

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1854.

---

No. I.

---

*Geo. Henry Jones.*  
ART. I.—*Recent Commentaries on the Song of Solomon.*

*Das Hohelied untersucht und ausgelegt*, von Franz Delitzsch, Dr. u. ord. Prof. d. Theologie zu Erlangen u. s. w. 1851. 8vo. pp. 237.

*Das Hohelied von Salomo, uebersetzt und erklärt*, von Heinrich August Hahn, Dr. Phil. Lie. Theologie und ausserordentlichem Professor der letzteren an der Königl. Universität zu Greifswalden, u. s. w. 1852. 16mo. pp. 98.

*Das Hohelied Salomonis ausgelegt*, von E. W. Hengstenberg, Dr. und Prof. d. Theologie zu Berlin. 1853. 8vo. pp. 264.

*The Song of Solomon, Compared with other parts of Scripture.* Second Edition. London, 1852. 16mo. pp. 230.

*A Commentary on the Song of Solomon*, by the Rev. Geo. Burrowes, Prof. in Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1853. 12mo. pp. 527.

It is remarkable that such a number of Commentaries upon this brief and difficult book should have appeared within so short a period, and in places so remote from each other. This circumstance, if it be not purely casual, resulting from the accidental direction of the studies of the individuals whose productions we have before us, would seem to indicate an extensive leaning in the church at present towards the study of the Can-

*G. W. H. Alexander.*

ART. II.—*Curiosities of University Life.*

*Das Akademische Leben des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die protestantisch-theologischen Fakultäten Deutschlands, nach handschriftlichen Quellen:* von A. Tholuck. Halle, 1853, 8vo. pp. 327.

WE could not readily name a recent work more likely to be received with avidity than this, if it were put into English dress. It is prepared almost wholly from sources existing in the manuscripts of university archives. Far from intending to give an abridgment or abstract, we shall content ourselves with culling some of the more striking facts, believing that we shall thus satisfy the rational curiosity of learned readers. And in doing this, we shall freely adopt the language of the learned and excellent author.

The work treats of university life, in the seventeenth century, and especially in the German States; but the writer very often goes back to the days of the Reformation, and even to the middle ages. The university corporation—which derives its name from the *universitas studiosorum, magistrorum*, and not *scientiarum*, as many suppose—had its centre of power in its rector. From the very origin, the rector was invested with a sort of princely dignity. After the close of the fifteenth century, he bore the title of Magnificence. Mencke remarks that in 1715 the city soldiers of Leipsick presented arms at the rector's approach. Where the prince was not rector, there was a pro-rector, who discharged the duties; this may be compared with the chancellor and vice-chancellor of Oxford and Cambridge. When the rector appeared in public, with purple robe, golden chain, and sceptre, it was only the prince and bishop, and not always the latter, who took precedence of him.

Next in order to the rector, was the chancellor. The origin of the office was accidental, from the fact, that in Paris the cathedral chancellor was also superintendent of the high-school.

It is evident, however, that the grand attraction of the university was its teachers. These had certain distinguished pri-

vileges. One was that of jurisdiction; and this not merely in academical, but in civil and criminal matters, and over the professors and their families, as well as over the students. They had rights, also, in regard to appointments. The rule was, that a professor should be nominated by the faculty of arts, and confirmed by the government. There were, however, exceptions in favour of the prince or state. Instructors were exempt from tax, tribute, billeting of troops, and the like. In some countries professors sat with the clergy in the states-general. To a great extent, they possessed the right of censure, in regard to publications.

At a very early date, the rank of professors among themselves was fixed by law. The theological faculty stood first. When they were unanimous, their decision on theological questions was final. Next to the divines came the jurists. Until the peace of Westphalia, all chancellors and privy counsellors were taken from their number. The philosophical or artistic faculty ranked lowest. Many feuds arose about the standing of doctors in certain higher faculties over professors of a lower order.

The distribution of professors into ordinary and extraordinary, is well known in Germany, and had its beginning very early, being found at Königsberg in 1545. Extraordinary professors had no stipend from the regular sources. Their relation to the faculty varied in different places. Next came the adjuncts, who in Königsberg stood above the extraordinaries, from whom they were chosen. To these must be added the *Magistri legentes* of the philosophical faculty, who needed no authority but the express consent of the university. In the middle ages, as soon as any one rose Master, he began to teach others. This explains the formula of collation, still common among us. These might be likened to the English tutor, and the modern German *privatdocent*. Special teaching privileges were often conferred on such masters as were eminent for their attainments.

The essential part of the professor's work was always the public lecture. Adam Osiander, in 1677, had five classes daily, at Tübingen, and the great Voetius had eight. Deutschmann and Weickmann at Wittenberg, and Heben-

streit at Jena, in 1696, lectured from six to eleven, and from three to six o'clock, each *una serie*, daily. It is said, but hardly credited, that Löscher read to thirteen classes in a day. These were exempt cases; the average may be set down at two private and four public exercises weekly. To these were added acts, or disputations, at which the professor held the chair. Theological professors were often also ecclesiastical counsellors, and canonical judges. They were likewise called to be superintendents and visitors of gymnasia and other schools. The study-labours of some were extreme and wearing. Luther and Calvin suffered from numerous diseases; Gerhard continually complains of the delicacy of his health; many suffered from the *malum hypochondriacum*, often doubtless identical with our dyspepsia, and from the stone. Amusements were few, but interruptions were many, from christenings, weddings, and the like, which were formal and time-consuming. Every travelling Master called on every professor of note, often staying for hours. Twice a day—it is a rare thing with German professors now—they attended church on Sunday; where, as Gerhard's funeral eulogy declares, this good man "was never seen to go to sleep;" and once a week there was an additional service. Till the close of the century the hospitable usage obtained, of entertaining learned visitors. When Crusius celebrated his eightieth birthday, in 1606, at Tübingen, he invited his colleagues to good cheer at the Golden Sheep. There were, however, not a few, who, as Stolterfoht of Lubeck says of himself, began their day at three in the morning, or who, like Dilherr, inscribed on the study door, "Sta, hospes, nec pulsa, nec turba, nisi major vis cogat!"

These pages contain new and valuable matter concerning the sustentation of professors. In early times, as in the first universities of Italy, the provision was very irregular, and chiefly from fees. But if we regard the small number of hearers, the emolument for lecturers was considerable—cases being known, in the thirteenth century, of from three hundred to four hundred and fifty dollars of our money for a single lecture. After the Reformation, most professors in theology, law and medicine, had some other employments, which in part sustained them. The stipend of German professors was

small. In Wittenberg, the professor of poetry, in 1536, had eighty gulden (each of twenty-one good groschen;) and in 1728 the whole income of a professor of philosophy was about two hundred and fifty rix-dollars. In 1556 the highest theologians at Wittenberg received two hundred gold gulden. In 1662, Meisner, at the same place, had five hundred florins. The receipts of Calixtus, at Helmstadt, in 1637, were five hundred rix-dollars, of Horneius four hundred. In Strasburg, there were theological chairs in 1622 which brought fifteen hundred florins. But the poor literati had many expenses. The houses of professors were proverbially prolific, and Fiebigger wrote a book, *De Polytekniâ Eruditorum*. Hülsemann of Leipsick had ten children; Meisner, who died at forty-three, as many; Martini fifteen; Calovius thirteen; Mayer thirteen; Micrälius fifteen; Walther fourteen, and Winkelmann eighteen. For the supply of necessities many of these learned men had donations and perquisites, which supplemented their slender salaries. All collations of degrees brought something in. Solemn opinions on controverted questions, when demanded, were followed by an honorarium. Dedications of books to great men were means of invoking golden showers, greater or smaller. The first volume of Gerhard's *Loei*, inscribed to Oxenstierna, brought him fifty ducats; for the fifth, dedicated to the Hanse towns, he received twenty-nine gulden. For a dedication to Gotha, he had two Hungarian ducats, and from Leipsick a gilt pitcher. Calixtus in the same way obtained from Duke Frederick Ulrich a hundred rix-dollars. Pfeiffer, for his *Dubia Vexata*, four hundred rix-dollars from George III.; Jacobäus a hundred ducats from the elector of Brandenburg. Whether authorship, properly so called, was lucrative in many cases, remains doubtful. Professors, moreover, took boarders into their families, and thus eked out their support. Boarding was one rix-dollar a week, and lodging eight rix-dollars a half year. Theological teachers often had, besides, their churches or lectureships. On a view of the whole matter, therefore, the instructors of that day may be considered to have been at least as well off as their successors in our own.

The great subject of university lectures must not be omitted.

These were called *lectiones*, not because they were always wholly read, but because their basis was a text-book, which was read; hence *textum legere* and *lectionem habere* were convertible phrases. The object of the lecture was to prepare students for the examination for degrees. Accordingly, we find decrees, forbidding professors to lengthen out their course beyond the ordinary term. Public lectures were in the *collegium*; private lectures *intra privatos parietes*. In 1575, the collegial buildings of Altdorf comprised five professors' houses, the libraries, the auditoriums, the anatomical theatre, the convent-hall, the alumneum, the laboratories, the observatory, the *œconomia*, the lodge of proctors, and the prison. The average of lectures daily read by any one is in this part of the book set down by Tholuck at three. The ordinary professor was held to four lectures in a week. Saturday was disputation-day; Thursday was bathing-day. The morning was the season for the more important courses; and generally the older professors came first. But day began early in the sixteenth century. Von Osse, a jurist, about 1540, tells of lectures at five in the morning; to prepare for which, there were students who rose at two and three o'clock. In Heidelberg, professors lectured, by statute, from six to eight. In the seventeenth century, eight or nine seems to have been thought early enough.

Then, as now, there was diversity in the manner of delivering the lecture. As we have said already, it was not always read. The phrase for lecturing was, with reference to the text, *legere librum*. The statutes of Bologna expressly forbade the dictation of expositions; and in Cologne, it was enjoined in 1392, "Si in lecturis schedulis memorialibus uti contingat, discrete hoc fiat et honeste." The statutes of Erfurt, in 1633, say much the same, to wit; that the professor offer nothing from manuscript, in the way of dictating any thing to be written down, but *ore tenus vel penitus memoriter*, or from memorandums brought from home, communicate his instructions. Nevertheless, both in Romish and Protestant universities this method of dictation obtained wide currency. It seems to have been introduced by the Jesuits, whose rules enjoined a dictation of formal propositions. In the sixteenth century this mode was so fixed at Padua, that the young men used to send

their *famuli* to take down the lectures. The same was the way at Paris. In Heidelberg, it was allowed to bachelors *dictare ad pennam*. The degrees of rigorous adherence to this were however various. Among the manuscripts of Andrea occur Commentaries on the epistles, *dictati ad calamum*. Meisner's *Pia Desideria* were published in 1679, exactly from the *Heft*, or note-book of the student.

From about this time extemporaneous lectures appear to be the exception. "When I was sixteen years old," says Schuppe of Marburg, "and had gone through my year of freshman—fagging (of which more presently,) I attended lectures on oratory by a famous jurisconsult. I took down diligently all that he dictated, and when I went home engrossed the same, underscoring what pleased me with red and green ink. When I afterwards came to another university, I visited the celebrated orator Fuchsius, who had been the amanuensis of Keckermann. He saw my *Heft*, read it, and said, 'If you have the Rhetoric of Dietericus and Keckermann by you, I will show you that all this is taken out of it, word for word.'" In 1662, the Tübingen visitation censures Wagner for dwelling too long on one topic, and dictating whole treatises. In 1644, Cundisius says, that "to deliver all memoriter is not edifying; that he therefore dictates, with occasional free remark." In 1649, it is ordained that the student shall not be overburdened with too much writing. In 1653, there is a statute against too rigid dictation, and the delivery of long commentaries, which the teacher may afterward publish in a volume.

The polemic temper of the times led some professors to dwell for a whole term on some single head of controversy. These dissertations formed the folios and quartos of that day. According to Æneas Sylvius, one Haselbach of Vienna lectured two and twenty years on the first chapter of Isaiah, and had not got through at the time of his death. Ulrich Pregizer, chancellor at Tübingen, began lecturing on Daniel, March 27, 1620, and ended his three hundred and twelve lectures thereupon, August 23, 1624. On the day last named he assaulted Isaiah, which occupied him twenty-five years, in fifteen hundred and nine lectures. On the day of ending these, he fell upon Jeremiah, and expounded the former half in four hundred

and fifty-nine lectures, April 10, 1656, "on which day, being eighty years old, he slept in the Lord." Stümperwerk is reported by Spener as a *monstrum prolixitatis*; he spent a year on the first nine chapters of Isaiah. In 1655, Lyser, of Wittenberg, had been some years upon Job. Of both Rungius and König it is known that they spent their whole professional life upon Genesis. Against these abuses there were perpetual edicts of the authorities. Thus in 1614, at Wittenberg, no professor shall lecture on one chapter more than three or four days, nor on one locus in theology more than sixteen days; this was comforting. After the middle of the century, we find a growing disposition to suppress theological subtleties. In the Italian universities it was not unusual, nor is it now, for the lecture to be interrupted by questions from the student. Repetition of lectures, or what in some medical schools is known as 'quizzing,' was considered the *nervus instructionis*. This took place during the last quarter of the hour, or in the evening, or next day. In Tübingen there were repetents, called *Resumptores*. In some universities it was the rule that the hearers should be strictly catechized upon the foregoing lecture.

Curious notices are given, of this as well as the preceding century, respecting the diligence of professors. The old Erfurt statutes of 1447 complain of Masters who have prebends, and yet neglect their work; and enjoin on such to lecture thrice a week. In Helmstadt, 1614, the duke speaks of some who passed twenty weeks without giving a lecture. A letter from the same place, in 1619, names the professors "a swarm of drones." In 1698, Metzger writes from Tübingen: "I know not what to say of my studies. We cannot really learn theology, for there are no lectures, and hence no learning, except from books. Why then do we come to college? Our friend Förtsch, who alone merits the name of professor thus far, reads upon philosophy and morals; in a word, we live in perpetual sloth. In this whole semester there have been only six public lectures." In Jena, one writes to the government: "Musaeus has not lectured for thirty weeks; having his work against Wedelius in hand, he may have been hindered." The climax of *far niente* is attained by Sagittarius, who writes thus:



“From last winter till the end of August 1681, I have read no lectures; first, from dread of the plague, which scattered all my hearers and their messmates except one; then from being busy day and night on the Catalogue, then absent in Carsbad, then again on the Catalogue. I have not purposely omitted any lecture, but sometimes the severe illness of my wife and my own hypochondria have prevented. I began to note in my calendar how often this happened, but gave it up, lest reading it over should renew my grief.” Sometimes a horse-market afforded an excuse, as Tscherning of Rostock sings in 1650:

Cras plurimus frequensque  
 Illic et hic equiso,  
 Illic et hic agaso . . .  
 Quis ergo, quis doceret,  
 Quis hoc die doceret  
 Tot inter et caballos!

Numerous holidays, even after the Reformation, gave opportunity to intermit duty. Against this laxity, the government enacted penal statutes, and inflicted fines for neglecting to lecture. Notwithstanding all that is here said, there are very few theological professors of that age, who did not publish something. Many of them had good libraries. In 1665 the library of the younger Buxtorf brought 1200 rix dollars, and in 1660, that of Bosius of Jena, 6000 rix dollars. There were certainly many men devoted to their calling, such as Muso of Rinteln, whose motto was, “*Professorem oportet laborantem mori.*”

But what shall we say of the diligence of students? In 1600, Cothmann, professor at Rostock, beseeches the students to attend at least one lecture in the week. We must not forget, among the causes of irregularity, the custom of travelling from one university to another, of which something shall be added below. This was very delightful to young nobles, and men of wealth, who came with horses and servants. In the Basle annals of 1584, we read: “The Brandenburg nobleman, Bernhard Schulenberg, came *studiorum causa* with servants and three horses.” In the Tübingen visitation report of 1608, it is related, that “young *nobiles studiosi* attend no lectures, and are not enrolled by the dean

of faculty; professing that they come, not to study, but to visit the university." Meisner of Wittenberg, in the funeral discourse upon Hutter, says: "He heard more lectures from Pappus at Strasburg, than one in a hundred of you now hear. For most choose to be self-taught, and account it a disgrace to be among learners. Let a man (say they) stay in his study, and leave public lectures to novices." In 1644, Professor Richter of Jena writes: "Some hold it to be disgraceful to go to lecture, or study hard; and this deters others." In 1696, Bachmann complains: "The lectures are not diligently attended; there is many a one who says, 'I am not at Jena for the sake of study.'"

But the instances are not all of this kind. Meisner, at the age of nineteen, at Wittenberg, is reproached by his friend, that he will not leave his studies long enough to write a letter. The celebrated chancellor Hoe of Wittenberg, thus writes: "As my children wonder that I should have studied in three different faculties within the term of four years, let them know, that often for two or three days I had not a warm morsel in my mouth. Many a night I did not go to bed, but read and wrote continually, so that the devil has sometimes blown out my light, made a racket in my room, and stormed me with books." And young Erick Calixtus writes from Altdorf, in 1648: "I am especially devoting myself to the formation of a Latin style, for which purpose I am reading the letters of Cicero and Pliny; adding the endeavour to ground myself more deeply in Greek. If I had opportunity for Hebrew, I would not neglect it. Hackspan the Orientalist teaches Syriac and Arabic. Besides, I am zealously pursuing the study of history, and attend also to its 'two eyes,' geography and chronology. I have also begun a *repetitorium* of logic, and mean to turn my attention to ethics. Felbiger expounds the metaphysical conclusions of Horneius, which, however, I am afraid to attend, because I lack the necessary preparation. I also give myself to the study of the Scriptures and of personal piety. In short, I will earnestly strive to show myself pious toward God, discreet toward man, and diligent in my studies." No better account could be given than that of Bert, concerning the young men of Leyden: "Tantum fuisse juven-

tutis in literis et sapientiæ studio contentionem, tantam in doctores reverentiam, tantum zelum atque impetum pietatis, ut vix major esse potuerit."

In the olden time, the professor entered his auditorium with the doctor's cap, *biretum*, and in clerical robes. Red cloaks were known in some places as a university costume. Pointed beard and moustache were also common; after the middle of the century wigs became more in use. On the professor's entrance, the students rose respectfully. They used also to raise the cap at the mention of certain honourable names. In some universities the hour was opened and closed with prayer. The tone of the lecture was commonly that of books, but the learned men did not always forbear jesting. Towards the end of this century, we begin to discern traces of a scurrility which was afterwards more common. The lectures were thus far exclusively in Latin. In Rostock, students spoke Latin, even when summoned before the Senate. The earliest theological lectures in German were read by Buddeus, in the eighteenth century. The student-garb of the early seventeenth century had something of a Spanish air; a three-cornered *biretum*, flowing locks, neck bare to the shoulders, great linen ruff, a cloak which was most modish when long, slashed trunk-hose, short, broad-flapped boots, and sword or dagger, with huge figured hilt. Beards had been forbidden, but crept into use. In 1510, the Frankfort authorities declared themselves against effeminate curling of the hair. Meyfart describes the student, during the time of the thirty-years-war, "with sword, feather, boots, spurs, collar, and scarf over the breast and left shoulder; a twisted pigtail behind, a slashed doublet, and a short cloak, which does not hide the parts which all respectable people cover." After the middle of the century, we must add a full-bottomed periwig. Besides the sword, the older students of this period carried sticks into the lecture-room. In 1679, it was matter of censure for the student to appear before a professor without his cloak. In Holland, professors of theology wore a long cloak with sleeves, and students went to church and lectures in morning-gowns. The same slovenliness began to manifest itself in Germany, towards the close of the century. A Jena protocol of 1696 says: "From the time that

Pennalism was abolished, there was a great decline in manners, and no student appeared in a cloak." Sometimes they had morning-gowns under their mantles, or went to meals *sans culottes*. Even in polished Leipsick, the complaint, in 1702, 1713, and 1719, is that students go about in gowns and night-caps, smoking tobacco. When Gebauer, the law professor, went from Leipsick to Göttingen, he insisted that the young men should be uncovered during lecture, but could not bring it about. If a Pennal, or freshman, came to a lecture, which was seldom allowed, it was only on condition that he appeared ragged and dirty, and without stick or sword. Each faculty had its respective auditorium. These were sometimes very cold; indeed the warming of public rooms had not yet become common, even in Germany.

The good and evil morals of the times reflected themselves in the little sphere of university life. Before the thirty-years-war, there was partly sobriety and partly rudeness; afterwards a general relaxation, except where religion was revived, as it was extensively from 1650 and onwards. We have already spoken of one professional delinquency, the neglect of public lectures. Among other prevalent faults were ambition, envy, and quarrelsomeness. In the former part of the century there were beautiful instances of harmony and warm friendship among learned men. The Wittenberg professors were a remarkable instance. Meisner, Franz, and Martini, are represented as living like brothers. Not less pleasing is the picture of the "three Johns," at Jena—John Gerhard, John Major, and John Himmel. Leipsick and Tübingen were also in peace. As might be expected, some exceptions are noticed. But the contrast is great, in the latter half of the century. In 1665, it became necessary to warn professors not to use their chairs for the abuse of living or dead colleagues. There was professor against professor, and faculty against faculty. Tübingen lost students, because of quarrels among its theologians. Tobias Wagner was the champion of the day. The terrible quarrels at Königsberg became widely notorious. In the Reformed universities, the contests between Cartesians and Voetians were very bitter. The younger Alting and Maresius lived at Franeker, under the same roof, yet without exchang-

ing words. Steubing says of Herborn, "the whole school was not only rent into factions, but one professor against another. They not only stung one another in lectures, wherever they could, but had brawls before the government." As the dreaded Pietism began to influence one and another, these strifes and bickerings took on more meanness and more bitterness. The Leipsick *Acta publica* have this record: "On the 15th and 17th of June, the superintendent and our college Ittig vituperated me (Olearius) and Dr. Rechenberg, and called us the *eruca*, infecting with its poison the noble rose-garden of the grace of God. For our doctrine concerning the *terminus gratiæ*, parents were restrained from sending their sons to Leipsick." At other places, the instances of mutual complaint and crimination are very numerous. They even lashed one another in sermons. Complaint was made of Danzius at Jena, that he had offered to give fifty gulden to a soldier, if he would cut off the nose and ears of Hebenstreit.

The ransacking of old manuscripts by Tholuck has brought out many unsavoury things in the private morals of professors. Duke Julius warned the Helmstadt faculties not to nominate to him any "guzzling professors." In 1609, Lavater says of Professor Eglin of Marburg: "Eglin is so deep in debt that he could not satisfy his creditors if he were to coin every hair on his head into a ducat. As Paræus writes, he gave such offence during his late sojourn at Heidelberg, that they wished him to go back to Marburg, so as not further to scandalize the young students." Meyfart writes of professors, about the middle of the century, "who gormandized and tiddled with the academic youth, and danced in halls and gardens." In Tübingen, a visitation decree of 1652 charges certain professors with card-playing. The people of the Palatinate were given to good things, especially to Neckar and Moselle wine. *Palatino more bibere* became a proverb. Hebenstreit complains of Danzius, as above, "that he had been so drunken, that he lost his senses and lay along on the earth, . . . and had to spend the night in the alehouse." It is true, Danzius alleges in his answer, that "it was against his will." These degrading instances, however large a place they occupy in the recovered documents of that day, must nevertheless be re-

garded as painful exceptions. There were not a few who, in addition to learning, possessed gifts and graces which were a blessing to their pupils; such were Meisner, Franz and Martini, at Wittenberg; Gerhard, Himmel, Glassius and Chemnitz, at Jena; the Tarnovii, the Quistorps and Lütkemann, at Rostock; Helvicus at Marburg; Schmid at Strasburg, and Hafenreffer at Tübingen.

As the universities owed their prosperity entirely to the students who chose to frequent them, certain privileges were allowed to the young men. They were not, generally, amenable to the municipal courts. They were free from taxes on their books and other effects. They had the right to remove noisy workmen from the neighbourhood of their chambers. They had liberty in regard to fishing and hunting, as is still the case at Marburg and Göttingen.

Great honour was bestowed on the clerical profession and those who were preparing for it. This was an inducement for men to bring up their sons to the church; and by a sort of levitical descent, certain families, as, for instance, those of Musäus, Lyser, Olearius and Osiander, have had an unbroken succession of ministers for two hundred years. In the Fabricius family, five brothers and two sons were clergymen at the same time. At the beginning of the Reformation, there was a scarcity of preachers, but in the seventeenth century they were multiplied to excess. Some remained till the age of forty, looking for a charge.

Melancthon went to the university at thirteen; but this was regarded as an exception. The age of seventeen was more usual, as in the case of Calixtus, Hulsemann, Dorsche and Calovius; König and Ernst Gerhard were entered at sixteen; Affelmann and Hedinger at fifteen; Helvicus, Henry Hulsius, Reland and M. Pfaff, at thirteen; John Buxtorf at twelve, and William Lyser and Henry Dauber at ten. Helvicus, on being matriculated in 1581, turned Cato's distichs into Greek verse, and at fifteen put the Sunday gospels into Hebrew; and when he commenced as Master, in his nineteenth year, had read all the Greek historians, orators and tragedians. Dauber held Hebrew disputations under Pasor, at the age of eleven. In his thirteenth year he held a *collegium hebraicum*. At eight-

een he was professor of law. Drusius says of a son, who died nine years old: "I have lost a son, my only one, and therefore dearest to me, on whom all my hopes rested, who—to omit other things—had made such progress in the oriental tongues, that I may say his equal was not in Europe. Many, both in England and the low countries, who were acquainted with him, know that I speak the truth. In his fifth year, he began to learn, besides Latin, the Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac. In his seventh year he could read the Hebrew Psalter fluently. Two years later he could read unvocalized Hebrew, and knew, beyond many rabbins, the system of points."

The word *deposition* indicates the strange ceremonial to which the newcomer was subjected on assuming the academic yoke. It is wonderful to observe how widely a custom of this kind has obtained among various classes of men, on land and sea. It was thought necessary that the matriculate should come to his rights through humiliation. Similar vexations are traceable to the Greek schools of philosophy. They existed in the universities before the Reformation. The freshman, or "fox," as he is called in Germany, was known at Paris as a *bec jaune*, in Latin *beanus*. He was regarded as "pecus campi, cui, ut rite ad publicas lectiones praearetur, cornua deponenda essent;" and hence the term *deposition*. As early as 1543, we find these initiations at Prague to have been very formidable. The chief rite consisted in the laying off of the horns attached to an ox-hide, thrown over the novice. The following verses belong to the service on the occasion:

Beanus iste sordidus,  
Spectandus altis cornibus,  
Ut sit novus Scholasticus  
Providerit de sumptibus.

Signum fricamus horridum,  
Crassum dolamus rusticum,  
Curvum quod est, deflectimus,  
Altum quod est deponimus.

In substance, these annoyances prevailed at all the universities. At Tübingen, the ceremonies were conducted by older students; at Strasburg, Heidelberg, Erfurt and Jena, by the *famulus communis*. We have an account of the process as

observed at Strasburg in 1671. The Bacchants, or students, appear in procession, under the command of the Depositor-in-chief. The hair of the Beanus is removed with an enormous pair of shears; his ears are cleansed with a stick; a tooth, called the bacchant-tooth, is extracted; his nails are rasped with an enormous file, each act being accompanied with an appropriate address. After which comes the hand-kissing, and libation of wine on the head, with a grand banquet and jollification. In some places there were interspersed mock examinations of the candidate, who was boxed on the ear for his wrong answers. Serious men protested against these enormities, especially as they took place even when a student changed his university. Putsch, the celebrated editor of Sallust, went to Jena from Leyden, and then to Leipsick; at the last mentioned place he had to endure the *depositio*. At Heidelberg there was talk of abating this nuisance as early as 1600. In 1636, Schmid of Strasburg wrote against it. But it was not done away until the next century; and it existed at Jena in 1726, and at Erfurt in 1733.

It may be interesting to inquire what there was in the German universities answering to our college foundations, scholarships, and education-funds. In Wittenberg, about 1564, the Elector Augustus made a foundation for a stipend of between forty and a hundred gulden, every four years, for twenty-seven students; this was raised to a hundred and fifty in 1577. At Tübingen, Marburg, Rostock, Heidelberg, Altdorf, and Basle, there were like provisions. These beneficiaries were subjected to many special rules, derived from the monkish age. They were restricted as to their board and exercise. They were allowed to indulge to a certain extent in music. They might be beaten with rods.

The manner of living in learned institutions before the Reformation, was very much like that of the English universities. Noblemen and some others were allowed for special reasons to lodge out of the precincts; but the contrary rule prevailed with most undergraduates. The same was true in the earliest period of the Reformation. But it soon became more common to live in the town. Some good men bewailed the innovation, and especially the disuse of the rule, that no student should be



without his tutor. Osse, in 1556, mentions the diminution of students at Leipsick from sixteen hundred to three hundred and fifty, and ascribes it to the dissatisfaction of parents, who no longer felt that there was any proper guardianship over their sons.

The period necessary in order to the successive degrees, varied at different schools. In Paris, it was two years for baccalaureate, three years for mastership; to which add five years attendance on theological lectures; a ten years curriculum for churchmen. The term for theologians at Tübingen, seems to have been a quinquennium. The same in Holland. Stipendiaries at Marburg studied, at first seven, afterwards five years. Some, however, remained ten years, but the majority about five.

The grand elements of university life in those days were lectures, disputations, and public speeches. Of public lectures we have already made mention. Private lectures were less common than in modern German instruction. The great reliance was on private exercises and disputations. "The students," says Meyfart, "come rarely to the public halls, when there are lectures, but hang about the doors. Sometimes they resort to a *disputatorium*, with their fellows, and then send home their theses with a dedication to their parents." The middle-age method of learning every thing by rote, found its antagonism in free disputation. Before the fourteenth century, it was customary at Paris for the Masters to dispute among themselves once a week in presence of the students, and once a year more publicly in church. In the fifteenth century, Bachelors disputed, under the presidency of the Masters. "They dispute"—so wrote Vives, in 1531, "before meals, at meals, and after meals; they dispute publicly, privately, everywhere, and always." The polemic character of the Reformation times modified, but did not abolish this dialectical pugnacity. Saturdays were commonly devoted to this exercise. In the Reformed Universities of Holland, these methods were equally prevalent. In 1645, Duve writes to Calixtus, from Franeker: "Quamvis continuum illud disputandi exercitium, quod hic quidem inolevit, ut in eo proram ac puppim, imo ipsam theologiæ animam colloquent, haud magnam mihi spem in animo meo excitet alicujus

προκοπής." Voetius, in his theological method, prescribes a weekly disputation. The Heidelberg statutes of 1588 enjoin two public disputations for theologians; those of 1672, four. At Marburg they were half-yearly. In Herborn, an act was to be held every Saturday, by each professor in his turn. Similar exercises were held by the philologists, and Greek debates were not uncommon. Helvicus introduced Hebrew debates into Marburg and Giessen. Tholuck detects charlatanry in Pfaff's advertisement of Samaritan disputations. It was said of Dilherr, at Jena, that he could dispute in eight languages. The grossest scurrilities were sometimes uttered. But the whole thing came to its close; and what remains of university debate in Germany, is "only the tattered fragment of an ancient court-dress."

Take with us a glimpse of the way in which good men two hundred years ago desired that their sons should deport themselves at college; we make one extract from the counsels of the Chancellor Anton Wolf of Darmstadt, in 1630. "Instructions for my beloved son, Eberhard Wolf, how with God's compassionate help he shall conduct himself in his expected two-years absence from home: 1. Every morning when he has risen from bed, and has combed, washed, and dressed himself, let him humbly fall on his knees before his Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, and earnestly send up his prayers with a flame of true devotion and deepest humility; also every day, without failure or forgetfulness, let him use that prayer which I composed and sent with him to Marburg, adding my blessing, weak and futile in itself, but mighty through Christ. 2. After morning prayer, let him read or hear at least one psalm of David, in order to keep in constant and strong recollection the Psalter, which in his tender youth he learned entirely by heart. 3. After the psalm, let him read or hear one or two chapters of the Bible. 4. The same should he do, not only when he rises in the morning, but also in the evening, before he goes to bed. 5. In addition, let him sometimes during the day, retire and cast himself on his knees, and seriously address himself to heaven, in some such wise as I have prescribed on the *Quasimodogeniti* Sunday, last passed.

6. Let him peruse all *disputationes theologicas*, and then attend and listen to them; but when more than one is holden in a month, he may omit all but one, so as not to abstract too much time from the *studio juris*. 7. Let him hear two sermons on Sunday, and one in the week; but in addition, on Sunday, and on Saturday towards evening, let him turn over some fine book of prayers, postills, or theological treatises, and during the same hours complete the second perusal which he has begun of the *Locorum theologorum Hafnenfferi*. 8. And it is my particular desire, that at least every quarter, he should devoutly approach the Lord's table; also that he accustom himself diligently to observe all Sundays and feast-days, employing them solely for the improvement of piety, by prayer, reading, hearing, singing, or conversation. 9. All the forenoon hours of the whole week, Sunday excepted, and the afternoons of three days, should he, after devotion and reading of the Bible, bestow *solo juris studio*. 26. For one half year, let him daily for one hour go to the dancing-school, and the year following, to the fencing-school; but if there be no dancing-master at Jena, let him attend to the fencing without the dancing," etc., etc.

The state of morals and religion was outwardly better in the universities of the seventeenth century than at a later day. This may be inferred from what is said by Francke, in his *Timotheus*, that the young men generally attended to the forms even of private devotion. Here and there we meet with a beautiful instance of something more, especially of professors who cared for the souls of their pupils. Such was Schmid of Strasburg. Read the testimony of Lütke-*mann*, a pupil, in a letter to him, in 1644: "In pectore mihi intime versaris, mi pater, qui si me non de novo generasti, ad novum hominem non parum contribuisti. Felicem prædico diem, quo Argentinam ingressus duos nactus sum duces, unum, ut essem philosophus, alterum, ut essem *Dei servus*. Mysterium revelarem, nisi turpe esset multa de se et illo quocum loqueris (dicere); non tamen mentirer, si Deum voluissem laudare, tuque unitatem quandam spiritus cerneres. Nolo quidquam dare auribus. Non tamen negare debeo, si me ministro pietas apud nos hic tabernaculum figat, necnon ad alios extendat, post Deum tibi

debere, qui pietatis semen mihi in manum tradideris." This good man was a teacher of philosophy, as well as a preacher. His maxim was, "I would rather save one soul, than make a hundred learned." He was the instructor of H. Müller, who became the spiritual father of so many children. Under the Spenerian revival, conversions became more common among the learned youth.

But there was a dark side to the picture; though Tholuck warns us against judging of the mass by the instances which he collects. Much of the rudeness belonged to the times. The wars of the period carried evil influences into the seats of learning. The contemporary writers are loud in complaints of the violence which prevailed among students. The first outbreak of this was naturally against the *Philisterium*, a slang-latin term for the townsmen or canaille. A Helmstadt protocol of 1696 relates, that a wedding was invaded by students; the beer was all drunk up, people were smitten on the ribs, and some were wounded with swords. The same year, a poor fellow complains to the Jena deputies, that he had been assaulted by a gownsman, so that he kept his bed for a year. About 1665, there was founded at Helmstadt a *societas venatica*, which held forth among other offices that of hunting down and vexing the brutes of townfolk. "Grassationes nocturnæ, et vociferationes, ululatus et rugitus studiosorum," appear as standing charges of edicts against university-men. In Wittenberg, the gravamina were, "clamores vix humani," and "obsœnæ cantiones." The worship of churches was interrupted by profane and obstreperous behaviour. In Reideburg, near Halle, they ascended the pulpit during church-time, played on bagpipes, and dragged women out of the pews to dance. In Helmstadt, they came to afternoon service and put out the singers by their discordant noises. In Strasburg, they would sit in tap-houses during Sabbath hours, filling the neighbourhood with the din of their wassail. Duels and even murders are mentioned. The Marburg Annals of 1619 speak of it as a favour, that the year has passed without any one being slain. The enactments against hard drinking show how widely it prevailed. The work before us contains numerous

statements of thefts by students. A common song ascribes a certain climatic character to the university vices.

“ Wer von Tübingen kommt ohne Weib,  
 Von Jena mit gesunden Leib,  
 Von Helmstädt ohne Wunden,  
 Von Jena ohne Schründen,  
 Von Marburg ungrefallen,  
 Hat nicht studirt auf allen.”

The evils of university life were greatly fostered by those combinations or sodalities, often connected with national origin, which in some shape have continued even until our times. The youth of one kingdom or state were banded together, and came into frequent collision with those of another. It was a custom of early origin and wide prevalence. The “four nations” of the University of Paris came at length to be subdivided into provinces. In 1559, at Tübingen, the Poles and the Prussians had their respective brotherhoods. The Heidelberg Annals of 1610 make mention of a tumult between French and German, as also between Silesian and Swiss students. These *Landsmannschaften* often proved too strong for the authorities.

Out of these associations sprang the hideous evil of *Pennalismus*, the terror of the age. The word denotes that peculiar tyranny which was exercised over freshmen and novices, to which the fagging of English public schools is a trifle, and of which every trace has long ago disappeared in America. We have already noted the vexations which awaited matriculates, on their entering the university. Unfortunately the troubles of the newcomer did not end here. We read of *bejauniis*, of mulcts to which the *bees-jaunes* were subjected at Paris. That the thing was well understood in Germany appears from Hoe’s autobiography: “I made my deposition of the horns,” says he, “not at Wittenberg, but at Vienna in 1592, and therefore had already accomplished my pennalismus.” As time went on, the exactions from the *beanus*, or fox, became more and more brutal. After the matriculation supper, the novice was attached to some senior student as his *famulus*, a term familiar to readers of Faust. In some universities our poor client was truly a body-servant of his patron, called him master, waited at meals, followed him abroad, cleaned his shoes, and moreover

was liable to extortions in the way of clothing, books and money. At length, he was bound to go poorly clad, on the ground that his best clothes belonged to the master. The pennals had their separate place in the lecture-room, and were expected to do service in all bacchanal orgies in town and country. These excesses have been known to take place even in professors' houses; and some bear witness that the abuse was especially encouraged by the theological faculty. The term of pennialistic subjugation was nicely fixed to one year, six months, six weeks, six days, six hours, and six minutes. This accomplished, the fox was to go to the individual members of his national society, to receive absolution from each; then the absolution-supper, the collation of right to wear the sword, hitherto withheld, and at last the wished-for consummation, when, from having his hair burnt, he became a *brand-fox*.

Two celebrated men, Schuppe, and the author of Philaudec von Sittenwald, are cited in regard to this system of fagging. "When I was come to the university," says the former, "there visited me some right worshipful Pennal-masters, during my term of subjection. Seeing that I had in my hand the *Horæ subsecivæ* of Camerarius, they cried, 'See here what a grand pennal, to be reading big books! My little pennal, dost thou know what thou readest?' I was abashed, and made a low bow. Then one of them came to me: 'Have you any cash?' 'No,' said I. 'Then,' replied he, 'you must send the Camerarius to the wine-shop, and fetch two quarts of wine; I will then give you good help.' I accordingly sent my Camerarius and my Sunday cloak, and begged the publican to wait till I could write to my father. The burgomaster Lünker, an honest German, was in the shop, and, turning over the volume, saw what I had written in the margin, and said to the maid, 'This must be a fine learned gentleman who has been reading this book;' and then to the host, 'Let him have what he wants.' I did my service as reverently as if I had been page to the duke of Friedland, thinking if I gave too little tribute, I should hear the dreadful sentence, 'Let the brute go hang.'"

At their orgies, as described by Moscherosch, they went to every excess of roystering, with various tricks and injuries put upon the freshmen, who were forced to partake of a horrid

mixture from a covered vessel; its contents are noted in a Jena programme of 1638; "ex farciminum panis, laterum frustulis, sale, luto, bolum quendam confectum et novitiorum ori ita intrusum, ut ex gingivis sanguis proflueret, nuper non sine justa indignatione percepimus." This monstrous usurpation seems to have taken its rise in the seventeenth century. The Jena programme, touching its abolition, speaks of it as having existed for fifty years. Early in the century many edicts were fulminated against it. Jena was the most notorious for the rigour of its pennialism. In 1649, Schmid writing to Hülsemann about his son, says he was frightened away from this university "ob dissolutos commilitonum mores et insultationes, quibus excipi solent illius scholæ proselyti." About 1630 there began a general coalition for putting it down. Great joy broke forth when the work was at length accomplished. In Wittenberg the rector says in 1661: "The situation of our university," writes Dortmayer, "is wonderfully changed from what it was, as the 'servitia, exactiones, symbola, nationes, omniaque vexandi nomina' are abolished." This, however, did not infer the dissolving of all national combinations; these indeed were formally legalized at Königsberg.

Among the curiosities of university life, from the American point of view, are the travels of German students. Every one who has spent a summer in those countries, will call to mind the groups of young fellows, with sticks and knapsacks, who traverse the land in all directions; but few are aware how much this had become a regular system. In the seventeenth century the *peregrinatio academica* was a necessary part of education. Voetius, in his well known isagogical work, speaks of it as the keystone of theological edification. Dorsche, in 1634, writes of the theologian Westerfeld, "learned as he is—'deest illi academiarum Germaniæ lustratio.'" There are many books on the subject, by Zwinger, Thomasius, Winkler, Lipsius, Fabricius, and Erpenius.

Before the seventeenth century the method was to study at several universities. Young men went in numbers to Paris, and many, chiefly for medicine, to Padua. It was not unusual to go to four, or even seven different schools. Some examples may be worthy of note. Rist, of Holstein, went to Rinteln,

Rostock, Leipsick, Utrecht, and Leyden. Reinboht was two years at Leipsick, five at Jena, then again at Rostock. Michaelis was at Königsberg in 1642, some years at Rostock, then at Greifswald and Copenhagen, and lastly at Leyden. John Fabricius was two years at Rostock, three at Wittenberg, two at Königsberg, three at Leyden under Golius, rose master at Rostock, and then travelled through Denmark, Holstein, and France, returning in 1642. Many Germans went to the universities of Holland. But in the seventeenth century this custom began to give place to the proper university-pilgrimage. It was most regular for this to follow graduation as master, or the call to some profession. Holland, which Calixtus calls the *compendium orbis*, was a favourite object of these wanderings. Richter, the chancellor of Altdorf, thus writes to three young men of Nuremburg, in 1615: "At Leyden you will find a house which is frequented by Nurembergers. Erasmus says truly: *Aliam gentem non esse, quæ vel ad humanitatem vel ad benignitatem sit propensior, quæ ingenium habeat adeo simplex et ab insidiis omnique fuco alienum.* He applauds the cleanliness, in which they surpassed all other people, and adds: *Vix in ulla orbis parte doctorum virorum numerus frequentior quam in illo terræ angulo.*" Next after Holland, England was sought by learned young travellers. The Mecklenburg jurist Willebrand, after a journey to Holland, went in 1637 to England. Lindemann of Rostock, 1634, spent a year in Holland, and six months in England. Schwarz, a Pomeranian polemic, after seven years of study at Wittenberg, was six months at Utrecht, a year at London and Oxford, and a year at Paris. Von Derschow of Königsberg studied in 1635 with Poccocke, then a young man; Mieg, of Heidelberg, was in 1633 and 1644, with Lightfoot. In 1675, Dassov of Kiel studied in Oxford with the Jew Abendana, and Danz resorted to the aged Poccocke in 1683. Paris and even Geneva were much frequented, especially for the acquisition of the French language.

It is a very natural question, how the poor students of that age obtained means for such long journeyings and expensive residences abroad. In the early years of the period, the journey was commonly made in the company of travelling merchants. When Heckermann was recalled, in 1602, from



Heidelberg to Dantzick, he had to remain eight days in Frankfurt, because there was no Dantzick trader there. From Basle to Dordrecht is now a journey of two days. But the four Swiss commissioners in 1618, partly in a four-horse coach, with an armed guard, and partly by water, took twenty-one days, and received from the government two hundred ducats for expenses. Moreover, these peregrinations were not intermitted during the thirty-years-war. The answer to the question is first this: there were in certain universities fixed travelling bounties, as for instance, at Copenhagen to the amount of three thousand rix-dollars. Then there were benefactions of princes, nobles, and other patrons. Calovius received from the Prussian estates three hundred and thirty dollars, for travelling. Winkelmann was sent abroad by his landgrave. Many went as *compagnons de voyage*. In some cases, especially in Holland, the stranger made something by private lessons. But we must withhold our hand, and advise those who need fuller details to resort to the original volume.

*Richard H. Stoddard.*

ART. III.—*Character and Writings of Pascal.*

*Pensées de Blaise Pascal sur la religion, et sur quelques autres sujets.* Paris: Chez Lefèvre, et Compagnie. 1847.

*Lettres écrites à un Provincial, par Blaise Pascal.* Paris: Librairie de Firmin Didot Frères. 1849.

WHAT reader of ecclesiastical annals does not feel a tender interest in the history of the Jansenists; follow their progress through successive years; mark their efforts for the maintenance of the truth; sympathize with them under their sufferings; and view with admiration their heroic constancy?

The author of this kind of schism in the Romish Church was Cornelius Jansenius; at first Professor of Divinity in the University of Louvain, and afterwards Bishop of Ypres—a man of acknowledged erudition, unwearied activity, and fervent piety. The greater part of his life had been devoted to the