

Protecting Manliness in the Age of Enlightenment

The New Physical Education and Gymnastics in
Germany, 1770–1800

Teresa Sanislo

In the last few decades of the eighteenth century, a small but influential circle of enlightened educational reformers known as the Philanthropinists began a campaign to improve the physical upbringing of the youth and bring back what they referred to as the lost art of ancient gymnastics. Between 1770 and 1793, the Philanthropinists published a series of texts calling for a hardy dietary regimen for children and the introduction of gymnastics or physical training into the schools.¹ They put their ideas into practice at their famous experimental boarding schools in Dessau and Schnepfenthal. By the end of the century, the Philanthropinists had convinced only a few school directors to follow their lead. Yet their writings and practical work had long-lasting significance. They helped bring the idea of a new physical education to the broader public and eventually had a profound impact on German gymnastics movement that emerged in the early 1800s. Among nineteenth-century German gymnasts and contemporary historians of education and sport, therefore, the Philanthropinists have become known as the founding fathers of German physical education and gymnastics.²

Why, centuries after the fall of Greece and Rome, did the Philanthropinists begin to call for a revival of ancient gymnastics? Why were they so concerned about health, physical fitness, and the training of the body? After all, the late eighteenth century is commonly referred to as the Age of Enlightenment, a time in which philosophers and proponents of reform praised the powers of rationality and the mind. Feminist historians have often portrayed the movement for Enlightenment

as one that privileged the mind over the body, reinforcing a gender coding of these terms and of masculine rationality over feminine embodiment. What does the discourse on the new physical education reveal, therefore, about gender ideals in this period?

The work of the Philanthropinists represents the beginning of a new valuing of the training of the body. It established a new significance of this theme for gender relations among the educated middle-class in the modern period. An analysis of their language and imagery demonstrates that gendered concerns lay at the heart of their project. The Philanthropinists designed the new physical education and gymnastics as a means of restoring masculine attributes for the next generation and protecting what they believed was a “natural” order among the sexes. They drew attention to the embodied nature of manliness and the necessity of achieving a balance between the mental and physical elements of masculine character. Their project suggests that new gender ideals were riddled with tension as competing notions of masculinity emerged in this period.

Gender and the Body in the Late Eighteenth Century

German feminist historians often refer the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century as a transformative period for gender and women’s history. Karin Hausen, Barbara Duden, Ute Frevert, and others argue that in this period the foundations for the construction of gender difference rooted in religious, social, and scholarly traditions of the early modern period were losing sway.³ New gender ideals emerged based on the notion of the completely different yet complementary nature of man and woman. Recent literature on the history of the body, gender, and sexuality emphasizes the ways in which the “polarization of the sexes” and the notion of separate spheres were increasingly read into gendered bodies and grounded in biological difference.⁴

Feminist historians and political theorists also argue that masculine characteristics came to be privileged in the newly emerging public sphere and in politics. They point to masculine rationality and the image of the disembodied rational male as central elements of early citizenship ideals. A subtext within this literature focuses on the role that representations of women’s bodies and embodiment played in their theoretical exclusion from the public and full civil status. Literature, philosophy, and political theory often represented women as more physical, more natural, and less rational beings and therefore relegated them to the private sphere.⁵ This line of analysis has led to very fruitful

work in gender history and emphasizes a central feature of the gender dynamics of this period. Yet by focusing on the image of the disembodied rational male, feminist scholars have often overlooked the ways in which masculinity was at times portrayed and experienced in explicitly physical or embodied ways.

In the past few years, however, studies of masculinity have gained new importance. A wave of recent publications on manliness and the male body has emerged out of new work in gender studies, the history of sexuality, gay and lesbian studies, and even a new men's studies.⁶ European and American historians have generated new narratives about masculinity grounded in physical strength, courage, self-control, and toughness, producing countless studies of rough, primitive, or muscular masculinity.⁷ Yet in much of this new literature, feminist insights regarding the significance of masculine rationality and the relationship between manliness and the mind, culture, and civilization often fall into the background.

The dissonance between these two different strands within the historiography on gender and the body suggests that it is important to develop a concept of masculinity that recognizes competing notions of manliness. This perspective is essential for explaining the Philanthropinists' project to revive ancient gymnastics. One can really understand the emergence of the new gymnastics only by looking at competing visions of masculinity in the context of the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century and probing the tensions generated by different, possibly divergent, elements of "masculine character." Focusing on the problematic nature of masculinity helps explain why educational reformers suddenly found it necessary to devise a program that promised to build manly men and why physical culture took on such importance for ideals of manliness.

The idea of and urgency for a new gymnastics for young men emerged out of concern over divergent elements of masculinity. On the one hand is the man of strength, vigor, willpower, and courage; on the other is the civilized man, a rational, intellectual, and culturally refined being. One might argue that these two sides of man are not necessarily contradictory or in tension with one another, yet the Philanthropinists came to see them as such or at least as needing to be reconciled, balanced, or managed. The remainder of this chapter explores why the movement's proponents thought that rugged and heroic manliness was threatened in the Age of Enlightenment and how they designed a program of physical hardening and gymnastics to revive and protect it.

An analysis of the work of the Philanthropinists draws attention to

the connections between the interplay of gender ideals and practice. Much of the early feminist scholarship on the character of the sexes and male/female embodiment focused heavily on the formulation and spread of gender ideals and gender ideologies. More recent research in late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century German gender history has begun to explore in greater detail the ways in which gender identities and relations are constructed in practice. Anne-Charlott Trepp's pathbreaking research on gender relations among men and women of the new middle class in Hamburg, for example, demonstrates that an analysis of the dominant gender ideologies of the period does not fully explain the range of options for the formulation of gender identities in practice. Her study reveals that men and women formulated alternative identities and practices that were very much in tension with the dominant gender ideals of the period.⁸

Trepp's study suggests that historians need to go beyond a discussion of the ideology of the "character of the sexes" to understand the complexities of gender relations of this period. However, her book did not explore the tension that her historical subjects must have felt in relation to contemporary gender ideals. Trepp leaves the impression that individuals in this period operated almost independently of the dominant gender codes.

My analysis of the Philanthropinist movement tries to bridge the gap between older research and more recent studies, like Trepp's, by examining the formulation of gender ideals, the tensions around them, and the efforts to maintain the "natural" gender order in practice. It explores the ways in which educated middle-class men dealt with the tension between the gender ideals that they propagated and the "real" male and female bodies that they encountered. Enlightened reformers recognized that not all bodies conformed to the "principles of nature." Rather than denying the idea of natural differences, they proclaimed their age "unnatural" and designed new programs aimed at restoring and maintaining what they deemed to be the natural gender order.

Gender and the New Physical Education

In their proposals for a new physical education, the Philanthropinists offered biting criticism of contemporary methods of child rearing and schooling. They argued that the physical upbringing of youth was marked by an unnatural softness (*Weichlichkeit*). In countless texts, they outlined the ways in which a soft lifestyle led to the physical

degeneration of the youth. *Weichlichkeit* encompassed a number of interconnected ideas. The Philanthropinists used this term to describe the physically degenerative effects of luxury, material comfort, overrefinement, sedentary lifestyles, and mental work or intellectual pursuits. They also used it to condemn the idea of spoiling or coddling the child. The Philanthropinists argued that parents were increasingly raising their children in soft or luxurious conditions and hence were hindering natural hardening processes that would toughen the body. With disdain, they described parents tucking children into soft feather beds, feeding them luxurious and spicy foods, keeping them indoors in heated rooms, dressing them in elaborate fashions, and encouraging them to sit still indoors on sofas.

All of the Philanthropinists agreed that modern schooling, which focused solely on the intellect and neglected the body, contributed to the problem of *Weichlichkeit*. They portrayed the classroom as unhealthy, emphasizing the extent to which it reproduced the soft conditions of the domestic sphere. The Philanthropinists warned of the consequences of locking children indoors in hot, stuffy rooms and forcing them to sit still for hours, bent over their books. School youth were deprived of the hardening effects of exposure to fresh air, movement, and exercise. It was no wonder, they argued, that schoolchildren became sluggish, weak, and sickly creatures. Drawing on the contemporary medical literature on the ill health of scholars, they also outlined the deleterious effects of intensive intellectual activity on the body of the child.⁹ Given the conditions in the classroom and the schools, Peter Villaume asked, “do we really have to wonder about the weakness of the human race?”¹⁰

To counter the effects of *Weichlichkeit*, Basedow, Villaume, Gutsmuths, and others proposed a series of reforms allegedly grounded in the principles of nature and reason. Their proposals reflect a strong faith in the idea of a rational regulation of the body and preventative measures to maintain a healthy, strong physical constitution. The concept of *Abhartung* (physical hardening) was central to their program. They called for a more rugged, natural upbringing to toughen the body. They recommended that parents subject their children to an ascetic regimen, including cold bathing, simple foods and drink, hard sleeping surfaces, unrestrictive clothing, exposure to the elements, and physical movement. Finally, gymnastics exercises were necessary to give the body strength, firmness, and dexterity.

Gendered language and imagery were central to the literature on the

new physical education and gymnastics. An opposition between feminine softness and manly hardness lay at the heart of this discourse. The Philanthropinists set up gendered contrasts between a weak, soft, pampered upbringing and their rugged and more natural program. The terms *Weichlichkeit* and *Verweichlichung* invoked images of feminine softness, weakness, and sensitivity.¹¹ Many of the Philanthropinists also used more explicitly gendered language, employing words such as *feminine* and *effeminate* to describe softness in child rearing and schooling and the weaklings that it produced.

Johann Christian Gutsmuths, the gymnastics instructor at Schnepfenthal, used female imagery to convey the idea of physical degeneration and decline. His book, *Gymnastics for the Youth*, whose 1793 publication brought widespread fame to the new gymnastics, is saturated with gendered language. To generate a sense of urgency regarding the problem of *Weichlichkeit*, he described men becoming as soft, weak, and timid as women, plagued with feminine ailments. Gutsmuths painted a vivid portrait of what might happen to men of the upper ranks if they no longer tried to follow their natural drives for physical activity:

Our distinguished men would soon become distinguished women; we would only see them at the dressing table, the drawing board, or at the piano. The constant female society of sisters, aunts, cousins, chambermaids, and girls, in which our distinguished boys grow up, rubs off like makeup, they soon adopt the most refined tone, begin to fear spiders and monsters, get cramps, sensitivity, vapors . . . and become used to an overly tender care of the body and health, which is in no way fitting for a man.¹²

His scenario describes a world turned upside down in which men have lost their manly strength and courage. Trying again to raise concern about *Weichlichkeit*, he stressed that any nation that wished to make claim to manliness must banish feminine softness from the education of the youth.

Gutsmuths and others were clearly anxious about the idea that the softness of women might rub off on men. Gutsmuths explained that “the exaggerated tenderness of the female sex” was bound to transfer “easily to the young male. He is the natural lover of this sex and models himself so easily and gladly after her, if the opportunity is there in their upbringing.”¹³ Villaume recommended that boys who had a ten-

dency for softness and sensitivity should spend less time in the company of women.¹⁴ Johann Stuve was so concerned about the idea of feminization that he warned widows not to try to raise their sons alone.¹⁵

The Philanthropinists were explicit about their attempt to restore manliness and masculine virtues to the next generation. *Weichlichkeit* destroyed not only health, strength, and firmness of body—traits deemed specifically masculine—but also the foundations of masculine character. Weak, sickly, plagued by sensuality, and obsessed with physical comfort, men were no longer capable of demonstrating courage and firmness of character. By disciplining the body, building health, strength, dexterity, and a mastery over one’s physical desires and capacities, a man could achieve presence of mind, independence, courage, willpower, and resolve. Gutsmuths explained the connection between physical hardening and training and masculine character:

Let us *harden* the body, and it will maintain endurance and strength of nerves; let us *exercise* it, so that it can become powerful and active, then it will enliven the mind, and make one manly, powerful, unremitting, resolute, and courageous.¹⁶

The ultimate goal was to achieve a level of physical perfection through which one could unify “health with manly strength and firmness, endurance, courage, and presence of mind.”¹⁷

While Basedow, Campe, Villaume, and Gutsmuths claimed that improved health and enhanced strength were essential for both sexes, they pointed out that boys and young men had a special responsibility to train their bodies to build manly character. Only then would they become protectors of their families, productive members of society, and sacrificing, patriotic citizens. Prescribing a series of “exercises for future manhood,” including a program to harden the body, teach self-reliance, and build strength, dexterity, and courage, Johann Bernhard Basedow explained that “only in this way can we raise real men. My schooling and teachers did not teach me to become a man, but I hope that there will once again be men in the future.”¹⁸

Despite the emphasis on the effects of *Weichlichkeit* on masculine character, the Philanthropinists did not completely omit girls from the new physical education.¹⁹ Ironically, the discussion of restoring masculine attributes to the next generation opened up space for reforming the physical upbringing of girls and young women. The Philanthropinists

envisioned a new physical culture for women that emphasized health, strength, and natural beauty. These reformers were very concerned with the weakness of women, especially as it affected their ability to bear strong children and raise manly men. Many Philanthropinists argued that women passed their weakness on to the next generation and that physical hardening thus must begin with the body of the mother. Girls were to be raised in a hardier manner so that as women they could withstand the pains of childbirth and become capable housewives and mothers. Promoting an ideal of natural, simple feminine beauty, the Philanthropinists condemned unnatural and unhealthy fashions such as the corset. At the same time, they asked parents to include girls in the program of physical hardening and encourage them to practice more movement and exercise.

While the Philanthropinists agreed that women should develop a greater degree of strength, they were clearly uneasy with the idea of strong women and the threat that they might pose to the natural, harmonious gender order. The reformers clearly did not want to negate sex difference in the body or do away with the idea of the weaker sex. They sought to limit the degree of strength that girls and young women were to achieve. In *The Method Book*, Basedow claimed that women needed less strength than men. Both nature and society intended for women to be the weaker sex. It was natural and proper that the body, physical appearance, and movements announced sex difference. So while men must develop manly strength, women should focus on cultivating a pleasing, graceful feminine demeanor.²⁰ He sought a balance between extreme feminine softness and manly strength for women:

From the exaggerated softness of the female sex comes the harmful weakness of ours. Women are not allowed to be as strong as men, but [they must be] strong for them, so that they may bear strong men.²¹

In *Fatherly Advice for My Daughter*, J. H. Campe told his fictive offspring to develop a hardy physical constitution. Yet he also warned that women should not step beyond the feminine sphere and take up manly physical exercises and training. This was not the way to achieve a woman's true calling as wife, mother, and housekeeper.²² None of the Philanthropinists recommended that girls participate in intensive and formal physical training.²³ Rather, domestic labor, walks, and graceful

sports such as badminton and ice skating would be enough for girls and young women.

In general, the Philanthropinists focused primarily on issues of health when talking about a new physical education and culture for women. *Weichlichkeit* did not appear to endanger female character. In fact, they reinforced images of femininity associated with gentleness, sensitivity, willingness to yield, dependence on others, timidity, and lack of courage. They even suggested that intensive physical training for women might work against natural relations between the sexes. Basedow, Campe, and Villaume argued that the opposition between strength and weakness lay at the heart of the bond uniting the sexes: a man's strength in body and mind attracted the weaker and less capable woman. Invoking the image of the oak tree and clinging vine, Campe portrayed the relationship between the sexes as one of strength and protection on the one hand and dependence and loyalty on the other.²⁴ He agreed with others, therefore, that the physical upbringing of youth should occur in accordance with this simple law of nature and should reinforce sex differences in body and character.

Civilization and Its Discontents: *Weichlichkeit* and the Feminization of "Modern," "Civilized" Germans

The discussion of *Weichlichkeit* in the physical upbringing of youth was grounded in a cultural critique of the age. The Philanthropinists increasingly saw the eighteenth century as not only an Age of Enlightenment but also one of softness and weakness. Drawing on the writings of French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, they focused attention on the darker side of the civilizing process. As a subtext to the critique of child-rearing practices, they told the story of the physical degeneration and hence feminization of "modern" Germans. Comparisons between "civilized" Germans and other peoples from both the past and present played a key role in constructing this narrative. The Philanthropinists pointed to the health and physical prowess of the ancients and of "primitive" peoples across the globe. With awe they described the strength and manliness of the Greek youth working out at the gymnasium or the Native American, the epitome of the contemporary noble savage, making his way across the wilderness. They also referred frequently to the hardy physical constitution of the ancient Germans. Citations from Tacitus offered proof that Germans were naturally

strong, vigorous, courageous, and manly. In all these cases, they attributed the strength and manly character of these peoples to their natural, hardy upbringing. Living close to nature or in harmony with its principles, the Greeks, ancient Germans, and “primitive” peoples toughened their bodies through exposure to the elements, simple living, and physical exertion. The physical culture and strength of these peoples served as evidence of the advantages of the natural principles of *Abhartung*.

The Philanthropinists did not fail to point out that physical strength and training were important attributes for warrior societies. They often noted that Greek gymnastics fields produced not only strong scholars and athletes but also patriotic and heroic citizen-soldiers. The reformers drew attention to the importance of physical hardening for development of heroic virtues such as courage and the capacity for bold, principled, and patriotic action. The hero’s body became a symbol of all that the new physical education stood for. The Spartan warrior and ancient Germanic hero trained his body and overcame both the slavishness of sensuality and physical pain. He was capable of sacrificing himself and using his body as a tool in a struggle for a higher cause.

Compared to the ancients and “primitive” peoples, “civilized” Germans appeared particularly soft and weak. Bemoaning the fact that modern Germans were only shadowy figures compared to their ancient ancestors, Gutsmuths described a scenario in which parents tell their children about their forefathers.

We appear stiller and quieter than our ancient forefathers. We recognize that they are lively “natural men” whose physical strength is superior to ours, but they are people like us. We show our children their picture. They are pleased by these quick and lively German men, their courage, their strength and hardness. They ask us: why are we not like this?²⁵

Gutsmuths and others argued that physical degeneration represented not an accident of nature but rather a direct result of the civilizing process and modernity. Stuve explained that “refined and civilized people lost physical strength and dexterity as they gained intellectual and cultural refinement.”²⁶ “People of this age are weaker and softer than their forefathers,” he declared, “so you need to work with greater energy today to ensure that children stay healthy and strong.”²⁷ The Philanthropinists argued that luxury, material comforts, refinement,

sedentary occupations, and increased intellectual pursuits were markers of the modern age and the root causes of the weakness and ill health of modern, civilized Germans. They also pointed to the separation between the military and civil society as another factor contributing to physical decline. The Philanthropinists argued that standing armies had replaced citizen armies; hence, most modern Germans were no longer required to be fierce warriors and strong men.

The discussion of *Weichlichkeit* was grounded in a socially specific analysis. In the eighteenth century, civility, refinement, conspicuous consumption, leisure, education, and nonphysical labor were factors that marked social difference, marking boundaries not only between Europeans and “primitive” peoples but also between the upper and lower ranks in Germany. The Philanthropinists made it clear, therefore, that their program was directed primarily toward the soft upper and educated classes. An urban/rural opposition also lay behind this discourse. Cities and towns, the centers of civilization and refinement, were the seats of weakness, softness, and ill health. Idealized images of rugged, vigorous peasants who had retained elements of the natural lifestyle and physical constitution of their ancient ancestors abound in these texts. While some, such as Campe, offered biting critiques of the court and high society (*grosse Welt*), none of the Philanthropinists limited their discussion to the nobility. They all agreed that *Weichlichkeit* affected other wealthy, educated elites, all those, especially in the cities, who shared to some degree the attributes of modern, civilized humanity. The reformers focused, for example, on the problem of education and the intellectualism of the age. They were very concerned with the softening and feminizing effects of study, intense reflection, and scholarship. None of these men questioned the associations among manliness, rationality, and scholarship. While emphasizing that women, for reasons of health, should not engage in scholarship or authorship, Campe explained that men were the strong sex in both body and mind. Nature gave men a greater capacity for reason and abstract thought. A man’s stronger physical constitution, moreover, enabled him to withstand the physical strains of intellectual activity and scholarship. Yet Campe and other Philanthropinists remained concerned that intellectualism and the unhealthy life of the scholar threatened masculine strength and character.²⁸ Next to the image of the dandy, the scholar emerged as a symbol of the softness, weakness, and effeminacy of the age.

The Philanthropinists expressed skepticism about the idea of

progress. Like Rousseau, they began to question the gains that civilization had made with the move out of the state of nature into civilized society. Focusing on the problem of *Weichlichkeit*, they drew attention to perceived negative consequences of the civilizing process in Germany. Cultural and intellectual refinement threatened to destroy some of the key elements of masculine character embodied in the ideal of rugged and heroic manliness. They argued that in an age in which so many had left behind the principles of nature, strong bodies, a masculine physique, and heroic character would not simply emerge on their own. A program of physical hardening and training was needed to counterbalance the weakness and softness of the age. "There is an art of building the body," Villaume explained, "and this art is necessary not in Kamtchatka, in Senegal, and Oronoko but in Europe, in Germany."²⁹

At the heart of this discourse lay an effort to rework the cultural understanding of refinement. The Philanthropinists tried to break what they saw as a contemporary association between savagery and strength. They made it clear that they understood the value of culture and were not promoting a return to the state of nature. Yet they also insisted that physical strength should constitute an attribute of the truly cultivated man. Gutsmuths assured his readers that the new physical education did not represent a return to the wild roughness of the ancient Germans, maintaining that it was possible to unite physical strength, manliness, and culture.

Your ideal cannot and should not be rough *Germanic savagery* but rather a unity of *Germanic physical firmness and strength, courage and manliness, and the cultivation of the heart and mind*. For the *former* you would need Germanic forests, rude ignorance, a nomadic life without culture, without grace or muses, the barbaric right of the strongest; for the *latter*, something that can be combined with the culture of your intellect with pleasant harmony; *the development and training of your physical capacities, manly aversion to effeminate softness*.³⁰

Gutsmuths captured the sentiments of his contemporaries when he explained that he sought to fuse the positive elements of the different sides of man. "If we unify the physical perfection of natural man with the intellectual cultivation of the civilized, we will see the most beautiful ideal of our race, an ideal that sends our hearts racing."³¹ The new

physical education and gymnastics emerged as a means of reaching this ideal and achieving a balance between nature/culture and body/mind. The Philanthropinists looked to the ancient Greeks and their physical training program as the model to unite *Kultur*, strength, and manliness.

Conclusion

The discourse on gender, physical education, and gymnastics prompts a reinterpretation of the standard assumptions about gender in this period. Feminist historians often point to a series of gendered oppositions (male/female, active/passive, rational/emotional, mind/body, culture/nature) as central to gender relations in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.³² Within the Philanthropinists' texts, however, many of these gendered cultural codes were reversed. Nature, the body, and primitive humanity were associated with manliness or rugged, heroic masculinity. Femininity and effeminacy, conversely, were linked with civility, cultural refinement, intellectualism, and civilization. An analysis of the discourse on the new physical education suggests that it is important to recognize the multiple ways that gendered oppositions and meanings can be configured in a given historical context. Historians need to think in complex ways about the concept of the "character of the sexes." The Philanthropinists underscored the unstable or problematic nature of masculinity and masculine character, arguing that manliness was not inherent but rather had to be built. More importantly, they emphasized the problematic nature of masculinity in the modern age, the tensions between different sides of man, and the need to balance and reconcile them.

The trend toward valuing the training of the body and emphasizing its importance for gender relations continued and intensified in the early nineteenth century. The problem that the Philanthropinists defined haunted the imagination of a growing number of educated men.³³ Against the background of the Napoleonic Wars, concerns about the civilizing process, physical degeneration, and manliness became more widespread and intense. Prussian patriots and early German nationalists increasingly put their hopes for a victory over the French in the notion of the "nation in arms." Their propaganda, designed to stir patriotic sentiment and sacrifice, along with the Prussian king's call to arms in 1813, put heroic manliness at the center of the "liberation" project.³⁴ In this context, a growing number of educators, patriots, military leaders, and public officials began to promote the

new gymnastics as a training ground for manly citizen-soldiers and a cradle of patriotic sentiment. Between 1810 and 1819, a series of new gymnastic societies were founded across the German territories.³⁵

As the discourse on gymnastics became more overtly nationalistic and militaristic, the links among physical education, physical training, and manliness tightened even further. National independence appeared to rest in part on training the male body, protecting masculine character, and cultivating patriotic bonds among men. The concern for stronger female bodies, which had been so significant in the Philanthropists' texts, faded. The leaders of the new gymnastics movement no longer raised the patriotic significance of hardening and strengthening female bodies for motherhood. At the same time, repressing images of strong, warrior women that circulated during and after the wars, they ignored or rejected the possibility of training female "defenders of the fatherland."³⁶ Excluding women from the new gymnastic societies and fields, they began to construct a purely masculine patriotic space that would eventually come to play a large role in the German national movement and political culture of the nineteenth century.³⁷

Notes

1. See Johann Bernhard Basedow, *Das Methodenbuch für Väter und Mütter der Familien und Völker* (1770; Leipzig, 1913); Johann Bernhard Basedow, *Elementarwerk* (1774; Leipzig, 1909); Christian Friedrich GutsMuths, *Gymnastik für die Jugend*, 1st ed. (Schnepfenthal, 1793); Christian Gotthilf Salzmann, *Noch etwas über die Erziehung nebst Ankündigung einer Erziehungsanstalt* (Leipzig, 1784); Johann Stuve, *Über die körperliche Erziehung nebst einer Nachricht von der Neu-Ruppinischen Schule* (Züllichau, 1781); Johann Stuve, "Allgemeine Grundsätze der Erziehung," *Allgemeine Revision* 1 (1785): 235–328; Peter Villaume, "Von der Bildung des Körpers in Rücksicht auf die Vollkommenheit und Glückseligkeit der Menschen. Oder über die physische Erziehung Insodernheit," in *Quellenbücher der Leibesübungen*, ed. Max Schwarze and Wilhelm Limpert (Dresden, 1948), 2:5–288.

2. See Karl Wassmannsdorf, *Die Turnübungen in den Philanthropinen* (Heidelberg, 1870); Edmund Neuendorf, *Geschichte der neuen deutschen Leibesübungen* (Dresden, 1930), vol. 1; Deobold B. Van Dalen, Elmer D. Mitchell, and Bruce L. Bennett, *A World History of Physical Education* (New York, 1953).

3. Karin Hausen, "Family and Role-Division: The Polarization of Sexual Stereotypes in the Nineteenth Century—An Aspect of the Dissociation of Work and Family Life," in *The German Family: Essays on the Social History of the Family in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany*, ed., Richard

Evans and W. R. Lee (London, 1981), 51–83; Barbara Duden, “Das schöne Eigentum: Zur Herausbildung des bürgerlichen Frauenbildes an der Wende vom 18. zur 19. Jahrhundert,” *Kursbuch* 48 (1977): 125–40; Ute Frevert, “Bürgerliche Meisterdenker und das Geschlechtsverhältnis: Konzepte, Erfahrungen, Visionen an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert,” in *Bürgerinnen und Bürger: Geschlechtsverhältnisse im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Frevert (Göttingen, 1988), 17–48; Ute Frevert, *Women in German History: From Bourgeois Emancipation to Sexual Liberation* (New York, 1989).

4. Londa Schiebinger, *The Mind Has No Sex? Women in the Origins of Modern Science* (Cambridge, 1989); Ludmilla Jordanova, *Sexual Visions: Images of Gender in Science and Medicine between the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Madison, 1989); Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, 1990); Claudia Honegger, *Die Ordnung der Geschlechter: Die Wissenschaften vom Menschen und das Weib, 1750–1850* (Frankfurt, 1991).

5. For a review of feminist literature on citizenship from an interdisciplinary perspective, see Ruth Lister, *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives* (New York, 1997).

6. For an overview of this new area of study, see David H. J. Morgan, “Men Made Manifest: Histories of Masculinities,” *Gender and History* 1 (1989): 87–91; Hanna Schissler, “Männerstudien in den USA,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 18 (1992): 204–20; Ute Frevert, “Männergeschichte oder die Suche nach dem ‘ersten’ Geschlecht,” in *Was ist Gesellschaftsgeschichte? Positionen, Theorien, Analysen*, ed. Manfred Hettling (Munich, 1991), 31–43; John Tosh, “What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 179–202.

7. Anne-Charlott Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit und selbständige Weiblichkeit: Frauen und Männer im Hamburger-Bürgertum Zwischen 1770 und 1840* (Göttingen, 1996).

8. George Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe* (Madison, 1985); George Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (New York, 1996); Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York, 1993); J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, eds., *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800–1940* (Manchester, 1987); Kenneth R. Dutton, *The Perfectible Body: The Western Ideal of Male Physical Development* (New York, 1995).

9. S. A. D. Tissot, *Von der Gesundheit der Gelehrten* (Zurich, 1768); G. J. Ackermann, *Über die Krankheiten der Gelehrten und die leichte und sicherste Art sie zu Heilen* (Nuremberg, 1777).

10. Villaume, “Von der Bildung,” 2:20–21.

11. Historians of science, gender, and the body frequently point out that physicians and natural philosophers often used the language of softness and sensitivity to describe the “female organism” (Jordanova, *Sexual Visions*, 28;

Schiebinger, *Mind Has No Sex?* 214–24; Honegger, *Die Ordnung*, 126–99; Evelyn Berriot-Salvadore, “The Discourse on Medicine and Science,” trans. A. Goldhammer, in *A History of Women*, ed. Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot [Cambridge, 1993], 2:358).

12. Gutsmuths, *Gymnastik*, 1st ed., 13.

13. *Ibid.*, 13–14.

14. Peter Villaume, “Über Weichhertzlichkeit: Eine pädagogische Aufgabe,” *Pädagogische Unterhandlungen* 3 (1780): 547.

15. Stuve, *Über die körperliche*, 63.

16. Gutsmuths, *Gymnastik*, 1st ed., 86.

17. *Ibid.*, 85.

18. Basedow, *Elementarwerk*, 1:35–37.

19. This is often overlooked by Mosse and many historians of education and sport, who assume that the new physical education and gymnastics were for men.

20. Basedow, *Das Methodenbuch*, 138–65.

21. *Ibid.*, 141.

22. J. H. Campe, *Väterlicher Rat für meine Tochter* (Braunschweig, 1789), 10–12.

23. Basedow, *Das Methodenbuch*, 138–65; Campe, *Väterlicher Rat*, 20–27, 32–35; Peter Villaume, “Nachricht von einer Erziehungsanstalt für Frauenzimmer von gesittetem Stande und von Adel in Halberstadt,” *Pädagogische Unterhandlungen* (1780): 354–410; Christian Andre, *Bildung der Töchter in Schnepfenthal* (Schnepfenthal, 1789); Christian Friedrich Gutsmuths, *Gymnastik für die Jugend*, 2nd ed. (Schnepfenthal, 1804), 508–10.

24. Campe, *Väterlicher Rat*, 21.

25. Gutsmuths, *Gymnastik*, 1st ed., 3.

26. Stuve, “Allgemeine,” 272.

27. Stuve, *Über die körperliche*, 7.

28. Campe, *Väterlicher Rat*, 50–55.

29. Villaume, “Von der Bildung,” 38.

30. Gutsmuths, *Gymnastik*, 1st ed., 41.

31. *Ibid.*, 117.

32. For the discussion and debate on the specifically gendered opposition male/female and culture/nature, see Sherry B. Ortner, “Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?” in *Woman, Culture, and Society*, ed. Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (Stanford, 1974), 67–87; Carol P. MacCormack and Marilyn Strathern, eds., *Nature, Culture, and Gender* (Cambridge, 1980); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (London, 1982); Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1995).

33. For a detailed analysis of the politics of gender, the body, physical training, and nationalism at the turn of the nineteenth century, see Teresa Sanislo, “The Dangers of Civilization: Protecting Manliness in the Age of

Enlightenment and 'National Liberation'" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2001).

34. For recent work on manliness and the Napoleonic Wars, see Walter Pape, "'Männerglück'-Lyrische Kriegsagitation und Friedensehnsucht zur Zeit der Befreiungskriege," in *Kriegsbereitschaft und Friedensordnung in Deutschland, 1800–1814*, ed. Jost Döffler (Hamburg, 1994), 101–26; Hans-Martin Kaulbuch, "Männliche Ideale von Krieg und Frieden in der Kunst der napoleonischen Ära," in *Kriegsbereitschaft und Friedensordnung*, ed. Döffler, 127–54; Karen Hagemann, "'Heran, heran, zu Sieg oder Tod!' Entwürfe patriotisch-wehrhafter Männlichkeit in der Zeit der Befreiungskriege," in *Männerggeschichte-Geschlechtergeschichte: Männlichkeit im Wandel der Moderne*, ed. Thomas Kühne (Frankfurt, 1996), 51–68; Ute Frevert, "Soldaten, Staatsbürger: Überlegungen zur historischen Konstruktion von Männlichkeit," in *Männerggeschichte-Geschlechtergeschichte*, ed. Kühne, 69–87; Karen Hagemann, "Of 'Manly Valor' and 'German Honor': Nation, War, and Masculinity in the Age of the Prussian Uprising against Napoleon," *Central European History* 30 (1997): 187–220.

35. Dieter Düding, *Organisierter gesellschaftlicher Nationalismus in Deutschland (1808–1847): Bedeutung und Funktion der Turner- und Sängervereine für die deutsche Nationalbewegung* (Munich, 1984).

36. On the discourse on patriotic women and female fighters during and after the Napoleonic Wars, see Hannelore Cyrus, "Von erlaubter und unerlaubter Frauenart um Freiheit zu kämpfen: Freiheitskämpferinnen im 19. Jahrhundert und die Freie Hansestadt Bremen," in *Grenzgängerinnen: Revolutionäre Frauen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Helga Grubitzsch, Hannelore Cyrus, and Elke Haarbusch (Düsseldorf, 1985), 19–92; Mosse, *Nationalism*, 100–101; Karen Hagemann, "Heldennütter, Kriegerbräute, und Amozonen: Entwürfe 'patriotischer' Weiblichkeit zur Zeit der Freiheitskriege," in *Militär und Gesellschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ute Frevert (Stuttgart, 1997), 174–200.

37. For an overview of the history of the German gymnastics movement in the nineteenth century, see Dieter Langewiesche, "'Für Volk und Vaterland kräftige zu würken': Zur politischen und gesellschaftlichen Rolle der Turner zwischen, 1811–1871," in *Kulturgut oder Körperkult? Sport und Sportwissenschaft im Wandel*, ed. Ommo Grube (Tübingen 1990), 22–61. For an analysis of ideals of manliness in the nineteenth-century gymnastics movement, see Daniel A. McMillan, "'Die höchste und heiligste Pflicht': Das Männlichkeitsideal der deutschen Turnbewegung, 1811–1871," in *Männerggeschichte-Geschlechtergeschichte*, ed. Kühne, 88–100.