

# *The Bildungsbürgertum and the Learned Professions in Prussia, 1770-1830: The Origins of a Class\**

by R. Steven TURNER\*\*

## I

During the nineteenth century the German upper middle class displayed a deep cleavage between its professional and bureaucratic wing and its commercial and entrepreneurial elements. Until late in the century these two groups held apart from each other socially, educated their sons in different schools, and often espoused different and mutually hostile political philosophies. The propertied middle class, the *Besitzbürgertum*, obviously had its origins in German industrial and commercial expansion of the nineteenth century; the origins of the professional middle class, the *Bildungsbürgertum*, are more distant and complex.<sup>1</sup> In Prussia historians have regarded this social group as created by the educational reforms of the early nineteenth century and ultimately by the diverse forces of German idealism and bureaucratic absolutism. This view, however, neglects the lines of continuity between the *Bildungsbürgertum* of the nineteenth century and the learned, professional elements of Prussia before the reforms. This article offers a different perspective: it examines the mature *Bildungsbürgertum* in Prussia during the *Vormärz* period and advances a new interpretation of its evolution from its eighteenth-century antecedents.

The mature *Bildungsbürgertum* could be defined in three different ways. In the Prussia of 1840 it included most loosely those Prussians who through the nature and extent of their secondary schooling had won the right to satisfy Prussia's universal military obligation through one year of active service and a period in the reserves. By 1841 this privilege could be claimed by all boys who had completed three school forms of a classical gymnasium (*Tertianer*, about age fourteen), or the sixth

\* Research for this paper was undertaken while I was a fellow of the *Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung* and a guest of the *Institut für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften der Universität München* in 1977-78. I am very grateful for their support.

\*\* Department of History, University of New Brunswick.

<sup>1</sup> For a critique of German historiography on the problem see Klaus VONDUNG, "Einleitung. Probleme einer Sozialgeschichte der Ideen", in *Das wilhelminische Bildungsbürgertum. Zur Sozialgeschichte seiner Ideen*, ed. Klaus VONDUNG (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), pp. 6-11. Also Lenore O'BOYLE, "Klassische Bildung und soziale Struktur in Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1848", *Historische Zeitschrift*, 207 (1968): 584-608; Fritz RINGER, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969); Hansjoachim HENNING, *Das westdeutsche Bürgertum in der Epoche der Hochindustrialisierung 1860-1914. Teil I: Das Bildungsbürgertum in den preussischen Westprovinzen* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1972).

and highest form of a burgher school (*Real-oder höhere Bürgerschule*, about age seventeen), or who could demonstrate on examination a comparable education.<sup>2</sup> Many boys attended these schools only long enough to win this privilege and then moved on into all walks of life. A second, stricter definition accepts as members of the *Bildungsbürgertum* only those who had completed the next-to-highest school form of a gymnasium (*Sekundaner*) or had passed the burgher school leaving-examination and won its diploma. By the late 1840s these attainments had become official minimum requirements for entry into many prestigious branches of the subaltern civil service, the Prussian officer corps, most engineering, agricultural, and commercial schools, and the medico-surgical institutes.<sup>3</sup> Those who possessed such educational backgrounds and had moved into such careers constituted a true "elite of education" in Prussian society.

This paper employs a third and still stricter definition that identifies as true members of the *Bildungsbürgertum* only those Prussians who had gone on from the schools to the universities and had subsequently entered one of the traditional professions for which the universities trained: theology, law, medicine, and higher teaching. By this definition the *Bildungsbürgertum* included around 1840 some 2,800 doctors with the M.D. degree; 5,800 ordained Evangelical pastors; 3,500 Catholic priests; 2,300 teachers in the higher secondary schools; and 430 university professors and *Privatdozenten*.<sup>4</sup> It also included 2,600 judges in the state courts, 1,500 attorneys (*Justizkommissare*), and about 1,000 judges in private courts, counting only salaried posts. Positions in the administrative and fiscal bureaucracy, also monopolized by jurists, have been estimated at 1,600, excluding subaltern posts.<sup>5</sup> To these numbers should be added the ranks of those training or waiting for a salaried position: 3,800 university students, perhaps 5,500 in-service, post-graduate trainees (*Assessoren* and *Referendare*) in the bureaucratic service, and about 950 Evangelical pastoral candidates awaiting a clerical living.<sup>6</sup> These figures yield

<sup>2</sup> Ludwig VON RÖNNE, ed., *Das Unterrichtswesen des preussischen Staates*, 3 vols. in 2, (Berlin: Weit & Comp., 1855), II, pt. 2, pp. 302-07; Karl-Ernst JEISMANN, *Das preussische Gymnasium in Staat und Gesellschaft. Die Entstehung des Gymnasiums als Schule des Staates und der Gebildeten, 1787-1817* (Stuttgart: Ernest Klett Verlag, 1974), p. 357; and Fritz K. RINGER, *Education and Society in Modern Europe: a Comparative Study* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1978).

<sup>3</sup> VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichtswesen*, II, pt. 2, pp. 292-302 and *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> J. G. HOFFMAN, "Uebersicht der auf den sämtlichen Universitäten des preussischen Staates vom Sommersemester 1820 bis zum Wintersemester 1839/40 Studirenden..." in his *Sammlung kleiner Schriften staatswirthschaftlichen Inhalts* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1843), pp. 187-226; Wilhelm DIETERICI, ed., *Die statistischen Tabellen des preussischen Staates nach der amtlichen Aufnahme des Jahres 1843* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1845), p. 112; and Johann Friedrich Wilhelm KOCH, ed., *Die preussischen Universitäten. Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung and Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen*, 2 vols. in 3 (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1839), I, *passim*. University study was not a prerequisite for the Catholic clergy. Consequently I have not treated the Catholic clergy as a part of the *Bildungsbürgertum* except for purposes of this estimate.

<sup>5</sup> On the judicial bureaucracy see HOFFMANN, "Uebersicht", and the original figures in W. F. C. STARKE, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der bestehenden Gerichtsverfassung...* (Berlin: Carl Heymann, 1839), Teil 2, Abt. 3, Anhang 4; the figures are approximately confirmed by the count of judicial officials listed in *Handbuch über den königlich preussischen Hof und Staat für das Jahr 1845* (Berlin: Deckerschen Geh. Ober-Hofbuchdruckerei, 1845). Estimates of the administrative bureaucracy are more difficult; the estimate used here is that given for 1830 by Wilhelm BLEEK, *Von der Kameralausbildung zum Juristenprivileg. Studium, Prüfung und Ausbildung der höheren Beamten des allgemeinen Verwaltungsdienstes in Deutschland im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1972), pp. 139-41.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 139-49; KOCH, *Universitäten*, I: 2-3; and DAS STATISTISCHE BUREAU ZU BERLIN, *Tabellen und amtliche Nachrichten über den preussischen Staat für das Jahr 1849*, 6 vols.

31,780 members of the Prussian *Bildungsbürgertum* in 1840, 0.4 percent of Prussia's total male population and 1.6 percent of the urban male population. Prussia was in 1840 still predominantly agrarian and semi-feudal in its social structure; the figures emphasize how very tiny its professional and administrative class still was.

In some respects this third definition is too narrow. It excludes from the *Bildungsbürgertum* proper men who studied at universities but who did not enter traditional professions: private scholars, journalists, and some noblemen who after their studies turned to the army, to *Landrat* positions, or to administration of their estates. It excludes the university-trained who moved on to *declassé* positions in the lower schools, the subaltern bureaucracy, or the core of surgeons. It excludes elements which were part of the larger educated élite and which, though not educated in universities, undoubtedly shared the ethos of the university-educated: Prussia's higher surgeons and apothecaries (who were in fact trained in universities, though not normally as matriculated students), some army officers, engineers, and officials of the technical bureaucracy, and middle-level functionaries. The educated élite defined by the second definition above would seem to have been roughly four to five times larger than this *Bildungsbürgertum* as identified with the practitioners of the traditional professions.<sup>7</sup>

But the strict definition used here has advantages. It includes most if not all university graduates, all the most powerful and influential elements of Prussia's educated élite, and all the elements which determined the ethos of that élite as a whole. What chiefly distinguished the *Bildungsbürgertum* was its status as a professional class, as the collectivity of learned professions and the expertise that went with them. The strict definition used here neglects general educational attainment *per se* to stress this functional and professional aspect of the *Bildungsbürgertum*.

## II

The *Bildungsbürgertum* of the *Vormärz* period represented the functional counterpart of a social entity to be found much earlier in Prussian history. Early eighteenth-century legal and social theory envisioned society as an amalgam of traditional estates or *Stände*. It denoted the class of university-trained professionals as the *Gelehrtenstand*, the *Gelehrtentum*, or (later) the *Gebildete*. Its largest components, jurists, lawyers, and clerics, were probably proportionately more numerous in 1740 than in 1840. The number of medical doctors was proportionately smaller, as was that of teachers in the higher schools, for this career had not yet se-

(Berlin: A. W. Hayn, 1851-55), IV: 565-67. Koch's figures on university enrolments are for the summer semester of 1837 and include only *Inländer*, i.e. native Prussians. The estimate of the number of *Assessoren* and *Referendare* in the administrative service is largely a guess.

<sup>7</sup> Wilhelm DIETERICI, *Geschichtliche und statistische Nachrichten über die Universitäten im preussischen Staat* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1836), pp. 130-37 and L. WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen in Preussen. Historisch-statistische Darstellung* (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1864), pp. 512-15.

parated from theology as an independent profession.<sup>8</sup> By 1740 university study was a prerequisite for membership in this learned estate, a rudimentary system of state examinations already existed, and the group possessed legal status, social privileges, and considerable self-consciousness as a recognized class in society. In these respects it resembled the *Bildungsbürgertum* of a hundred years later; in practice, however, the basis of professional life was very different.

Professional life in the early eighteenth century was profoundly corporative. The collegiate organizations, the distinctive costumes, the network of sumptuary, legal, and municipal privileges that characterized every professional group constituted as much the essence as the trappings of the professional dignity. They surrounded the local practitioner with an aura of honorific distinction, before which considerations of function or social utility paled, which served to set him and his family off against lesser urban elements, from which he normally held himself aloof. Although jurists, professors, doctors, and the better clergymen all enjoyed their distinctive sets of local privileges, they shared as well the common distinction of membership in the learned estate or *Gelehrtenstand*.<sup>9</sup> This honorific distinction accrued to them not because of any similar element perceived in the professional services they rendered, or even because of their educational attainment *per se*. It accrued to them rather as social acknowledgement of their exclusive possession of the common intellectual culture upon which all professional learning was based.

This intellectual underlay of early professional life was still the culture of late humanism with its dual idea of *pietas et eloquentia*. Possession of it presupposed oral facility, elegant latinity, moral seriousness, immersion in the writings of the Latin authors, the Fathers, and the Scriptures, and — most important — a living sense of the pride and social exclusiveness that followed from membership in the *res publica literaria*. These intellectual values and abilities (largely stylistic in nature) were instilled in the Latin schools of the larger towns, where the sons of professional men bound for the university were set apart by their exclusive right to the scholar's gown.<sup>10</sup> The universities further inculcated this culture through their emphasis upon the disputation, oral testing, the mass lecture, and the transmission of relatively closed bodies of Latin lore. Indeed, the very ideal of academic learning to which the universities adhered reflected the intellectual values of the learned es-

<sup>8</sup> On the concept of *Stand* see Jacob and Wilhelm GRIMM, eds., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 10 vols., (Leipzig: S. Hirzel Verlag, 1960), X, sec. 2, bk. 1, pp. 683-727. On the number of attorneys see Adolf WEISSLER, *Die Umbildung der Anwaltschaft unter Friedrich dem Grossen* (Königshütte: Franz Ploch, 1891), pp. 15-16; on the clergy, Georges PARISET, *L'État et les Églises en Prusse sous Frédéric-Guillaume Ier (1713-1740)* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1897), p. 556. In 1740 Prussia had one ordained Protestant clergyman for every 681 Protestant inhabitants; in 1843, one for every 1,615. PARISET, *État et Églises*, p. 556; DIETERICI, *Tabellen... 1843*, pp. 110-12.

<sup>9</sup> Walter Horace BRUFORD, *Culture and Society in Classical Weimar, 1775-1806* (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1962), pp. 56-68; H. VOELCKER, ed., *Die Stadt Goethes. Frankfurt am Main im XVIII Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Blazek und Bergmann, 1932), pp. 89-104, 146-64.

<sup>10</sup> Erich TRUNZ, "Der deutsche Späthumanismus um 1600 als Standeskultur", *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts*, 21 (1931): 17-53; Fritz BLATTNER, "Die Wandlung von der altprotestantischen Gelehrten Schule zum humanistischen Gymnasium", in *Das Gymnasium in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Hermann ROHRS (Frankfurt am Main: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1969), pp. 1-13, esp. pp. 1-9; and Wilhelm ROESSLER, *Die Entstehung des modernen Erziehungswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1961), esp. pp. 95-142. And see Thomas NIPPERDEY's review of Roessler's book, in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 216 (1964): 249-72.

tate. Inevitably described as *Gelehrsamkeit*, the ideal itself connoted stylistic attainment, fitness for the style of life associated with a scholar. *Gelehrsamkeit* expressed a quantitative learned ideal that stressed thoroughness, system, love of historical detail, and that espoused a universal erudition hostile to specialization.<sup>11</sup> A common commitment to these intellectual values and their social expressions gave to the so-called *Gelehrtentum* a cultural unity that transcended its differentiation by profession and legitimized its claim to be an honorific estate in society.

The upper faculties of the universities carried out the integration of professional learning with traditional humanistic culture. Men regarded the faculty sciences of theology, law, and medicine not so much as prerequisites to careers in a profession, but rather as studies constituting the organizational bases and intellectual foundations of *all* learning. The so-called *Fakultätswissenschaften* represented not bodies of expertise *per se*, but rather a polyhistoric corpus of learning whose three main divisions were thought to embrace all possible human knowledge, and to which all other disciplines served as mere auxiliaries. Thus one studied history as the basis of law and law as the culmination of history, philosophy and often philology as the prerequisite of theology, and much of the natural sciences within the intellectual fold of medicine. The education of a scholar, a *Gelehrter*, regardless of his career plans, culminated in the learning of a faculty science, and the higher faculties thus offered an education as much "liberal" and "cultural" as the lectures of the arts faculties.<sup>12</sup> The drastic decline of the arts faculties at the end of the seventeenth century had ushered in a long period in which nearly all students of the larger Protestant universities matriculated directly into the upper faculties.<sup>13</sup> This further blurred the distinction between general humanistic and professional study and confirmed the essential identity of the two.

This fact partly explains the monopoly of ostensibly professional learning over German intellectual life in the early eighteenth century. At the Leipzig book fair as late as 1740 technical treatises in law, medicine, and theology still made up forty-four percent of all titles.<sup>14</sup> Germany still lacked the leisured and learned middle classes and the enlightened nobility that elsewhere fed the ranks of virtuosi, amateurs, *philosophes*, and literati. Its intellectual life still remained closely tied to the schools and universities, the ideals they espoused, the positions in society to which they led, and the corpora of knowledge they taught. The old learned estate thus played a double social role as Germany's functioning class of trained professionals and as its sole intelligentsia.

Since the learned estate was fundamentally a class of scholars, it followed that learned expertise, not functional expertise, constituted the highest ideal of professional life. The status of an educated man lay in what he knew or what his bearing testified he was, not in what he could do. By these assumptions the ability

<sup>11</sup> On the notion of *Gelehrsamkeit* see R. Steven TURNER, "University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany 1760-1806", in *The University in Society*, ed.: LAWRENCE STONE, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), II: 515-28.

<sup>12</sup> ROESSLER, *Erziehungswesens*, pp. 101, 119-20.

<sup>13</sup> FRANZ EULENBURG, *Die Frequenz der deutschen Universitäten von ihrer Gründung bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), pp. 189-212.

<sup>14</sup> RUDOLF JENTZSCH, *Der deutsch-lateinische Büchermarkt nach den leipziger Ostermessen-Katalogen von 1740, 1770 und 1800 in seiner Gliederung und Wandlung* (Leipzig: R. Voigtlande Verlag, 1912), Tables I-III.

of a jurist to administer the law or a doctor to heal the sick followed unproblematically from erudite studies, or the method of delivering these services was felt to be known from tradition or corporative participation. This body of assumptions is difficult to illustrate explicitly, but it was subtly reflected in all the ways in which professional men were trained, tested, and rewarded. University education in a profession afforded little or no practical training, and the testing procedures employed by the Prussian state through much of the eighteenth century largely ignored functional expertise. Since the early eighteenth century did not regard function as the basis of professional dignity, equal functions did not command equal prestige. Judgeships in Prussia's lower, municipal courts were equated in rank to subaltern and *referendar* positions in the higher ones, even though the actual function of and educational requirements for such judgeships resembled those of judges in the higher courts.<sup>15</sup> Perhaps the most important distinction in early professional life was between service in the cities and less prestigious positions in the towns and country. Prussia maintained separate procedures for testing, appointing, and supervising doctors, surgeons, and clergymen depending upon whether they served in cities or small towns, even though the function and educational requirements of both classes of positions were largely the same.<sup>16</sup> Appointments by the Hohenzollerns and their agents consistently stressed the principle of merit; but merit, as Hans Rosenberg remarked, rarely meant functional expertise and never expertise alone.<sup>17</sup>

In the second half of the eighteenth century the intellectual culture which sustained the old learned estate underwent a cataclysmic dissolution before the forces of the Enlightenment. New systems of ideas revolted in succession against their old subordination to theology, law, and medicine. They asserted their own contradictory claims to be the principles of all learning, and in effect subsumed professional studies as special applications of their more universal principles. Manifestations of this revolt could be seen in the emergence at Göttingen of a school of historians indifferent to the requirements of judicial theory; in the historical approach to the study of scripture; in Kant's spirited defence of the lower faculty as the sole true domain of pure learning; in F. A. Wolf's efforts to divorce the education of philologists and teachers from that of theologians; in Fichte's attacks upon the professional faculties as the refuge of philistinism and vulgar utilitarianism; in the new faith in pedagogy as a form of expertise in its own right; in the attempts of the so-called *Naturphilosophen* to ground all philosophy on the study of the natural sciences; and in Schelling's programme to reconstitute all professional study on a scientific basis. This revolt against the upper faculties can be said to have been consolidated institutionally in the Prussian university reforms and their aftermath. The Humboldtian theory of the university was an uneasy amalgam of concepts from idealist philosophy and neohumanism, and it largely ignored the professional functions of the upper fac-

<sup>15</sup> August Heinrich SIMON, *Geschichtliches über die königlich preussische Immediat-Justiz-Examinations-Kommission* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1855), pp. 57-58 and *passim*; Erich DÖHRING, *Geschichte der deutschen Rechtspflege seit 1500* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1853), pp. 127-34.

<sup>16</sup> *Novum Corpus Constitutionum Prussico-Brandenburgensium praecipue Marchicarum* (hereafter *NCC*), 12 vols. (Berlin, 1750-1810), 5, pt. 5 (1774): 297-300; 5, pt. 1 (1771): 77-82; Ludwig VON RÖNNE and Heinrich SIMON, eds., *Das Medicinal-Wesen des preussischen Staates...*, 2 vols. (Breslau: Georg Aderholz, 1844), I: 344-47, 414-15.

<sup>17</sup> Hans ROSENBERG, *Bureaucracy, Aristocracy, and Autocracy. The Prussian Experience 1660-1815* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 76-81; DÖHRING, *Rechtspflege*, pp. 59-63

ulties or treated them with suspicion. After 1810 the philosophical faculties waxed in importance, imposed their methods and rhetoric upon the upper faculties, and by the late 1830s had emerged as the largest in the universities. These late institutional developments merely consolidated the eighteenth-century revolution in ideas which had deposed the three bodies of professional learning from their position as the inevitable organizing principles of all knowledge.

A second front against the intellectual world of the old *Gelehrtentum* brought the creation of a new, popular intellectual culture largely indifferent to old humanist values and to the faculty sciences. The new culture manifested itself in many ways: in the burgeoning output of vernacular works of fiction, travel accounts, and popular edification; in the explosion in the number of newspapers, literary journals, and semi-popular magazines for history and economics; in enthusiasm for pedagogical experimentation; in the springing up of reading clubs and other societies for a host of social and semi-political purposes; and of course in the creation of a new and vigorous national literature and the rise of a semi-independent literati. At the core of the new reading public were professional men and functionaries, but their interests were secular, aesthetic, literary, practical, and moralistic; they were largely unconcerned with theology, erudite learning, or latinate scholarship *per se*. Indeed, one principal theme of the late *Aufklärung* was a mocking hostility toward traditional intellectual culture. Between 1750 and 1780 the very word *Gelehrsamkeit* was degraded to a term of satiric abuse. The learned ideal it had denoted gave way to new ideals: rational common sense, emotional and aesthetic sensitivity, and the most potent ideal of all, that of intellectual and aesthetic cultivation or *Bildung*. Together these developments forged a wholly new intelligentsia in Germany, an intelligentsia different in outlook from the old learned estate and organized around intellectual concerns in which the faculty sciences played marginal roles.

The most immediate social response to this shifting intellectual world is reflected in Table 1, which shows the number of students studying in the universities of the Prussian territories over a seventy-year period of the eighteenth century and their proportion of the total population.<sup>18</sup> It reveals that relative student numbers declined drastically after 1750 and were still declining at the end of the eighteenth century. In part this decline was caused by Prussia's annexations in the west of largely rural regions that inflated its population but not its student numbers; yet the same decline, though slightly less marked, is also observed when only the universities and territories that were Prussian in 1748 are used as a constant base. If the ratio of students to population can be accepted as a crude measure of the size of the professional, university-educated segment of Prussian society, then that group very probably declined even in absolute numbers between 1750 and 1795, even as the pop-

<sup>18</sup> The enrolment statistics used in Table 1 are those calculated from matriculation figures by Franz EULENBURG in his *Frequenz*, pp. 164-65. The Prussian universities of 1736-40 were Frankfurt an der Oder, Königsberg, Duisburg, and Halle; the Breslau Leopoldina became Prussian with the annexation of Silesia in 1742; Erlangen was Prussian from 1791 to 1806 and Erfurt from 1797 to 1806. The percentage of non-Prussians in the universities is not known for this period but was probably lower than in the *Vormärz* era (see Table 2). Population statistics are from Otto BEHRE, *Geschichte der Statistik in Brandenburg-Preussen bis zur Gründung des königlichen statistischen Bureaus* (Berlin: Carl Heymann, 1806), pp. 462, 299, and *passim*. All population statistics should be treated as approximate at best, especially those around the war years 1740-48 and 1756-63 and the years of the later French occupation of the western territories.

Table 1. PER CAPITA UNIVERSITY ENROLMENTS IN PRUSSIA, 1740-1805<sup>18</sup>

Years	Average enrolment per year, all universities (calculated)	Total population of Prussia (in millions)	Prussians per student	Approximate population in territories of 1748 (in millions)	Average enrolment per year (5 univs.) of 1748	Prussians per student (area of 1748)
1736-40	1,627 (4 univs.)	2.33 (1740)	1,431	—	—	—
1741-45	1,954 (5 univs.)	3.42 (1743)	1,751	3.42	1,954	1,751
1746-50	1,778	3.48 (1748)	1,957	3.48	1,778	1,957
1751-55	1,793	3.74 (1753)	2,086	3.74	1,793	2,086
1756-60	1,454	—	—	—	1,454	—
1761-65	1,574	3.62 (1764)	2,297	3.62	1,574	2,297
1766-70	1,211	4.00 (1768)	3,306	4.00	1,211	3,306
1771-75	1,400	4.24 (1773)	3,027	4.18	1,400	2,984
1776-80	1,773	4.88 (1778)	2,752	4.34	1,773	2,449
1781-85	1,916	5.13 (1783)	2,679	4.54	1,916	2,372
1786-90	1,712	5.62 (1788)	3,282	4.98	1,712	2,910
1791-95	1,685 (6 univs.)	5.84 (1793)	3,468	5.10	1,485	3,435
1796-1800	2,068 (7 univs.)	6.16 (1798)	2,977	5.34	1,776	3,007
1801-05	1,694 (7 univs.)	6.46 (1803)	3,811	5.57	1,458	3,823

ulation on a roughly constant territorial base increased by almost half. Table 2 suggests that by this measure the first half of the nineteenth century was a clear extension of this post-1750 pattern.<sup>19</sup> Except during the enrolment boom of the 1820s, which produced a glut of jurists and clerics by 1830, per capita student numbers were only slightly higher than in the later eighteenth century and remained at this level at least until 1870. Even the peak of the enrolment boom around 1830 did not reach the per capita levels that had been normal between 1710 and 1750.

Table 2. PER CAPITA UNIVERSITY ENROLMENTS IN PRUSSIA, 1820-1849<sup>19</sup>

Years	Total university enrolment per year (average)	% of non-Prussian students	Population of Prussia (in millions)	Number of Prussian students	Prussians per native student
1820-22	3,564	21	11.66 (1822)	2,818	4,139
1829-31	5,008	4	13.04 (1831)	4,837	2,695
1838-40	4,431	18	14.93 (1840)	3,640	4,101
1849	4,306	13	16.08 (1849)	3,737	4,218

This long decline after 1750 signified a decisive shift in the social function of university study. As the professional disciplines found themselves increasingly deprived of their former status as the capstones of old humanistic learning, increasing-

<sup>19</sup> Statistics of Table 2 are from DIETERICI, *Tabellen... 1843*, pp. 22, 124, and DAS STATISTISCHE BUREAU, *Tabellen... 1849*, II: 575.



ly they took on the guise they possess today: that of functional specialties, bodies of expertise leading almost exclusively to careers as practitioners.<sup>20</sup> University study thus became tied ever more closely to the notion of professional preparation. Groups which had studied for purely cultural reasons or had attended casually vanished increasingly from the universities as enrolments became more and more a function of career opportunities. Since these increased very little in Prussia before 1806, university enrolments, except for brief periods of boom and bust, either remained stable or fell.

Through these mechanisms the intellectual currents of the *Aufklärung* challenged the viability of the traditional learned estate. The numerical contraction of the estate relative to the population enhanced its prestige and perhaps its awareness of its élite position, yet at the same time the much-lamented fragmentation of the traditional world of estates seemed to undermine the social basis of that élite status.<sup>21</sup> Old humanistic intellectual standards grew increasingly archaic, and this threatened what had preserved the sense of cultural and social unity transcending differentiation by function. It confused the criteria of professional acceptance and the conditions of academic mobility, and it blurred the clear delineation of the professions and their privileges, both from one another and from rival functional groups below.<sup>22</sup> Prestige, previously a by-product of stylistic attainment and corporate privilege, accrued more and more to its possessors on the basis of their function and their claim to functional expertise. By the end of the eighteenth century all the professional groups that had constituted the old learned estate or *Gelehrtentum* had begun, often reluctantly, to make painful readjustments intended to preserve their traditional status and cope with these challenges. Through these adjustments the old *Gelehrtentum* was transformed into the *Bildungsbürgertum* of the nineteenth century.

### III

This transformation of professional values manifested itself most vividly in the evolution of the state examination system. The Hohenzollern monarchy had always used its licensing privilege in its programme to secularize and control the professions, but by the later eighteenth century the state had begun to employ its testing powers in a thorough reshaping of professional groups. In this process "the state" invariably meant small groups within an individual profession that possessed special bureaucratic authority or influence. These groups were able to mobilize the

<sup>20</sup> See for example ANON. [Gedike?], "Ueber Berlin. Von einem Fremden. 22.-25. Briefe", *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, 4 (1784): 337-51, 447-70, esp. 461-70.

<sup>21</sup> On the fragmentation of the *ständischer* world see Reinhard KOSELLECK, *Preussen zwischen Reform and Revolution. Allgemeines Landrecht, Verwaltung und soziale Bewegung von 1791 bis 1848* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1967), pp. 52-78, esp. 70-78; Thomas NIPPERDEY, "Verein als soziale Struktur in Deutschland im späten 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert", in *Geschichtswissenschaft und Vereinwesen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), pp. 7-15. Contemporary references include Johann Christoph ADELUNG, "Vorrede", in *Fortsetzung und Ergänzung zu Christian Gottlieb Jöchers allgemeinem Gelehrten-Lexico...*, ed.: J. C. ADELUNG (Leipzig, 1784), 1:1-5, and ANON., "Etwas für und über die Gelehrten. An die Herausgeber", *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, 2 (1783): 365.

<sup>22</sup> Henri BRUNSCHWIG sets out his own rather different theory of a "crisis of the middle class" in his provocative book, *Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia*, trans. Frank Jellinek (Paris, 1947; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), esp. pp. 119-46.

testing authority to impose their own standards upon an often reluctant rank-and-file. The examination system proved a fine instrument for extending Hohenzollern authority and simultaneously protecting the ultimate interests of the traditional professions. After the blurring of the stylistic and social criteria that had previously determined membership in the learned estate, the examinations yielded more objective criteria for licensing professional men and so maintained the social and functional boundaries that protected the traditional professions. The examination system and the educational prerequisites associated with it quickly became tools in the struggle between professional groups and between professions and their semi-learned competitors for status and privileges. The history of the examination system shows examples of how the system performed all these functions.

By the early eighteenth century the Hohenzollern monarchy had established its right to test all professionals. Doctors faced an examination before the Medical Collegium in Berlin after 1725. The Evangelical clergy by 1740 normally took three or four examinations, the two most important being the so-called *Tentamina pro licentia concionandi*, held before the local consistory upon leaving the university, and the *Examina pro Ministerio*, held before the consistory or its representatives after the clergyman had received a call to a particular church. Numerous early testing edicts for individual courts and judicial posts prepared the way for a general edict of 1737 that demanded a three-day examination in Berlin before the entire High Court of Appeal for all candidates to any councillorship or judgeship in the higher courts of Prussia. Admittance to any of these examinations required a certificate of attendance at a Prussian university, normally for a minimum of two years.<sup>23</sup>

This older examination system differed considerably from that which had begun to evolve by the end of the eighteenth century. Examinations were still modelled on academic ones, and usually they tested not so much functional competence as learnedness and rhetorical style. Testing fees were high and usually tests assumed a ceremonial, public aspect in which they functioned as a kind of public investiture for the candidate. The state medical examination in Berlin, for example, consisted of an oral, Latin examination on medical theory, a description of a case of illness observed (but not treated) by the candidate, and six public anatomy lectures delivered by the new doctor in the anatomical theatre. The entire Medical Collegium then approved or rejected the candidate.<sup>24</sup> Examinations like this aimed at testing general erudition, not functional competence. The most important exams, like the *Examina pro Ministerio* and the major judicial exam of 1737, were administered only after the candidate had been nominated publicly to his position; often the *Examina pro Ministerio* took place in the church before the candidate's future congregation and the patron who had already selected him. Such public exposure might deter the incompetent and inspire the weak to vigorous preparation, but the

<sup>23</sup> VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 15-26, 344-47; PARISSET, *État et Églises*, pp. 271-76; Paul DREWS, *Der evangelische Geistliche in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Jena: Diederichs, 1905), pp. 119-21, 135-37; SIMON, *Justiz-Examinations-Kommission*, pp. 1-10; BLEEK, *Kameralausbildung*, pp. 61-83; *NCC*, 2 (1759): 391-92; 4 (1767): 867-70.

<sup>24</sup> Theodore PUSCHMANN, *Geschichte des medicinischen Unterrichts* (Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1889), pp. 471-75; F. L. AUGUSTIN, *Die königlich preussische Medicinalverfassung...*, 6 vols. (Potsdam: Karl Horvath, 1818-38), I: 252-56; II: 592-96.

possibility of actually failing a candidate in such a ceremonial and public setting was very low and seems rarely to have been resorted to.<sup>25</sup>

Invariably the modernization of the examination system for each profession took the same form. First, the examining body became a small, permanently constituted commission and was no longer the entire chamber or consistory or court meeting *in pleno*. Examinations became more confidential and critical, increasingly subjugated to the demands of expertise, and more easily controlled by the central bureaucracy. Second, the true examination was administered *before* the candidate had begun to seek a post, usually immediately upon his leaving the university. Testing became a matter of licensing a candidate to seek a post, not officially sanctioning his claim upon one. A third development especially important for the bureaucracy was the emergence of a graduated career pattern, each career level attained only after successful completion of a different examination. A fourth development was the manner in which admission to the examination became ever more strictly governed by academic attainment, not only in the universities, but earlier in the gymnasiums. All the traditional professions reflected this basic pattern.

The Evangelical clergy manifested especially clearly the sequence through which examination systems were modernized. Under Frederick II and later, the state brought the clergy under increasingly rigorous state control, until clergymen, especially those in the country, were reduced to the status of docile welfare agents.<sup>26</sup> To raise the quality of the clergy and to enhance its own control over recruitment, the state tried consistently to reduce the importance of the larger exam, the *Examina pro Ministerio*, and enhance that of the *Tentamina pro licentia*. Edicts of 1761, 1767, 1774, and later set fines of five thaler for any clergyman who allowed a candidate lacking the official licence (awarded upon completion of the *Tentamina*) to preach, and a fine of twenty thaler for any candidate who failed to report to the High Consistory for testing within one year of leaving the university. The state also attempted to make the *Examina pro Ministerio* less a formality. A parallel series of edicts forbade patrons to extend the formal summons to a vacant church living before the candidate had been officially presented to the provincial consistory for the *Examina*. In 1765 the requirements were extended to include a sermon *and* a written thesis on assigned theological topics; the examination and ordination by this date always took place before the consistory and not in the local church.<sup>27</sup>

Briefly under the Wollner regime a central Supreme Religious Examinations Commission was set up to test the orthodoxy of candidates; after its abolition authority for testing reverted to the provincial consistories where it remained. Mas-sow's definitive testing edict of 1799 carefully preserved the ceremonial aspects of

<sup>25</sup> Hermann WERDERMANN, *Der evangelische Pfarrer in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Quelle und Mayer, 1925), p. 27; Henrich Philipp Conrad HENKE, "Ueber die Nothwendigkeit der moralischen Verbesserung des Predigerstandes", *Eusebia*, ed. Henke, 1 (Helmstädt, 1797): 36-42, 89, 106-07.

<sup>26</sup> DREWS, *Geistliche*, pp. 126-30; WERDERMANN, *Pfarrer*, pp. 56, 70; Robert M. BIGLER, *The Politics of German Protestantism. The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815-1848* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 1-35; NCC, 2 (1759): 397-98; 3 (1760): 1325-66; 3 (1760): 1331-32; 3 (1764): 507-20.

<sup>27</sup> NCC, 3 (1761): 1333-34; 3 (1763): 345-46; 3 (1765): 599-600; 4 (1767): 795-96; 5 (1772), pt. 5, pp. 489-90; 6 (1774): 3215-18.

<sup>28</sup> NCC, 10 (1799): 2203-34.

testing and combined them with more rigorous procedures.<sup>28</sup> Both the *Tentamina* and *Examina* became actually two examinations: a private oral and written examination before a small commission determined by the consistory, and, if this were successful, a public examination and specimen sermons before the full body. These testing procedures remained in effect through the *Vormärz* period and well after church union, except that special testing commissions were later attached to the provincial consistories to take over the work of testing.

The Massow regulations of 1799 also placed a new stress on functional as well as learned competence. Interwoven with the dominant Prussian tradition of theological rationalism was the view of the clergyman as teacher or *Volkslehrer*, and often as little else. The Enlightenment engendered enthusiasm for pastoral theology and hostility toward erudite theological studies as useless for the practical clergyman; this theme runs through much of late eighteenth-century literature on the clerical career.<sup>29</sup> The 1799 regulations seized upon the theme: consistories were instructed at length on how to test the candidate's ability to pitch his sermons to the intellectual level of his congregation, to catechize a school class, and to conduct the administrative business of a vicarage. After 1810 chairs in pastoral theology were founded at universities in Prussia and elsewhere, and pastoral theology became the guise under which the new emphasis on functional expertise made its appearance in the clerical career.<sup>30</sup>

In contrast with their rigour in other German states, Prussia's theological examinations seem never to have posed a major hurdle to most would-be clergymen.<sup>31</sup> The Protestant clergy long remained the surest channel of upward mobility in the state, and the testing system never eliminated the chronic oversupply of licensed candidates for the available livings. The East Prussian judiciary (*Regierung*) rebuked the local consistory in 1766 for granting the licence to candidates ignorant of Greek and Hebrew, and many similar complaints came from the central bureaucracy between 1790 and 1805.<sup>32</sup> The regulations of 1799 made it possible to obtain a post with practically no Greek and only a reading knowledge of Latin, although such poorly educated clergymen were probably doomed to poverty-level livings. The linguistic upgrading of the Prussian clergy came not through the theological examinations but through the edict of 1833 that denied admission to the *Tentamina* to university students who still carried a mark of "unprepared" on their gymnasium leaving exam. This meant that the candidate must have demonstrated competence in Greek at the very rigorous level demanded by this examination. The new leaving examination or *Abitur* regulation of 1834 introduced a compulsory examination in

<sup>28</sup> For example HENKE, "Predigerstandes", *passim*; Johann Joachim SPALDING, *Ueber die Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamtes und deren Beförderung*, 3rd. ed. (Berlin: Voss, 1791); Hellmuth HEYDEN, *Kirchengeschichte von Pommern*, 2 vols. (Stettin: Fischer und Schmidt, 1938), II: 230-45. As late as 1845 the inclusion of *Pfarrer* in the *Lehrstand* was a common usage; see Henrich BERGHAUS, *Statistik des preussischen Staats; einer Darstellung seiner Grundmacht und Kultur...* (Berlin: Reimer, 1845), pp. 185-94.

<sup>30</sup> George H. ANDERSON, "Challenge and Change within German Protestant Theological Education during the Nineteenth Century", *Church History*, 39 (1970): 36-48.

<sup>31</sup> Compare Martin HASSELHORN in his fine study, *Der altwürttembergische Pfarrstand im 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1958), pp. 32-33.

<sup>32</sup> Hartwig NOTBOHM, *Das evangelische Kirchen- und Schulwesen in Ostpreussen während der Regierung Friedrich des Grossen* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1959), pp. 107-17; *NCC*, 10 (1797): 953-56; 9 (1795): 2611-14.

Hebrew for all students planning a career in theology. These strict measures combined with the glutted market for clergymen contributed to the sharp fall in enrolments of the theological faculties during the 1830s.<sup>33</sup>

For the medical profession the old testing edict of 1725 remained in effect long after its claim to scientific reputability had vanished. Admission to the state examination required the M.D. degree, and thus the faculty examinations presented the major hurdle to would-be doctors, but the notorious laxity of faculty examinations seems to have motivated new efforts to modernize the state examinations.<sup>34</sup> In 1789 and 1791 cabinet orders abolished the ceremonial Latin examination before the full High Medical Collegium and substituted a German examination before a select commission from that body.<sup>35</sup> The first major overhaul of medical testing, however, came in 1798.<sup>36</sup>

During the second half of the eighteenth century medical practice and medical education had been revolutionized by the introduction of routine clinical training; perhaps no innovation was so important in substituting a functional ideal for the traditional image of the academic doctor.<sup>37</sup> The new examination acknowledged this revolution by requiring all candidates to treat two cases of illness in the Charité hospital for one month under the eyes of examiners and to prove at least three months of formal clinical training. At the end of the treatment period a major oral examination was held on the cases and on all aspects of medical treatment. If the candidate passed, he received the licence or *Approbation* to practise. A standing Supreme Testing Commission consisting of five members was set up under the High Medical Collegium to administer the test. This commission was dominated by academics from various Berlin medical schools: seventeen of the first twenty-six members were or became professors in the medical faculty of Berlin University.

Prussian medical testing illustrates clearly how professional groups used testing edicts to protect their social interests and homogeneity. The most important problem that faced Prussian doctors in 1800 was their relationship to surgeons and surgery. The old distinction erudite medicine made between internal and external practice had long been recognized as impractical and scientifically meaningless. Many doctors studied surgery and a few practised it as well. Since 1750 surgery had increased in scientific respectability and had become a very lucrative, if demanding, craft. On these grounds many doctors and all medical reformers wished to unite medicine and surgery. Against this programme stood the traditional social barriers

<sup>33</sup> KOCH, *Universitäten*, II, pt. 1, pp. 363, 364-81; Johannes CONRAD, "Die Statistik der Universität Halle während der 200 Jahre ihres Bestehens", in *Festschriften der vier Fakultäten zum zweihundertjährigen Jubiläum der... Universität Halle-Wittenberg den 3. August 1894* (Halle, 1895), p. 19.

<sup>34</sup> VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 298-310. For a description of the examination before the faculty see AUGUSTIN, *Medicinalverfassung*, II: 585-90.

<sup>35</sup> VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 340-44; AUGUSTIN, *Medicinalverfassung*, II: 592-96.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 592-96; VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 344-45; PUSCHMANN, *Medicinisches Unterrichts*, p. 461.

<sup>37</sup> On the rise of clinical training see Hans-Heinz EULNER, *Die Entwicklung der medizinischen Spezialfächer an den Universitäten des deutschen Sprachgebietes* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1970).

and hostilities between the two groups and the historical and legal privileges of the surgeons to a monopoly, at least in theory, over their craft.<sup>38</sup>

The testing edict of 1798 recognized and helped to maintain the old medical-surgical dichotomy. For this reason doctors and state medical officials increasingly felt it to be inadequate and antiquated. In 1825 it gave way to a remarkable new edict, authored mainly by the professor, army surgeon, and state medical official Johann Rust.<sup>39</sup> This new edict abolished all past medical examinations and defined a series of new, separate examinations: anatomy, clinical practice, general medical theory, surgical-clinical practice, surgical operative techniques, obstetrics and gynaecology, ophthalmology, and forensic medicine. In its most radical step the edict abolished the old distinction between M.D.s and surgeons and created in its place three categories of medical personnel based on educational attainment and the number and sequence of the examinations passed.<sup>40</sup>

The lowest of these new categories, the Surgeons II (*Wundarzt zweiter Klasse*), corresponded to the old apprentice-trained barber-surgeons. These were now specified as para-medical personnel, permitted to practise the simplest surgery and routine treatment only under the surveillance of a higher doctor. The highest category, the *promovierter Arzt* or M.D., was now required to attend the university for four years rather than three, with the final year spent in clinical work. A related edict of 1825 instituted a new examination that medical students would take after two years of university study, the controversial *Tentamen philosophicum*. It was to ensure a broad grounding in the humanities and pure sciences before the student began his exclusive concentration on medicine and to secure the M.D.'s claim to *Bildung* and its prerequisites in the face of increased specialization of medical training. M.D.s were required to pass all the first four examinations listed above and thus were obligated for the first time to possess a knowledge of surgical theory if not of practice. The state also encouraged them to prepare for other examinations, especially that on surgical technique, which would permit them to become doctors of medicine and surgery.

The edict also created a new middle category of doctor, the Surgeon I (*Wundarzt erster Klasse*). These doctors had to possess an education equivalent to the third form of the gymnasium, or better, and three years of theoretical and practical study in medico-surgical institutes (*medizinisch-chirurgische Lehranstalten*) connected to the university medical faculties.<sup>41</sup> On the state examination they were

<sup>38</sup> CHURFÜRSTL. AKADEMIE NÜTZLICHER WISSENSCHAFTEN ZU ERFURT, *Gekrönte Preisschrift über die von der... Akademie... aufgegebene Frage: Ist es nothwendig und ist es möglich, beide Teile der Heilkunst, die Medicin und die Chirurgie..., wieder zu vereinigen? ... von Johann Heinrich Jugler...* (Erfurt: Beyer und Maring, 1799). The volume reprints the winning essay and closely summarizes fifteen others. For other discussions see the items listed in Karl SCHUBERT in his *Der Kampf um die Gleichberechtigung der Chirurgie und der inneren Medizin um die Wende des 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Diss. Medizinischen Akademie in Düsseldorf 1938 (Düsseldorf, 1938) and EULNER, *Specialfächer*, pp. 296-320.

<sup>39</sup> VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 50-59; CASPER, "Blick auf die Fortschritte der Kön. Preuss. Medicinal Verfassung bei ihrem hundertjährigen Jubiläum", *Journal der practischen Heilkunde*, ed. C.W. Hufeland and E. Osann, 66 (January 1828): 8-24. On Rust see E. GURLT, "Rust, Johann Nepomuk", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 56 vols. (Berlin, 1875-1912), XXX: 25-29.

<sup>40</sup> The 1825 edict is reprinted in KOCH, *Universitäten*, II, pt. 1, pp. 35-64 and medical edicts related to it, pp. 29-34, 68-70.

<sup>41</sup> VON RÖNNE and SIMON, *Medicinal-Wesen*, I: 320-35.

obligated to pass in modified form many of the same examinations as M.D.s. The state then licensed them to practise not only higher surgery but also internal medicine, provided they settled where there was no M.D. In the vicinity of the M.D.s, who were to be found in every city or large town, Surgeons I could legally practise only surgery.

The edict of 1825 clearly was intended to further both the interests of the M.D.s as a professional group and also the needs of the state. It relegated the lower surgeons to the status of paramedicals; of no social or economic threat to doctors, and it opened to the M.D. lucrative surgical practices. In the Surgeons I the state merely recognized the existence of a standing élite of educated surgeons. It intended through them to remedy the long-standing absence of qualified medical personnel in the villages and country. The right to practice internal medicine was supposed to induce Surgeons I to settle in the country, where no M.D. willingly would. They were expected to be "prepared to content themselves with the meager remuneration which as a rule is all that can be expected from villagers".<sup>42</sup> Also, this plan protected M.D.s from the social and economic competition of the new quasi-doctors.

The interests of bureaucratic absolutism normally harmonized well with those of the traditional professions. The former sought efficiency and the extension of its police powers; the latter sought to secure their status and social profile through increasingly formal criteria of performance and access, imposed inevitably by the state. This fact allowed the state testing system to become a powerful instrument of modernization within the professions. But this harmony between the interests of state and profession was not inevitable, and in the case of medicine it failed utterly. It became clear by 1835 that the Surgeons I preferred to practise surgery in the cities rather than medicine in the country. They contributed for this reason to a growing fear of overcrowding within the medical profession, as the number of doctors in all categories increased very rapidly in the later *Vormärz* period.<sup>43</sup> Around 1835 these professional anxieties exploded into a series of bitter attacks upon the medical bureaucracy and especially upon the Surgeons I. M.D.s mobilized the rhetoric of *Wissenschaft* and *Bildung* to denounce the education of Surgeons I as unscientific and their practice as incompetent.<sup>44</sup> Criticism of the medical bureaucracy grew increasingly virulent, until the compromise between state and professional interests represented by the 1825 edict had clearly broken down.

The medical bureaucracy reacted at once. To check the alleged oversupply of doctors it used its control of the testing commission to raise standards, so that in

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 295-98; quoted on p. 296.

<sup>43</sup> From the middle 1830s the number of doctors increased slightly faster than the population. DAS STATISTISCHE BUREAU, *Tabellen... 1849*, VI: 610-12. In rural provinces the number of Prussians per doctor could be as high as 6,000 or 7,000, HOFFMANN, "Uebersicht", pp. 214-15; see note 4. Doctors concentrated in cities, and there overcrowding may have been a real problem. Berlin in 1838 had one doctor for every 776 inhabitants; Breslau, one for 666, Cologne, one for 927, DIETERICI, *Tabellen... 1843*, pp. 100-03. There were ten Surgeons I for every thirty-nine M.D.s in 1843, ten for every fifty-seven in 1849.

<sup>44</sup> As samples of this literature see Phillip Friedrich VON WALTHER, *Ueber das Verhältnis der Medicin zur Chirurgie und die Duplicität im ärztlichen Stande...* (Carlsruhe und Freiburg: Herder, 1841); WASSERFUHR, *Gutachtliche Aeusserung über einige Gegenstände der preussischen Medicinal-verfassung* (Stettin: Nicolai, 1837); and Ernst BISCHOFF, *Ueber die Verhältnisse der Medizin zur Chirurgie* (Bonn, 1842).

1836-37, 82 of the 254 candidates for the state medical examination failed. Under heavy pressure from the doctors, the bureaucracy in 1837 banned the Surgeons I from settling in the cities for medical *or* surgical practice.<sup>45</sup> But by 1843 there was still one Surgeon I for every four M.D.s in Prussia, and the cry against them had scarcely abated. In 1846 the state surrendered. It began to close down the medico-surgical institutes, and a new edict of 1852 abolished the category of Surgeon I altogether.<sup>46</sup> This step had some scientific justification. Nevertheless the new edict marked a clear political and social victory for the M.D.s and was perhaps the last step in the consolidation of the *Bildungsbürgertum* as a professional class. During the *Vormärz* period the career of a Surgeon I was perhaps the only route into a traditional, learned profession that did not lead over the gymnasium *Abitur* examination and the university matriculation. Its elimination completed the monopoly of the *Bildungsbürgertum* over the traditional professions.

Medicine and the clergy remained exclusively bourgeois professions, but the careers that led into Prussia's administrative and judicial bureaucracies attracted nobles as well. For this reason and for their proximity to state power, bureaucratic and judicial careers far exceeded the other learned professions in prestige and offered to a handful of bourgeois jurists and administrators the rewards of wealth, ennoblement, and entrée into the inner circles of the state. As the bureaucracy was of direct concern to the state and relatively unprotected by traditional privileges, central authority succeeded in imposing a pattern of modernization upon its examination and recruitment system unusually early. The bureaucracy's development shows how the modernization of professions often served highly political ends in Prussia and was closely associated with the rise of "vertical recruitment" through a graduated career sequence.

During the first half of the eighteenth century, Prussia's judicial bureaucracy as centred in the old *Regierungen* and other higher courts was still a "feudal" bureaucracy.<sup>47</sup> It defended local, aristocratic interests and it resisted the centralizing control of the monarchy. Its members possessed minimal judicial qualifications; local, aristocratic patronage governed appointments; and its usually unsalaried members depended on fees, gifts, and conventional bribery for income. It fought constant battles over rank and jurisdiction with the newer administrative bureaucracy in the Chambers of War and Domains and in the General Directory, and, lacking the support of the king, it lost continually. By 1750 the judiciary had been widely discredited and was politically impotent. Thus the judicial reforms undertaken by Samuel von Cocceji at that time were also political reforms, in which professional reinvigoration was to be the way to political revival. Cocceji dismissed incompetent judges, abolished competing jurisdictions, put judges on a salary, speeded up legal actions, and staffed the Berlin Court of Appeal with young, mainly bour-

<sup>45</sup> Johann RUST, *Die Medicinal-Verfassung Preussens, wie sie war und wie sie ist* (Berlin: Enslin, 1838), esp. pp. 136-37, 151.

<sup>46</sup> PUSCHMANN, *Medicinisches Unterrichts*, p. 475.

<sup>47</sup> Peter LUNDGREEN, "Gegensatz und Verschmelzung von 'alter' und 'neuer' Bürokratie im Ancien Régime: Ein Vergleich von Frankreich und Preussen", in *Sozialgeschichte Heute. Festschrift für Hans Rosenberg...*, ed. Hans-Ulrich WEHLER (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), pp. 104-18; ROSENBERG, *Bureaucracy*, pp. 15, 52-60, and *passim*.



geois jurists who supported him and his reforms. One of these jurists, his successor Jariges, completed the reforms in the testing edict of 1755.<sup>48</sup>

The edict of 1755 reinforced previous edicts that required an examination of all candidates for posts of councillor, attorney, or auditor in any higher court. But where previously this examination had been administered by the Berlin Court of Appeal *in pleno*, the new edict created a standing, six-member Supreme Testing Commission for Justice, *Immediat-Justiz-Examinations-Kommission (IJEK)*, in Berlin to administer the so-called *Prüfung pro assessore*. The composition of the *IJEK* clearly reflected its political purposes. In accordance with the need to upgrade the theoretical and academic qualifications of the top judiciary, three of the eleven men who sat on the commission between 1755 and 1800 were university professors and *Dr. juris*. Eight of the eleven were Councillors (*Räte*) of the Berlin Court of Appeal, again reflecting the centralizing, pro-monarchical tendency of the reform; no member of any provincial court sat upon the *IJEK* in the eighteenth century. Five of these eleven served for more than twenty years, and Councillor Johann Könen of the Court of Appeal served fifty years, from 1755 to 1805. By 1800, 622 candidates had passed before this small group of men, thus concentrating in their hands enormous power to shape the judicial career in Prussia. The examination itself consisted of a seven-hour oral exam on legal theory, held in German; a written specimen on the conduct of a trial; and various written legal opinions on sample cases.<sup>49</sup>

A parallel series of edicts around 1750 regulated the lower ranks of the judiciary. Lower court officials were tested precisely as the higher, only these examinations were administered by the provincial judiciary bodies. Young men seeking posts as unsalaried apprentices (*Auskultatoren*) had to prove two years of law study in the universities and undergo an oral exam. The next promotion to *Referendar* (in which the still-unsalaried apprentice began to assist in the work of the court as a non-voting member) required a further exam and specimen, the *Probe-Relation*. Admission to the third, "great examination" before the *IJEK* in Berlin was granted only to *Referendare* who had spent several years in the middle rank, sometimes with experience as judges in lower courts, and who had the recommendation of their superiors. Having passed the third exam in Berlin — an ordeal universally feared by Prussian jurists — the candidate became an *Assessor*, the rank from which all Councillors (*Räte*) of the higher courts were drawn. The edict of 1755 thus completed the evolution of the three-examination sequence which made vertical recruitment through the *Referendar-Assessor* ranks the norm for the judicial career in Prussia.<sup>50</sup> Politically these reforms raised the efficiency and prestige of the judiciary and subordinated it to the central state. In the 1760s, with the support of Frederick II, the judiciary won two important jurisdictional battles with the administrative bureaucracy, thus announcing its political rebirth.

<sup>48</sup> Hubert C. JOHNSON, *Frederick the Great and His Officials* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), pp. 106-23 and *passim*; ROSENBERG, *Bureaucracy*, pp. 123-39; Albert LOTZ, *Geschichte des deutschen Beamtentums* (Berlin: Decker Verlag, 1909), pp. 156, 192-203.

<sup>49</sup> SIMON, *Justiz-Examinations-Kommission*, pp. 1-48, 85-94.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-12.

The administrative bureaucracy presented a rather different picture.<sup>51</sup> Both Frederick William I and Frederick II preferred practical men with administrative experience to university-trained jurists for such posts. As a result the administrative bureaucracy was always a hodge-podge of social types and backgrounds, more open to adventurers, favourites, and coattail-riders than the judiciary. A *referendar* system existed in the various Chambers of War and Domain, but it was never an important source of recruitment. Of 120 councillors in 1768-71, fewer than ten percent had been *Referendare*, and these mostly nobles who could afford the years without salary. The main sources of recruitment were promotion from subaltern posts (50 percent of the 90 commoners, 14 percent of the 30 nobles); positions in the quartermaster and Advocate General corps (21 percent of the commoners; no nobles); and the officer corps (21 percent of the nobles — these posts were, of course, closed to commoners).<sup>52</sup>

Several factors ultimately forced an examination system and an expansion of the *referendar* channel on the central bureaucracy. One was the example and competition of the judiciary. Another was the expansion of the *Régie*-bureaucracy as a powerful and dangerous rival. The serious, widespread breakdown of the fiscal bureaucracy during the Seven Years War had suggested that Berlin could neither control the provincial Chambers nor depend on their loyalty, and had won the service the dangerous enmity of Frederick. As a new source of control over recruitment and advancement, Chancellor Ludwig von Hagen introduced the High Testing Commission (*Oberexaminationskommission*) in 1770 and expanded the *referendar* system. Although this commission was modelled on the *IJEK*, it never functioned as efficiently or as rigorously as its counterpart in the judiciary. Its creation, however, marked the beginning of the professionalization of the civil service.<sup>53</sup>

A profession requires by definition a body of expertise upon which its status can rest and which its testing system can examine. Unfortunately the administrative and fiscal bureaucracy lacked a body of expertise comparable to legal theory, already monopolized by its judicial rival. What it had was the eighteenth century's would-be science of cameralism, a hodge-podge of studies based on statescraft, economics, and administration. The bureaucracy attempted repeatedly after 1770 to expand the teaching of cameralism in the universities and to make cameralism (largely centred in the philosophical faculties) the basis of study for careers in the administrative service. Naturally the judicial bureaucracy (which controlled the administration of churches, schools, and universities) joined the law faculties in resisting this inroad on the traditional status of legal study. Despite this opposition, cameralistic study (usually combined with law) became the norm for Prussian bureaucrats outside the judiciary between 1780 and 1815.<sup>54</sup> The commitment to cameralism implied acceptance of a totally functional specimen of professional expertise that lay largely outside the traditional boundaries of the upper faculties and their disciplines.

<sup>51</sup> Walter L. DORN, "The Prussian Bureaucracy in the Eighteenth Century", *Political Science Quarterly*, 46 (1931): 403-23; 47 (1932): 75-84, 259-73. Also see ROSENBERG, *Bureaucracy*, pp. 60-70, and BLEEK, *Kameralausbildung*, pp. 61-83.

<sup>52</sup> JOHNSON, *Officials*, pp. 289-91.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 210-23; BLEEK, *Kameralausbildung*, pp. 61-83.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 84-107.

This competition continued into the Prussian reform period. In those years the reformers, with their cameralistic ideals of efficiency and rationalization, came almost exclusively from the administrative and fiscal bureaucracy or its new technical branches. The conservatives came largely from the judiciary, with its concern for legalism and its traditional sympathy for aristocratic social elements on the land. Wilhelm Bleek, among others, has argued that reaction in Prussia was largely the victory of the latter group over the former. He notes that in 1815 the judiciary succeeded in imposing an obligatory period of apprenticeship in the judiciary service (*Justizauskulturator*) on all members of the civil service, thus establishing the monopoly of legal education over the entire bureaucracy. In the early *Vormärz* period judicially-trained officials successfully and quietly undermined the political influence of bureaucrats from the technical services. These measures, Bleek claims, consolidated the conservative tendencies of the *Vormärz* bureaucracy and accelerated the decline of cameralism in Prussian universities.<sup>55</sup>

Two professional developments in the bureaucratic service can be detected in other professions as well. One of these was that the professional group became increasingly set off from its subaltern aids and paraprofessional competitors. During the eighteenth century, in the absence of well-defined educational requirements, the higher administrative bureaucracy had recruited regularly from essentially subaltern positions, more readily in fact than from the official *referendar* channel. This continued to be the case well after the Hagen reforms; the posts of *Sekretar*, *Kanzlist*, *Kalkulator*, *Registrator*, etc. were felt to be of lower status but not essentially of different kind from that of councillor. The order of February 1817 officially set these posts off as "subaltern" with lower educational requirements. It eliminated in practice the possibility of advance to councillor positions through this channel.<sup>56</sup> A second development was the growing inflation of academic qualifications. After 1836 the *IJEK* was creating well over 240 new *Assessoren* per year. Ever higher standards and failure rates that soared to thirty and forty per cent by the late 1840s failed to check the influx. The higher courts, the traditional goal of this group, could never absorb more than fifty to seventy new jurists per year. As a result the *Assessoren* began to move into positions as judges and attorneys in the lower courts, positions that formally required only the *referendar* examination and had previously been below the dignity of *Assessoren*. There they drove out the less-qualified *Referendare*, forcing them into the subaltern ranks and deflating the professional value of that title. In turn the higher courts began to recruit from the ranks of *Assessoren* who had already served in the lower courts and no longer from *Assessoren* fresh from the third examination.<sup>57</sup> In this way the excess supply of candidates for top positions led to a demand for higher qualifications in all ranks and altered the entire structure of the profession.

These accounts testify to the importance of the examination system in the modernization of the professions and illustrate the uses to which the testing system was put. But they still fail to reflect the pervasiveness of testing as a social ideal. For

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 108-61; *Gesetz-Sammlung für die Königlichen Preussischen Staaten. 1817* (Berlin: Georg Decker, n.d.), pp. 248-52.

<sup>56</sup> Wilhelm NAUDÉ, "Zur Geschichte des preussischen Subalternbeamtentums", *Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*, 18 (1905): 365-86.

<sup>57</sup> SIMON, *Justiz-Examinations-Kommission*, pp. 94-97.

the Berlin educator Friedrich Gedike, testing was already by 1789 a body of expertise in its own right, already a waiting tool of social amelioration. Indeed it was more; a nation that allowed its testing procedures for state offices to degenerate to mere formalities risked decline to "a degree of barbarism, of ignorance and usually also of immorality, in which it can perhaps persists for centuries, until some chance shock should reanimate its weakened powers".<sup>58</sup> Similar sentiments persisted through the *Vormärz* period. Testing, an essential element in Wilhelm von Humboldt's administrative philosophy, was regarded as the bulwark of academic talent against ineducated mediocrity; and it was hailed as a "sacred duty" of the state.<sup>59</sup> In short, the ideal of state testing permeated the ethos of the *Bildungsbürgertum* just as the social reality of the testing systems came increasingly to prescribe access to professional careers.

#### IV

The testing ethos constituted only one element in what had become by the middle *Vormärz* period a comprehensive social theory, glorifying the role of the *Bildungsbürgertum* in Prussian society. The emergence of this new world view, like the rise of the testing system itself, constituted an elaborate adaptation to the crisis of the old learned estate, the *Gelehrtenstand*. The breakup of the old society of estates, coupled with the discrediting of its intellectual values, had posed many problems for the traditional intelligentsia, particularly how to justify the traditional social privileges it enjoyed as a recognized estate, how to codify its relationship to society as a whole, and how to preserve a sense of cultural unity and identity. Just as these problems became acute at the end of the eighteenth century, it became also increasingly evident that a solution was at hand.

Outside Prussia university-trained professionals often constituted strong municipal élites with close local ties that were often hostile to princely authority.<sup>60</sup> The thrust of Hohenzollern absolutism had always been to detach these groups from their municipal bonds and annex them to monarchal authority.<sup>61</sup> By the reign of Frederick William I the core of academically-trained professionals and bureaucrats stood under the direct jurisdiction of the central state: they were *staatsunmittelbar*, and enjoyed an impressive series of codified social and legal privileges. These included the so-called *eximirter* legal status, that is subjugation to the jurisdiction of state provincial courts alone and exemption from that of municipal or patrimonial courts, and personal exemption from military service plus conditional exemption for one's sons. Civil and criminal offences against those so privileged were punished more severely than similar transgressions against others, and slander or offences to their honour were considered dishonour to the state as well. Those possessing the

<sup>58</sup> Friedrich GEDIKE, *Einige Gedanken über die Methode zu examinieren* (Berlin: Unger, 1789), p. 15 and *passim*.

<sup>59</sup> Friedrich BENEKE, *Unsere Universitäten und was ihnen Noth thut. In Briefen an den Herrn Direktor Dr. Diesterweg...* (Berlin: Ernst Mittler, 1836), pp. 89-90; BLEEK, *Kameralausbildung*, pp. 25-44, esp. 39-43.

<sup>60</sup> Helen P. LIEBEL, "The Bourgeoisie in Southwestern Germany, 1500-1789: A Rising Class?", *International Review of Social History*, 10 (1965): 283-307.

<sup>61</sup> This discussion is heavily indebted to Reinhard KOSELLECK, *Preussen zwischen Reform und Revolution*, pp. 78-115.

status were exempted from taxes and were always free from onerous municipal obligations and levies, the latter a mark of considerable prestige in Prussian society. Noblemen might freely marry the daughters of this bourgeois élite, although the law forbade their marrying other commoners. Prussia's general legal code of 1791, the *Allgemeines Landrecht (ALR)*, codified all these privileges, but most had been in effect at least since the 1730s and had been extended and reasserted in repeated edicts throughout the century.<sup>62</sup>

Reinhart Koselleck's well-known discussion of the *ALR* has stressed the inconsistencies of its social theory. In principle and in organization the *ALR* clung to the traditional feudal conception of society as organized into the three leading estates of nobles, burghers, and peasants. In reality, claimed Koselleck, this traditional division had become little more than a façade by 1791, and the *ALR* recognized in fact a multiplicity of estates, defined more through profession, function, and legal status than through birth or tradition. The most important of these was the *Eximirte*, which included the nobility and, beside a very few categories of propertied burghers, the university-educated professionals and civil servants who corresponded to the old learned estate. The legal consolidation of this privileged class represented a long-standing, if tacit, policy of Hohenzollern absolutism: to create a new social and political élite, closely tied to the central government and its bureaucratic service, which included both nobles and elements from the burgher class. This new composite élite therefore cut across the traditional, feudal divisions of society which the Hohenzollerns knew to be incompatible with their dynastic interest. As proof of this policy's continuity, Koselleck notes that the privileges of this élite not only survived the Prussian reforms but were extended during them.<sup>63</sup>

Koselleck's discussion also makes clear that the new composite state élite embracing nobles, civil servants, and professional men was still in 1791 an "invisible" élite. It possessed legal status and practical importance but it had as yet received no theoretical recognition and was rarely invoked in descriptions or discussions of Prussian society. In the 1780s and 1790s, however, as the notion of a learned estate became increasingly archaic, the Prussian professional stratum increasingly saw its social identity in terms of its participation in this élite. It became more politically self-conscious, it identified more and more with the state bureaucracy, and it began to channel its ever-ambivalent attitude toward the nobility into notions of a higher "nobility of service and culture" that included commoners and aristocrats.<sup>64</sup> None of these themes had been wholly absent earlier, but they became especially marked in Prussian periodical literature of the late 1780s and 1790s.

<sup>62</sup> *NCC*, 1 (1752): 371; 8 (1788): 2175-84; 9 (1793): 1583-90; 9 (1791): 245-46; 9 (1792): 777-836; 10 (1800): 2825-26; and many other edicts in *NCC* concerning *eximirter* status. Also see JEISMANN, *Gymnasium*, pp. 359-60.

<sup>63</sup> KOSELLECK, *Preussen zwischen Reform und Revolution*, pp. 78-115; *Allgemeines Landrecht für die preussischen Staaten*, 4 vols., 3rd. ed. (Berlin: Pauli, 1796), Pt. 1, Title 1, Parag. 2, 6, and 7; Pt. 2, Title 8, Parag. 1, 2, and *passim*.

<sup>64</sup> See Johanna SCHULTZE, "Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Adel und Bürgertum in den deutschen Zeitschriften der letzten drei Jahrzehnte des 18. Jahrhunderts (1773-1806)", *Historische Studien*, no. 163 (1925); also Hans WEIL, *Die Entstehung des deutschen Bildungsprinzips* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1930), and BRUNDSCHWIG, *Enlightenment and Romanticism*, esp. chaps. 9, 11. Contemporary references include those cited by Schultze, and August Wilhelm REHBERG, "Sollen die alten Sprachen dem allgemeinen Unterricht der Jugend in den höhern Ständen zum Grunde gelegt, oder den eigentlichen Gelehrten allein überlassen werden?", *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, 11 (1788): 105-31, 253-

The conditions of the period also dictated the particular form in which the new self-consciousness of the professional stratum manifested itself. The later eighteenth century was, of course, a period of experimentation and passionate debate about education. The pedagogical disputes of the period also functioned as a kind of ersatz forum for debate of social ideas, an arena in which radical social impulses could be safely aired. The Prussian debate after 1785 over the burgher schools provides an example. Traditionally the Latin grammar schools in the cities had educated not only the sons of the professional classes, but also the sons of lesser civil servants, prosperous masters and merchants, and some lower social groups, though only the boys who intended to go to the universities — predominantly the sons of professional men — would remain much beyond age fourteen. In the 1780s numerous writers, among them some of the highest officials of the Prussian state, began to attack the status of the Latin schools as comprehensive schools on the grounds that they were detrimental to boys of the lesser burgher class. These boys found themselves forced to learn a useless Latin, and to endure the hazing and social snobbery of their university-bound fellows; all too often they were encouraged to abandon their place in life to study and seek a professional career. Reformers argued that the needs of such boys were better met by separate burgher schools, which stressed mathematics, modern languages, history, and practical crafts.<sup>65</sup> This progressive programme, however, implied one radical consequence. No longer city or comprehensive schools, the Latin schools would be left, in Minister von Zedlitz's words, as exclusive schools for "the nobleman, the future officer, the statesman, the scholar, preacher, and doctor" — in short, the new composite élite representing Prussia's administrative and professional element.<sup>66</sup> Popular pedagogical debates forced their participants to accept the existence of Prussia's composite élite, to accept it no longer as a mere legal entity but as a social reality entrenched in a unique school type.

By 1800 the burgher school debate had merged with the larger educational controversies of neohumanism and the social issues implicit in them. If the gymnasium was to be the school of a social élite, then what was the nature of that élite, its connection to the state, its right to moral authority, and its proper education? Could the gymnasium combine its élite and its comprehensive function? Was education to be dictated by a boy's future place in society or by more universalistic conceptions of human development?<sup>67</sup> Neohumanist pedagogy neither solved nor fully faced these problems. But the debates over them were crucial in shifting the self-image of the university-trained element toward that of a special intellectual élite in service to the state and away from that of a learned estate privileged through tradi-

74; ANON., "Ueber Berlin", pp. 469-71; and the often-cited passage from *Wilhelm Meister*, 2 vols., trans. Thomas Carlyle, Vols. 23 and 24 of *The Works of Thomas Carlyle in Thirty Volumes* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1899), I: 327-30. The glorification of *Bildung* served as the social strategy of a young, ambitious, yet socially disaffected element of the middle class to attain ersatz equality with the nobility.

<sup>65</sup> Manfred HEINEMANN, *Schule im Vorfeld der Verwaltung. Die Entwicklung der preussischen Unterrichtsverwaltung von 1771-1800* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), pp. 39-100; Detlef MÜLLER, *Sozialstruktur und Schulsystem. Aspekte zum Strukturwandel des Schulwesens im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 90-122; ANON., "Ueber Berlin", pp. 340, 447-53.

<sup>66</sup> ZEDLITZ, "Vorschläge zur Verbesserung des Schulwesens in den königlichen Ländern", *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, 10 (1787): 114.

<sup>67</sup> See Friedrich Immanuel NIETHAMMER, *Der Streit des Philanthropinismus und Humanismus in der Theorie des Erziehungs-Unterrichts unsrer Zeit* (Jena: Friedrich Frommann, 1808).

tion and style. The pedagogical debates became the medium through which the educated élite reached its first awareness of the new social and political role it could come to play under bureaucratic absolutism.

By 1830 these various elements had coalesced into a consistent social theory through which the *Bildungsbürgertum* defined, glorified, and defended its position in Prussian society. This theory could claim Fichte and Humboldt as its founders, and in some quarters its later elaboration owed much to the political thought of Hegel. Nevertheless, the idea possessed no canonical formulation and had no single chief spokesman. The theory in its purest form appears not in political or social tracts but in pedagogical writings and in the recurrent debates of the *Vormärz* period over gymnasium and university reform. Many features of German idealism and neohumanism contributed to this amalgam, but the notion of the "culture state" or *Kulturstaat* remained the central element.<sup>68</sup>

The various strands of German idealism shared the precept that the highest goal of the individual is the maximum development of individuality, freedom, and insight into the rational and necessary relationships of the world of intellect and spirit (*Geist*). Accordingly, the highest goal of civil society, conceived as an organic entity, was felt to be the maximization of these same moral and intellectual virtues. This maximization was felt to transcend the sum of its parts and become the expression of culture or *Kultur*, the highest condition of historical individuality, of moral and political consciousness, yet attained by a people. The agent of culture and its development is first the state, the highest purpose of which is, as the Berlin philosopher Friedrich Beneke wrote in 1836, "beyond dispute nothing other than spiritual action upon the world of spirit".<sup>69</sup> The second agent of culture is that "favoured class of individuals" who, as neohumanist Friedrich Niethammer wrote, "are called by fate to be the priests of reason, to preserve its holy fire on earth... and who are best called the Educated [*die Gebildeten*]"<sup>70</sup>

The theory of the culture state fused these two rather different concepts of the culture-bearer in that it identified the state with the body of state officials and extended the latter to include all university-educated professional men. "Those who are educated in the gymnasiums and universities", Beneke observed, "are the natural organs of government, and the gymnasiums and universities are essentially institutions of the state."<sup>71</sup> This body of thought brought the professional classes

<sup>68</sup> Discussions of the *Kulturstaat* idea with respect to its educational structure include RINGER, *Mandarins*, pp. 1-10; John VAN DE GRAAFF, "The Politics of German University Reform, 1810-1970" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1973), pp. 51-61; Helmut SCHELSKY, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 1963), pp. 139-49; and René KÖNIG, *Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität* (Berlin: Runde, 1935), pp. 107-24, 143-50, 167-79. Some of the formative primary tracts are Wilhelm VON HUMBOLDT, "Ueber die innere und äussere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin (Unvollendete Denkschrift, geschrieben 1810)", in *Die Idee der deutschen Universitäten*, ed. Ernst ANRICH, 2nd. ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), pp. 377-78; Friedrich Ernst Daniel SCHLEIERMACHER, "Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten im deutschen Sinn", in *Idee*, ed. ANRICH, pp. 223-32; and Johann Gottlieb FICHTE, "On Whom Will the Carrying out of this Scheme of Education Devolve?" in *Addresses to the German Nation*, trans. R. F. Jones and G. H. Turnbull, ed.: George Armstrong KELLY (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 160-74.

<sup>69</sup> BENEKE, *Unsere Universitäten*, pp. 89-90.

<sup>70</sup> NIETHAMMER, *Streit*, pp. 105-06.

<sup>71</sup> BENEKE, *Unsere Universitäten*, pp. 89-90.

within the pale of what Hans Rosenberg called the "bureaucratic mysticism" of the *Vormärz* era. Every state servant, argued Heinrich Leo, whether a minister of state or a village pastor, must carry within himself a vision of the national life and purpose, must not be merely a specialist or tool. He must become "an essential organ of the leading, supreme brain, an agent of that mysterious power of majesty itself, by which we designate that highest and most secret Essence, the spirit of the state, which so far transcends the corporal existence of individuals and groups".<sup>72</sup> Others who lacked the prerequisite of educational refinement, of *Bildung*, could never serve directly the highest moral and intellectual ends of society, only its subordinate materialistic means. In this subordinate function such men should, the theory implied, content themselves with political subordination as well.

This framework of assumptions generated the fervour that surrounded educational reform during the *Vormärz* period. Of all Prussian school types, the *Bildungsbürgertum* held, the gymnasium alone cultivated the inner spirit prerequisite to the state and its mystical ends, and to this cultivation its curriculum was especially suited. In the wake of the Prussian school reforms and the final victory of neohumanist pedagogy, the gymnasium stressed language, which exercised the reason and which represented the historical embodiment of human intellect. It stressed especially Greek, which exposed young Prussians to the moral example of that culture universally agreed upon by neohumanists to be the highest expression of the human spirit. The state could and must tolerate other, lesser school types, but the purity and rigour of the gymnasium must not be impugned, and at all cost the leading positions in the state service must be preserved for its graduates alone. Similarly idealistic spokesmen represented the universities as temples of learning, of *Wissenschaft*, the highest expression of culture. Their devotion to learning expressed itself in their ostensible subordination of practical, professional education to pure theory and thorough scientific training. It expressed itself in the rapidly increasing emphasis on the role of universities as research institutes. Men unprepared for the radical freedom of university life or for devotion to pure learning must be systematically excluded; disciplines unsuited for scientific treatment must be banned from universities and relegated to technical schools. Only in this way could the universities fulfill their high mission to train the servants of the state, for these by definition must be men of the intellect and the spirit, the bearers of culture, as dictated by the theory of the culture state.

Ideas like these just paraphrased appeared regularly in the *Vormärz* period in all pedagogical debates, in rectorate addresses, in gymnasium programmes and orations, and in the edicts of the Prussian Ministry of Education itself. They set out a body of social assumptions to which all educated men in Prussia were constantly exposed. The tendency of these assumptions was statist and bureaucratic, yet in their basic nebulousness they proved eminently compatible with liberalism and constitutionalism.<sup>73</sup> Within the wide range of political possibilities it left open, the theory of the culture state set out a social vision that was the exclusive property of the *Bildungsbürgertum*.

<sup>72</sup> Heinrich LEO, *Herr Dr. Diesterweg und die deutschen Universitäten. Eine Streitschrift* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1836), p. 106.

<sup>73</sup> Andrew LEES, *Revolution and Reflection. Intellectual Change in Germany during the 1850's* (Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), pp. 7-40; RINGER, *Mandarins, passim*; and see the remarks of Robert Michels quoted in VONDUNG, ed., *Bildungsbürgertum*, p. 31.



Obviously this ideology served the social ends of the *Bildungsbürgertum*, largely by buttressing the commonality of interests that the breakup of the old learned estate had threatened. It defined a common status as educated intellectual, as *Gebildete*, for jurists, clergymen, philologists, and all other university-trained groups, even though their incomes, modes of life, and the nature of their professional expertise differed very widely from one another. It assimilated all professional men into the politically ascendant central bureaucracy, even though some groups like doctors and some teachers held civil servant status only in a restricted sense. The theory integrated the professional classes with the service nobility of the day. It further codified the notion of a composite state élite transcending feudal distinctions of noble and commoner and based only upon cultural attainment and state service. And the theory protected the exclusiveness of the *Bildungsbürgertum* from below. The rigid prerequisites of classical education, university study, state examinations, and bureaucratic status set the *Bildungsbürgertum* clearly apart from the small element of prosperous masters, which could sometimes match the standard of living of lesser professionals, or from that of the commercial and entrepreneurial elements which could often surpass it. The theory of the culture state was in many respects a fairly recent product of idealist and neohumanist thought; the social interests it defended, however, were much older and largely continuous with those of the old learned estate of the eighteenth century.

## V

The extension of the state testing system and the rise of the ethos of education met on the common ground of school reform, and this programme, too, had its roots deep in the eighteenth century. A survey of 1774 revealed that Prussia possessed some sixty-nine true academic or grammar schools (*gelehrte Schulen*, Latin schools, *Pädagogien*, *Lyceen*, *Gymnasiums* — the name “gymnasium” was not applied by law to all such schools until 1812) employing 490 teachers, and the number seems to have changed little by the end of the century. But “grammar school” was not an official category with specific requirements, and the sixty-nine better schools blurred imperceptibly into the welter of city schools (perhaps 400 in Prussia) which still taught some Latin and which very occasionally sent a student on to the university, even though they might have had only one or two teachers and four or fewer school forms. All were comprehensive schools, enrolling virtually all elements of the urban population, though few of the lower social elements went on to attend the highest forms.<sup>74</sup> The teachers in the better urban schools had studied in the philosophical or theological faculties of the universities, and very occasionally had taken the degree of *Magister* or the *License*; some were theological candidates awaiting a church living.<sup>75</sup> The provincial judiciary bodies, the *Regierungen*, and the provincial consistories appointed the teachers if the school was one to which the state contributed funds, or the council of magistrates or the local patron did so if the school was a city or private foundation. The local clergy closely supervised both private

<sup>74</sup> BEHRE, *Geschichte der Statistik*, pp. 310, 297-311; JEISMANN, *Gymnasium*, pp. 45-66; MÜLLER, *Schulsystem*, pp. 41-55 and *passim*.

<sup>75</sup> See Paul SCHWARTZ, *Die Gelehrtenschulen Preussens unter dem Oberschulkollegium (1787-1806) und das Abiturientenexamen*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Wiedemann, 1910-12).

and royal schools, and religious instruction occupied well over a quarter of the curriculum.

At the end of the eighteenth century these traditional grammar schools came under increasingly heavy criticism of which the burgher school movement was but one symptom. An enrolment boom that struck the Prussian universities in the 1780s unleashed fears of social disruption caused by educational mobility. The spectres of excess professionals, an academic proletariat, falling educational standards, and a shortage of young men eligible for military service haunted the educational debates of the period. Conditions in the schools themselves were poor, reformers agreed; teachers were poorly trained, and the curriculum with its emphasis on traditional piety, memorization, and Latin stylistics was outmoded and detrimental to students. Governments and reformers experimented with alternate school types, and the more élite grammar schools began to revamp their traditional curriculum. For the old learned estate, whose cultural foundations lay in the grammar schools and were transmitted through them, this growing critique posed several challenges: how to reform the traditional curriculum without sacrificing the élite intellectual culture that guaranteed its unity and distinctiveness as an estate; how to enhance the status of the academic grammar schools and so withstand the challenges of other school types; how to codify patterns of educational licensing in an era in which the traditional, informal patterns of certification were breaking down. The solution to these problems, and others, lay through the state and its testing powers.

Prussian teachers and educators took the lead in reforming the traditional grammar school along lines that would preserve its traditional function as the domain of the professional stratum of Prussian society. By the end of the eighteenth century the Enlightenment's enthusiasm for education seemed to be engendering a new sense of self-consciousness and importance among Prussia's teachers. That pedagogical method constituted a body of expertise in its own right; that universal cultivation or *Bildung* was an educational goal above the traditional ones of piety and eloquence; that educational reform opened the way to the millennium of the Enlightened society — these articles of faith further fed the ambition of teachers and rectors to escape irksome theological supervision. By the 1780s this ferment of educational reform found political expression in Prussia in the activity of the Berlin pedagogues Friedrich Gedike and Ferdinand Meierotto and of their patron, the Prussian Minister Freiherr von Zedlitz. In 1787 Zedlitz created the Prussian Supreme School Commission (*Oberschulkollegium*), which was intended to secularize control of education in the state by placing pedagogical affairs in the hands of professional educators such as Gedike and his circle directly under minister and king. In 1788 this body imposed the first *Abitur* edict in Prussia's history.

The edict of 1788 decreed that all approved grammar schools must administer a leaving exam, the *Abitur* examination, to their students going on to university study, and that they must award the student a mark of "prepared" or "unprepared". Students who received a certificate of unpreparedness might attend the university nonetheless, but they were barred from stipendia or other financial aid.<sup>76</sup> Boys

<sup>76</sup> On the edict of 1788 see HEINEMANN, *Schule*, pp. 278-85 and JEISMANN, *Gymnasium* pp. 102-18. The best general account of the *Abitur*-system and its development in Prussia is WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 478-91. The edict was motivated partly by the state's wish to check what it believed to be excessive numbers of boys from the lower, *Handwerker* class entering the universities.

who came to the university untested for any reason could be tested there by the faculty.

Subsequently the state made the *Abitur* increasingly rigid and comprehensive. Wilhelm von Humboldt reformed the examination procedure in 1812. In order to create uniform standards, he spelled out in great detail the precise procedure and requirements of the exam and created new testing agencies, the *Wissenschaftliche Prüfungskommissionen*, to supervise it.<sup>77</sup> The Ministry of Education passed measures in 1825, 1832, and 1833 that closed the state examinations consecutively in law, medicine, and theology to students who had earned a mark of "unprepared" regardless of their subsequent university study. It formalized these measures in the new *Abitur* edict of 1834. This edict decreed that henceforth the examination would be given only in the gymnasium and no longer in the universities as well; students obtaining a mark of "unprepared" would be permitted to study only in the philosophical faculties and would be denied access to all state examinations. This measure merely formalized the gymnasium's *de facto* monopoly over access to professional careers in Prussia.<sup>78</sup>

The *Abitur* edicts proved to be powerful tools in the attempts of influential educators and the educational bureaucracy to change the gymnasium system. They proved especially effective in schools of private patronage, over which the state possessed no financial and only limited administrative control. The regulation of 1788 in effect defined a group of schools legally permitted to give the *Abitur* exam; these became by definition the group of higher schools in Prussia and their staff, the higher teaching corps. Prussia addressed its school reforms mainly to these institutions, raising their state subsidies, consolidating them with competing institutions, shuffling their teaching and administrative personnel, and raising teaching salaries and tuition. These measures proceeded very gradually over two decades, on a school-by-school basis in accordance with local needs and possibilities.<sup>79</sup> Between 1806 and 1812 representatives of neohumanism — Wolff, Schleiermacher, Humboldt, and Suvern — had come to dominate the educational bureaucracy, and they used the *Abitur* edict of 1812 to impose a neohumanistic curriculum upon all the official gymnasiums. That curriculum practically abandoned the study of religion, and in its place it instituted rigorous requirements in mathematics, history, and especially in Greek.<sup>80</sup>

As the chief vehicle of school reform the state worked to create a new class of professional teachers. In 1810 the Department of Education under Humboldt introduced a compulsory, statewide examination for teacher candidates. Humboldt and his circle saw in this measure a method of raising teaching standards and enhancing the state's control over the teaching corps that did not entail the political liabilities of curtailing the patron's right of appointment.<sup>81</sup> Henceforth all would-be teachers

<sup>77</sup> KOCH, *Universitäten*, II, pt. 1, pp. 345-60.

<sup>78</sup> WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, p. 448; KOCH, *Universitäten*, II, pt. 1, pp. 363-81; VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 2, pp. 275-93.

<sup>79</sup> JEISMANN, *Gymnasium*, pp. 372-76; and see WIESE's account of individual institutions, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 50-411.

<sup>80</sup> VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 2, pp. 139-44, 214-16, and the edicts themselves (see notes 77, 78).

<sup>81</sup> WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 11-16.

in any schools which were empowered to send students on to the university, or any school preparatory to these, were required to be tested immediately upon leaving the universities by the school testing commissions in the university towns. Only upon successful completion of this exam could a student call himself a teacher candidate, and only certified candidates could be nominated by patrons for school posts.<sup>82</sup> A further edict of 1831 extended the testing requirement to teachers in the official burgher schools, instituted a compulsory probationary period for all teachers to be followed by yet another examination, and defined a career-sequence of further exams for promotion to advanced teacher and for promotion to rector.<sup>83</sup> Through this series of testing edicts the state in the *Vormärz* period gained considerable if not total control of the teaching career.

These edicts and the testing system they introduced effectively created the profession of higher teaching in Prussia. Between 1820 and 1840 an average of eighty-eight teachers per year completed the teacher's examination. The number of gymnasiums grew moderately, from ninety-one in 1818 to 118 in 1848, but the number of official burgher schools soared from nine in 1832 to forty-eight in 1848. This generated a demand for teachers that grew steadily in a period in which opportunities in other learned professions declined.<sup>84</sup> As a consequence of the glutted market for clergymen in the 1830s, higher teaching seems to have replaced theology as the principal career channel in which the sons of non-academic fathers — mostly lower bureaucrats and teachers and some craftsmen — first took the giant step into the professional class.<sup>85</sup> Thus the philosophy of *Bildung* and the culture state, the ideological property of the higher teaching corps, became after 1835 doctrines of social mobility as well.

Higher teaching became more specialized in other respects. The teaching cadres were trained primarily in the philosophical faculties. The state's insistence that all teachers pass the teachers' examination, the *Examen pro facultate docendi*, increasingly closed off the higher teaching career to students with theological backgrounds, even though a few continued to train for the teachers' examination and for the theological exam, the *Tentamina pro licentia*. Other theologically trained candidates took refuge in the urban middle schools, which required no state exam for teachers. In 1827 Minister Altenstein closed this outlet by imposing an exam upon these schools as well.<sup>86</sup> The professionalization of the teaching corps, regulated through the examination system, increasingly squeezed other groups out of a teaching career.

The examination system also supported the growing prestige of higher teaching as a career. Salaries increased steadily through the *Vormärz* period, until by 1863 full-status teachers in middle-sized gymnasiums averaged 850 thaler per year — an extremely high salary by Prussian standards, in a period when a teacher

<sup>83</sup> Printed in VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 2, pp. 26-57.

<sup>84</sup> WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 556-57, 420-21.

<sup>85</sup> On this standard claim see for example O'BOYLE, "Klassische Bildung", pp. 602-03. The best supporting evidence for this early period is the data on the social backgrounds of university students and their relative numbers by faculty. See CONRAD, *Statistik... Halle*, pp. 19, 30-2 and Konrad H. JARAUSCH, "Die neuhumanistische Universität und die bürgerliche Gesellschaft 1800-1870", forthcoming in *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*.

<sup>86</sup> VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 1, pp. 424-26.

in the common schools (*Volksschulen*) would have been happy with 300 thaler.<sup>87</sup> Gymnasium directors held the same civil service rank as full professors in universities and bureaucrats of councillor (*Rat*) rank, while gymnasium teachers with the title "professor", held the same rank as associate university professors and *Referendare*.<sup>88</sup> Both the testing edicts of 1810 and 1831 specified historical and philological knowledge, not pedagogical theory, as the profession's basis of expertise. This fact separated the higher teachers from the teachers in common schools and lesser burgher schools, and linked them intellectually and socially to the world of the universities and pure learning. Gymnasium teachers joined with university professors of classical philology to create one of Prussia's earliest and most influential professional associations. Complaints that the gymnasiums were merely professional schools for classical philology surfaced frequently during the *Vormärz* period and proved a considerable embarrassment to the Prussian ministry.

The development of the Prussian school system and its sharp division into separate school types led to the development of a system of academic licensing, the so-called *Berechtigungswesen*, for the semi-learned professions as well. During the Napoleonic era and the years of gymnasium reform in Prussia, the burgher school movement had made little headway. By 1825 it again revived, and many communities began to create such schools or to revitalize older ones, in large part as a revolt against what was seen as the growing élitism of the gymnasiums and their fanatical emphasis upon the old languages.<sup>89</sup> The Ministry of Education did not oppose this movement but was clearly suspicious of it; it refused to encourage or to subsidize such schools, and it clearly intended to defend the prerogatives of the gymnasiums. These educational views were not shared by the ministries of the Interior and of Finance. In 1827 they agreed to accept as subaltern bureaucrats candidates who had completed the highest form of a gymnasium or of a burgher school, where previously only gymnasium-leavers had qualified.<sup>90</sup> This slap at his educational policy posed problems for Altenstein which multiplied over the next few years, for the term burgher school was applied loosely to an enormously diverse group of institutions, all of which wished to claim the new privilege for their graduates. In 1832, with considerable bad grace, Altenstein secured a cabinet order introducing a new leaving examination for these lesser schools and naming as official burgher schools only the nine-odd schools the ministry felt qualified to give it. Such schools had to reproduce the gymnasium curriculum exactly, but with no Greek and little Latin and with increased stress on modern languages, mathematics, and the natural sciences.<sup>91</sup> These *öffentliche Real- und höhere Bürgerschulen* were accepted along with the gymnasiums and polytechnics as the "higher schools" in Prussia.

<sup>87</sup> JEISMANN, *Gymnasium*, pp. 374-75; WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 555-59. On *Volksschulen* see VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 1, p. 809 and Heinrich BUSCHOFF, "Die preussische Volksschule als soziales Gebilde und politischer Bildungsfaktor in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Ein Bericht", *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 22 (1971): 385-96.

<sup>88</sup> VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 2, p. 108.

<sup>89</sup> See for example *Ibid.*, II, pt. 2, pp. 139-44, 144-56.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294-307 and WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, p. 491. Ministers Schuckmann in Interior and Kamptz in Justice were old political foes of Altenstein from the Hardenberg era.

<sup>91</sup> VON RÖNNE, *Unterrichts-Wesen*, II, pt. 2, pp. 307-16.

The ministries and most of the people involved accepted this compromise. It touched off a campaign by the burgher schools to win for their graduates access to other careers and privileges that gymnasium-leavers enjoyed. Not until long after 1850 did the burgher schools feel strong enough to challenge the gymnasium's monopoly over the preparation of students for the universities. By the end of the *Vormärz* period the ministries normally recognized the real school or burgher school diploma as equivalent to completion of the gymnasium's second form and set these as requirements for the upper subaltern service. A complex web of regulations existed by 1850 to define minimum school prerequisites for the officer corps, the military service exemption (*Freiwilligendienst*), admission to engineering and trade schools, agricultural schools, and the medico-surgical institutes.<sup>92</sup> Educational structure, buttressed by the testing system, had come to undergird both the *Bildungsbürgertum* proper and the larger educated élite that included the new, semi-learned professions.

The course of educational reform in Prussia illustrates again how a series of readjustments that had been forced upon the old learned estate, the *Gelehrtentum*, during the intellectual crisis of the late *Aufklärung* period, forged the mature *Bildungsbürgertum* into its nineteenth-century form. Neohumanism served to revitalize the archaic curriculum of the grammar schools. It preserved the centrality of the classical languages in intellectual culture and it enhanced the rigour and distinctiveness of the schools themselves. Reformers successfully allied themselves with the bureaucratic state and mobilized its testing authority in order to guarantee the monopoly of the gymnasiums over access to the universities and the learned professions. In this way they defended the social as well as intellectual status of the gymnasiums against all alternate school types and the alternate social groups and philosophies they represented.<sup>93</sup> The new class of teachers in the higher schools, itself a product of the state testing authority, embodied within itself the tension between the values of professional specialization on the one hand and those of liberal education, or *Bildung*, on the other. The teachers became the guardians of the latter notion, the common tie that linked the *Bildungsbürgertum* into a single social entity. The school reforms formalized and codified educational licensing in an era when traditional, informal patterns of certification were breaking down rapidly.

The consolidation of the *Bildungsbürgertum* also emphasized its continuity of outlook and interest with the old learned estate of the eighteenth century. The two groups had the same function, the same composition, and very similar privileges. But the differences were important also. The *Bildungsbürgertum*, through its link to the state and to the bureaucracy it staffed, through the single-mindedness of its adherence to the ethos of education, and through the growing importance of professional services in a modernizing society, enjoyed a social prestige and political in-

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294-316 and his account of the educational prerequisites to the higher *Fachschulen*, pp. 326-66; WIESE, *Das höhere Schulwesen*, pp. 618-21; and MÜLLER, *Schulsystem*, pp. 65-89.

<sup>93</sup> This discussion leaves open the vexed question of whether the consolidation of the *Bildungsbürgertum* actually reduced opportunity for social mobility through education in Prussia, of whether the professional stratum actually became a more closed, self-recruiting social entity than it had been in the eighteenth century. This question has generated lively controversies among historians of education. See R. Steven TURNER, "Social Mobility and the Traditional Professions in Prussia, 1770-1848" (forthcoming in *Central European History*) and the literature cited therein.

fluence the old learned estate had never attained. The old learned estate had been an intelligentsia organized around the vagaries of a learned style and the fragility of traditional privileges; the *Bildungsbürgertum* was an intelligentsia based on firmer ground: preferred access to a state-controlled educational structure and the social and professional licensing which passage through that structure conferred. The dissolution of the old *Gelehrtentum* and its values had effectively taught Prussia's professional stratum the necessity of seeking that new ground.