgart, Aarau/Zürich, Wiesbaden et al.) was an important 19th century journalist (founder and editor-in-chief 1840-1849 of the journal "Pädagogische Revue. Centralorgan für Pädagogik, Didaktik und Kulturpolitik") and scholar in the field of pedagogy (Historische Kommission 2007a). Among various special interests which also included educational theory and politics in the field of education he focussed on teaching the natural sciences and foreign languages in his practical work as well as in theoretical writings, for example in his main work on methodology by which he introduced the so-called genetic method (*Die genetische Methode des schulmäßigen Unterrichts in fremden Sprachen und Litteraturen*, 1846).
7. Münch 1908: 815; author's translation. The original reads: "Man war bei uns lange Zeit geneigt und ist es zum Teil noch, das Sprechen fremder Sprachen als außerhalb des Kreises der echten Bildungsaufgabe liegend zu betrachten, das heißt das wirkliche Sprechen lebender Sprachen; denn daß man nach vieljährigem Betrieb des Lateinischen diese Sprache nicht bloß lesen und schreiben, sondern auch einigermaßen mündlich gebrauchen könne, wurde ja freilich erwartet, wenn auch vielfach vergeblich".
8. Münch 1908: 815; author's translation. The original reads: "[...] es gibt weithin die Anschauung, als ob solches Sprechenkönnen ein Geschäft einer geistig niederen Schicht sei und bleibe, für Kellner und ihresgleichen, und als ob es immer eine Art von Abrichtung bedeute, wie sie eines Menschen der höheren Gattung unwürdig sei. Im Auslande, d. h. in den meisten europäischen Ländern, hat man nicht so gedacht".
9. Junker 1904: 420; author's translation. The original reads: "[...] daß [...] die Aussprache [...] sich gebessert hat, daß die Übungsstoffe nun

vorzugsweise zusammenhängende Stücke sind [...], daß eine tiefere Kenntnis des fremden Volkstums erzielt und die Lektüre stärker betont wird".

10. Institutionalization processes into which the state became involved very slowly only started at the beginning of the 1870s (see, for example, Doff 2002: 180-240). The first mandatory curriculum for higher girls' schools in Prussia was not put into effect before 1894 (the so-called *Maibestimmungen*, see Centralblatt 1894; for more details see section 5 of this article).
11. Clodius 1906: 4-5; author's translation. The original reads: "Denn wollte man den Eltern für ihr Schulgeld sozusagen etwas Greifbares, Sichtbares, Reales liefern, dann musste man das 'Können' in den Vordergrund stellen. Deshalb ist auch schon vor der Reform in den Mädchenschulen die Sprechfertigkeit immer mehr betrieben worden als in den Knabenschulen, wozu noch der Umstand nicht wenig beitrug, dass die Mädchen ihrer ganzen Natur nach für die Plappermethode besser geeignet sind als die Knaben".
12. Centralblatt 1892: 69; author's translation. The original reads: "Die Aufgabe der sprachlich-logischen Schulung, welche an lateinlehrenden Anstalten vorzugsweise der lateinischen Grammatik und den angeschlossenen Uebungen zufällt, ist an lateinlosen durch die französische Grammatik und die entsprechenden Uebungen zu lösen".
13. Thiel 1898: 102; author's translation. The original reads: "Die heftigsten Gegner der französischen Konversation, mit denen ich diskutiert habe, waren stets solche, die selbst der mündlichen Sprache nicht mächtig waren. Die bekannten Schlagworte vom Kellnerfranzösisch, welschem Tand und Papageiensprache lassen mich grade so kalt, wie die Vorurteile gegen die Frauenemanzipation. Auch warte ich noch immer auf die Leute, welche als Frucht der korrekten Grammatik korrekt sprechen oder schreiben".
14. Glauning 1895: 67; author's translation. The original reads: "Die Praxis ist nun freilich,

wenigstens soweit meine Erfahrung reicht, hinter den amtlichen Forderungen bis in die neuere Zeit ziemlich weit zurückgeblieben, wenn auch der Schulunterricht auf dem Gebiet der neueren Sprachen in anderer Hinsicht sehr bedeutende Fortschritte gemacht hat. [...] Dass in den letzten zehn oder zwölf Jahren die Pflege des Sprechens in den Schulen eine ausgedehntere geworden ist, bleibt unbestritten das Verdienst der auf phonetischen Boden fussenden 'Reformer', die in ihren methodischen Schriften die Pflege des Sprechens unermüdlich verlangt haben" (Glauning 1895: 67).

15. Clodius 1906: 6; author's translation. The original reads: "Was [...] die Reformer für diese Schulen [die lateinlosen Knabenschulen] in den letzten 30 Jahren erstrebten, das hatten die höheren Mädchenschulen schon längst. [...] die Reformer scheinen zum Teil bei den "höheren Töchtern" in die Lehre gegangen zu sein [...]"

References

Sources

Ackermann [sic] (1883). Der fremdsprachliche Unterricht in der höheren Mädchenschule. *Zeitschrift für weibliche Bildung*, 11, 173-184 and 217-226.

Breymann, H. (1895). *Die neusprachliche Reform-Literatur von 1876 bis 1893*. Leipzig.

Centralblatt für die gesammte Unterrichtsverwaltung in Preußen. Hg. in dem Ministerium der geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medicinalangelegenheiten. Berlin 1859-1908.

Clodius [sic] (1906). Die höhere Mädchenschule und der fremdsprachliche Unterricht. *Zeitschrift für französischen und englischen Unterricht*, 5, 1-14.

Glauning, F. (1895). VI. Englisch. In W. Münch, W. & F. Glauning (Eds.). *Didaktik und Methodik des französischen und englischen Unterrichts. Sonderausgabe aus Dr. A. Baumeister's Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre für höhere Schulen*. München: C. H. Beck.

Hippel, T. G. von (1801). *Nachlaß über weibliche Bildung*. Berlin: Voß.

Jorns, C. (1882). *The Young Lady's Vocabulary with Conversations. Für höhere Mädchenschulen, Seminarien und zum Selbststudium*. Berlin: Herbig.

Junker, H. P. (1904). Englischer Unterricht, geschichtlicher Abriß. In W. Rein (Ed.). *Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik*. Bd. 2. 2nd ed. Langensalza: Hermann Beyer & Söhne, 406-421.

Kameke, H. von (1893 [1892]). *The Girls' Book of Dialogues for the Use of Classes and for Private Use both for German and English Pupils, with some notes and headings of letters at the end.* 2nd ed. Dresden: Huhle.

Kreyenberg, G. (1887). *Die deutsche höhere Mädchenschule. Geschichte und Entwicklung derselben bis in die neueste Zeit.* Frankfurt: Moritz Diesterweg.

Lehmann, R. (1904). Die höheren Lehranstalten. Lehrpläne und Lehrbetrieb. In W. Lexis (Ed.). *Das Unterrichtswesen im Deutschen Reich. Bd. II: Die höheren Lehranstalten und das Mädchenschulwesen im Deutschen Reich.* Berlin: Asher, 67-165.

Mager, K. W. (1846). *Die genetische Methode des schulmäßigen Unterrichts in fremden Sprachen und Litteraturen.* Zürich.

Meidinger, J. V. (1783). *Practische Französische Grammatik wodurch man diese Sprache auf eine ganz neue und sehr leichte Art in kurzer Zeit gründlich erlernen kann.* Frankfurt.

Münch, W. (1908). Sprechen fremder Sprachen. In W. Rein (Ed.). *Encyclopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik. Achter Band. Erste Hälfte: Schulbesuch – Schweizerisches Schulwesen.* 2nd ed. Langensalza: Hermann Beyer & Söhne, 815-820.

Regel, E. (1897). Zur Methodik des Unterrichts an höheren Mädchenschulen – Englisch. In Wychgram (Ed.), 153-172.

Schopenhauer, J. (1839). Jugendleben und Wanderbilder. In E. Kleinau & C. Mayer (Eds.) (1996). *Erziehung und Bildung des weiblichen Geschlechts. Eine kommentierte Quellensammlung zur Bildungs- und Berufsbildungsgeschichte von Mädchen und Frauen.* Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, Bd. 2, 191-196.

Seidenstücker, J. H. P. (1811; 1813). *Elementarbuch zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache.* Erste Abtheilung 1811. Zweite Abtheilung 1813. Dortmund und Leipzig.

Staedler [sic] (1879). Methode und Grammatik des fremdsprachlichen Unterrichts. *Zeitschrift für weibliche Bildung*, 7, 67-86 und 117-130.

Tanger, G. (1888). *Muss der Sprachunterricht umkehren? Ein Beitrag zur neusprachlichen Reformbewegung im Zusammenhange mit der Überbürdungsfrage.* Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Thiel [sic] (1898). Neue oder alte Methode? *Die Lehrerin*, 14, 101-103.

Viëtor, W. [Quousque Tandem] (1882). *Der Sprachunterricht muß umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage.* 2nd ed. 1886. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Wendt, Gustav (1898/99; 1900/01). Die Wiener Reform Thesen. *Die Neueren Sprachen*, 6, 657-660 und 8, 61-64.

Wychgram, J. (Ed.) (1897). *Handbuch des höheren Mädchenschulwesens.* Leipzig: Voigtländer.

Wychgram, Jakob (1905). Stephan Waetzoldt. *Frauenbildung*, 4, 193-208.

Secondary works

Burke, P. (1986). Strengths and weaknesses of the history of mentalities. *History of European Ideas*, 7, 439-451.

Christ, H. & Rang, H.-J. (Eds.) (1985). *Fremdsprachenunterricht unter staatlicher Verwaltung 1700 bis 1945. Eine Dokumentation amtlicher Richtlinien und Verordnungen*. 7 vols. Tübingen: Narr.

Doff, S. (2002). *Englischlernen zwischen Tradition und Innovation. Fremdsprachenunterricht für Mädchen im 19. Jahrhundert*. München: Langenscheidt-Longman.

Doff, S. (2007). *Stairway to Heaven oder Road to Nowhere: Wie die Lehrerinnen in die höhere Schule kamen – und was dann geschah*. *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Historiographie* 13, 70-77.

Doff, S. & Klippel, F. (2007). Mädchen lernen fremde Sprachen – Lehrbücher und Lektüre im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. In H. Decke-Cornill & L. Volkmann (Eds.). *Gender Studies and Foreign Language Teaching*. Tübingen: Narr, 47-62.

Hardach-Pinke, Irene (1993). *Die Gouvernante. Geschichte eines Frauenberufs*. Frankfurt/Main und New York: Campus.

Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek (2007). Mager, Karl. In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (electronic version), vol. 20, 57-59.

Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek (2007). Meidinger, Johann Valentin. In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (electronic version), vol. 21, 189-192.

Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek (2007). Seidenstücker, Johann Heinrich Philipp. In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (electronic version), vol. 33, 630-632.

Hüllen, W. (2005). *Kleine Geschichte des Fremdsprachenlernens*. Berlin: Schmidt.

Klippel, F. (1994). *Englischlernen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Die Geschichte der Lehrbücher und Unterrichtsmethoden*. Münster: Nodus.

Küpper, E. (1987). Die höheren Mädchenschulen. In K.-E. Jeismann & P. Lundgreen (Eds.). *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte, Band III. Von der Neuordnung Deutschlands bis zur Gründung des Deutschen Reiches*. München: Beck, 180-191.

Winkler, Theolinde Maria (Ed.) (1935). *Hundert Jahre im Dienste der höheren Mädchenbildung, Im Auftrag des Institutes der Englischen Fräulein München-Nymphenburg*, 2 Bde. München: Filser.