THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1847.

No. III.

Art. I.—1. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society*, Vol. I. (East Jersey under the Proprietary Governments. By William A. Whitehead.) pp. 351. 1846. Bartlett & Welford, New York.

2. *The Goodly Heritage of Jerseymen.* The first Annual Address before the New Jersey Historical Society. By the Rt. Rev. George W. Doane, D.D. LL.D. pp. 32. 1846.

3. *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society.* 1845—1846. pp. 204. Newark, 1847.

4. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society*, Vol. II. (The Life of William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Major General in the Army of the United States, during the Revolution. By his Grandson, William Alexander Duer, LL.D.) pp. 292. 1847. Wiley & Putnam, New York.

Seldom has an association of the kind advanced more rapidly in public estimation, or made its existence known in a more acceptable manner within the circle of its influence, than has the New Jersey Historical Society. Although but little more than two years has elapsed since its organization, the publications

charge his obligations, including the debt to the provincial treasury which has been mentioned. The lands were sold and payment received in continental money, then a legal tender; but the rapid depreciation which ensued in that kind of currency, caused a repeal of the "tender law" before the debts could be paid by the commissioners, and the proceeds consequently became valueless. Nothing remained *but the debts*, and to discharge them the rest of his property was sacrificed under legal proceedings of his creditors.

Mr. Duer, says nothing of the personal appearance of Lord Stirling, but from the portrait which the work contains we should form a favourable impression of both his face and figure; his features being well proportioned—his eye penetrating—his forehead full and high—and the whole contour of his head pleasing. This portrait and the several plates of battle grounds add not a little to the appearance of the book, which in typographical execution and tasteful arrangement is creditable to the society under whose auspices it is issued.

Although, as we have remarked, less satisfactory in some respects than we could have wished, we commend the work to those interested in the men and times of which it treats as furnishing much information respecting them not before given to the public.

Art. II.—*German University Education, or the Professors and Students of Germany.* By W. C. Perry. 2d edition. London. 1846.

The rapid multiplication of colleges and universities (so called) among us is not more remarkable than the uniformity of their organization. The literary institutions of the new states are as accurately copied as their civil institutions from the models in the older colonies. We have no more reason to be sure that every new state will have its Governor, Senate, and House of Representatives, than that every new college will be furnished with the usual apparatus of a President, a Board of Trustees, a Faculty consisting of Professors and Tutors, and if possible a

building far beyond the actual or probable necessities of the infant seminary. This last is one of the most curious features in the history of our literary institutions. In no other age or country has the idea of a public seminary been so generally understood to involve that of a building as one of its essential elements. While some of the most famous of the German universities have done their work for ages with scarcely anything that could be called a public edifice, our schools are often crippled in their infancy by a gratuitous expenditure in this way of resources which might have been otherwise applied with tenfold profit. This diversity of usage is connected with the preference of small country villages as seats of learning, where the want of public buildings cannot be so easily supplied as in large towns. As to this last question, there is not a little to be said on both sides, but we cannot enter on it here, and have only mentioned it as furnishing a partial explanation of the difference between American and European usage as to the relative importance and priority of brick and mortar in the creation of a school of learning. It is not yet fifteen years since the only academical structure belonging to the University of Halle was its Library, while all its lectures were delivered either in a large room of the old city weigh-house, or in hired apartments scattered through the town, and some of them inferior to a decent English or American kitchen. Now indeed there is a public edifice both there and in other places where they have been wanting; but the long delay in their erection has no doubt made it possible to provide for wants which could only have been made known by experience. In America, on the contrary, there are probably few cases where a false economy or want of taste in the original erection of such buildings has not prompted the wish that it had been reserved for a later generation.

We have already dwelt too long, however, on a topic which was only introduced at first, as serving to illustrate the remarkable uniformity of method in the institution of our public seminaries. The same poverty of invention is here visible as in the naming of our towns and counties, where, with few exceptions, the incessant repetition of the same familiar names presents a striking contrast with the endless variety which meets the eye on the first glance at a map of the old world. In both cases this perpetual repetition has its origin in early and exclusive associ-

ations. To the great mass even of educated men among us, the only idea of a university or college is that of their Alma Mater, or at most of one or two establishments, so much alike as to confirm rather than correct the prejudice, that what exists in these, perhaps from causes wholly accidental, could not have been otherwise without a change in the very essence of the institution. There are few graduates of our colleges who have ever looked so far into the history of academical institutions in general, as to regard our own established type as only one variety of an extensive and a highly varied genus. This may be ascertained by suggesting to any number of such men successively, the idea of a college without a Board of Trustees or Corporation distinct from the Faculty or resident instructors; or without the usual division into classes; or with any number of such classes except four; or with any names but those of Senior, Junior, Sophomore, and Freshman. We are not now objecting to these long-established and familiar regulations, which, because they are such, if for no higher reason, are entitled to take precedence of all gratuitous innovations. We are only furnishing the reader with a test, by which to satisfy himself that these conventional arrangements are regarded by the multitude of those who have been educated under them, not only as expedient and desirable, but as entering essentially into their very definition of a college or a university. We question whether there are not some of the class described, who would regard as a serious departure from established and tried usage the exchange of the title President for that of Principal as in Canonsburg, or Provost as in Philadelphia; much more the total abrogation of the office, as in Charlottesville.

This blind attachment to our own familiar usages, with all its good conservative effects, may be pernicious, by preventing changes which are really required by local circumstances, and still more extensively by perpetuating rigid uniformity in a matter where, above most others, flexibility and the power of varied adaptation are essential to the full attainment of the end designed. This is emphatically true of our own country, where variety in unessential modes of education seems as necessary as substantial uniformity. It is therefore greatly to be wished that nothing in the habits or the feelings of our educated men should throw any insurmountable difficulty in the way of such variations, where

they are really desirable. Against mere wanton innovation the prejudice of early habit and association will at all times furnish a sufficient safeguard. Believing as we do that in this, as in many other cases, the best remedy for such prepossessions is historical information, we regard with satisfaction every opportunity of gaining or diffusing knowledge with respect to other systems. We shall therefore take occasion from the work now before us, to bring before our readers the principal academical systems of the old world. What we have in view is not statistical details, but those characteristic features which distinguish the systems from each other.

The prevailing type of academical organization in America may readily be traced to the first few colleges established, and especially to Harvard University, Yale College, and the College of New Jersey. William and Mary College, though the second in the order of time, appears to have been wholly without influence in this respect, perhaps because entirely peculiar in its constitution from the very first. The other three, with some variations as to form, present essentially the same organization, which is that of an English college, on a modest scale, and modified to suit the circumstances of the country. The system thus introduced among us and so widely extended since, is therefore the English system, as distinguished from the German. To these two forms may be reduced nearly all the existing varieties of academical organization. They may therefore not improperly be made the subject of our further inquiries; the rather as their distinctive features are so strongly marked as to be easily exhibited in contrast.

It is highly important to observe, however, that these systems now so unlike, and indeed so opposite, can be traced to a common origin. The mother university of Europe was the old University of Paris, an institution altogether different from the modern University of France. In the early history of the former, may be traced the organic changes, which by being pushed to an extreme, have since resulted in the systems designated as the English and the German. By going back to this remote stage of the formative process, we can most effectually ascertain what is common to both, as well as what is characteristic of either.

The old University of Paris, and the others modelled on it at an early period, were extremely simple in their constitution.

The only two essential elements were a body of teachers and a body of learners. Degrees, classes, offices, and buildings, were accidents of later origin. In the first universities, the idea seems to have been, that all should teach who could, and all should learn who would, and as they would. Hence the vast concourse both of teachers and learners in the middle ages, at Paris, Oxford, and Bologna, and other celebrated seats of learning. As the institutions acquired permanence and authority, it became necessary to restrict the right of teaching, by prescribing certain qualifications. This was the origin of degrees, which originally had exclusive reference to the actual functions of a teacher, a design which may still be traced in the titles of Doctor and Magister. Another change which could not fail to be found necessary soon, was a more systematic reference to the training of young men for particular professions. Hence arose the division into Faculties. All these arrangements have been permanent and common to all systems, being equally the ground work of the English and German organizations. In its most mature form, then, a university may be described as necessarily including a body of teachers or professors, divided into four great faculties, with the power of admitting others to the same rank with themselves. It is from this point that we are to trace the subsequent divergence of the different methods now represented in the constitution of the English and German Universities.

The first cause that led to the modification of this system, was one which might have been supposed to threaten no material departure from the primitive simplicity. This was the natural and almost unavoidable attempt to gather the young scholars into houses, where they might be dieted and lodged together, secured from imposition and temptation, and subjected to something like domestic discipline, both of a literary and a moral nature. This arrangement was perhaps rendered peculiarly necessary by the vast numbers and the tender age of those who attended the old universities. The associations thus formed were at first entirely voluntary, differing little in their origin from ordinary boarding-houses. By degrees, however, they assumed more of a regular scholastic form, and this was sometimes rendered permanent by liberal endowments. When the change last mentioned took place, the result was a College in the English sense. Where the same advantages in kind were furnished, but without endow-

ments for the gratuitous support of scholars, the institution was a Hall, according to a distinction still in force at Oxford.

It will be observed that these establishments formed no part of the University properly so called, which would still have been complete if no such conveniences had been superadded to its simple organization. The Professors in their Faculties together with their pupils were the necessary elements of the University. The Colleges and Halls were additional expedients for the safety, comfort, and improvement of the students. But the more these secondary institutions were improved and perfected, the more they threatened to complete and interfere with that on which they were engrafted. The arrangements originally made to assist the younger pupils in their studies under the university professors soon began to aim at something higher, and to operate not in subjection but in opposition to the general system. Appearances of this effect disclosed themselves in Paris at an early date, while other universities acquired a new character, according to the preference which they gave to one or the other of the two conflicting elements. The unbounded munificence of kings and private individuals in England gave to the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, an importance which at last eclipsed that of the older organization; while in Germany the absence of such rich endowments allowed the primitive system to maintain its ground, or rather to attain its full perfection.

This brief historical sketch prepares us for a comparison of the two systems as they are. It will be convenient to begin with what is common to both. The universities of Germany and England are alike then in professing to provide for the instruction of their pupils in the whole circle of literature and science by the agency of regular professors, to whose classes all the matriculated students have access. They are also alike in the power belonging to the university as a corporation, to confer degrees in all the faculties and to prescribe the necessary qualifications and tests. Upon this common basis very different superstructures have been reared. In each of the great English Universities there are some twenty colleges and halls, every one of which may be described as a university in miniature, being more or less perfectly provided with instructors of its own, and with a system of domestic discipline, entirely independent of the rest. Each of these colleges is a distinct corporation, holding its own pro-

perty, sometimes to a vast amount, and governed by its own laws. The bond of union is the reservation to the general body of the power to confer degrees. This renders general examinations necessary, and these perpetually kindle and maintain the emulation of the colleges among themselves. The natural effect of this has been to make the rival institutions exert every effort to increase their means of improvement and attraction to new pupils. But while this has tended to exalt the reputation and the influence of the colleges, it has led to the neglect and deterioration of the general system of instruction by professors. This has indeed at times seemed to retain only a nominal existence, some of the most eminent professors merely going through the form of lecturing as seldom as they could, and often to a handful of indifferent or accidental hearers. The acknowledged cause of this extraordinary change is the gradual substitution of the college course for that once furnished by the university at large; a change recommended and facilitated by the additional advantage of strict discipline and personal supervision, which the colleges hold out, and which the old university system did not afford, either in theory or practice. Here then is one distinctive feature of the English universities, that instead of a general system of instruction for the whole, there has been gradually substituted a number of distinct systems on a smaller scale, belonging to as many different colleges or halls, and only held together by a common dependence on the general body for the honorary close of the whole course of study; while the general system of instruction which once constituted the university itself, though still maintained, is little more than a dead letter or an empty form.

But there is still another marked peculiarity to be described, as even more conspicuously characteristic of the English system. The colleges have hitherto been represented only as schools for the training of young men, in subordination or in opposition to the university properly so called. But this, though certainly the original design of these collegiate institutions, is in fact but one of their actual functions, and in the case of some entirely neglected. The munificent endowments, which have made the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge what they are, were not exclusively intended to provide for the support of young men in the early stages of their education. In strict accordance with the

monastic taste and customs of the age when most of these establishments were founded, the larger part of their endowments was appropriated to the support of men, and for the most part of clergymen, whose education was already finished, and whose lives were to be spent in learned and religious retirement. Out of this number the actual teachers of the colleges are chosen, but they are far too numerous to be all employed in this way, nor is any such necessity imposed upon them. These Fellows constitute the corporations of the several colleges, and are the rulers both of these and of the general body, except in extraordinary cases, when some question of general interest brings together the whole body of graduates to exercise their right of voting, which is usually suffered to lie dormant. So far is the business of instruction from engrossing the whole body of men thus supported at these seats of learning, that some of the most wealthy and magnificent establishments, such as King's College at Cambridge, are almost closed against undergraduates, while others, such as Trinity and St. John's, carry on the business with an intensity of emulation rendered more remarkable by their peculiar local situation, cheek by jowl. Here then is another marked peculiarity of the English system, the possession of the highest academical authority by a large body of educated residents, deriving their support from the endowments of the colleges, but only partially and voluntarily engaged in the work of actual instruction.

Both these peculiarities are absolutely wanting in the German universities. They include no colleges whatever in the English sense. The *seminaria* and other local institutions are entirely different, and in fact form no part of the university. There has been nothing therefore to compete or come in conflict with the body of Professors, which continues, as at first, to constitute the academic corporation. Instead of being thrown into the shade or superseded by any rival class or interest, they still monopolize the whole work of public and authoritative teaching. The changes which experience has introduced into the organization of these great schools, far from tending, as in England, to diminish the importance or to paralyze the action of the university Professors, have tended only to increase their efficiency and dignity by enlisting in the work the greatest possible amount of cultivated talent, and at the same time rigidly excluding not only igno-

rance but mediocrity. The means employed for this end in the German universities are eminently simple and effective. They have often been described, and yet are very frequently misapprehended by American and English readers, on account of their remoteness from our own associations. The plan may perhaps be made intelligible thus. No man, according to the proper German system, can become a regular salaried Professor, without having previously exercised his gifts as a supernumerary titular Professor, recognised as such by the university, but dependent on the patronage of pupils. From this body of Extraordinary Professors, the higher rank of Ordinary teachers is constantly replenished. But even this brevet rank, if such it may be called, can only be attained after previous trial as a private adventurer. The Professors Extraordinary are selected from the body of Privatim Docentes, who are not even titular Professors, but licentiates or aspirants to that dignity. This is not an office to which men are appointed, but an indulgence which they seek, in order to evince their fitness for the business of instruction. An important feature in this whole arrangement is that the inferior ranks of teachers are not confined to any lower function of the didactic office, but permitted to attempt the very highest subjects and to use precisely the same forms and methods with the most illustrious of their superiors. This not only stimulates their powers, but applies the only really decisive test of their capacity to teach. Another circumstance which tends to keep their powers on the stretch, is that the process of promotion, which has been described, is not confined to any single institution, but embraces the whole circle of what may in the strict sense be called German Universities. The man who has succeeded or excelled as a Privatim Docens at Leipzig may be called as a Professor Extraordinarius to Göttingen, and if there successful may become one day a Professor Ordinarius at Berlin. The field thus opened to the young aspirant is of course a very different one from that presented by the rare and slow promotions of a single institution. At the same time, this free circulation through the whole Germanic system may be viewed both as a cause and an effect of the surprising uniformity which marks these institutions, so that a man may pass without inconvenience or the necessity of any change in plan or habit from any one to almost any other of the German universities.

This uniformity of structure and of practice is not owing, like a similar phenomenon among ourselves, to the successive and repeated imitation of a few models. It is rather the result of great simplicity combined with great efficiency in the original idea, which has been so faithfully adhered to, and so fully carried out, in the German universities. These institutions theoretically recognise but one mode of instruction, that of oral inculcation by a living teacher in the presence of his assembled pupils. They are therefore free from that complexity which elsewhere springs from the variety of secondary and auxiliary exercises. All the Professors are as such mere lecturers, and they all lecture very much in the same way. This simplicity of method must have been found, in the experience of ages, highly conducive to important ends; for Germany is certainly the last place where traditional prescription would be suffered to compensate for the absence of intrinsic merit, real or supposed. In a country where opinion is in constant flux, and where mere antiquity is reckoned rather a defect than an advantage, it is not to be supposed that these hereditary methods of instruction would have been so steadfastly maintained, if they had not been proved by long experiment to be the very means required for the full attainment, not of the highest ends perhaps, but of the ends actually aimed at, in the whole scheme of German education.

Another cause which has contributed to the production of the uniformity in question is the absolute dependence of these institutions on the state. Had they been left to the exclusive irresponsible control of local boards and corporations, they would long since have exhibited diversities of form, if not of substance, which are now precluded by the uniform action of a power acting under fixed laws and a settled usage. The differences which might still be expected to exist between the institutions of the several German states, are shut out by the obvious policy and interest of all the states to keep up their intellectual as well as their commercial intercourse, and by the constant circulation which, for that end, is encouraged and maintained among their institutions. This uniform dependence of the German seminaries on the government is not to be confounded with the injudicious and disastrous intermeddling of political authorities among ourselves in the details of academical instruction and government. Nothing can well exceed the freedom guaranteed to the German

academic bodies in reference to all purely scientific or scholastic questions. The state control has reference almost exclusively to the appointment and support of the Professors, and to the general organization of the several institutions, by controlling which the governments are able to secure the uniformity in question, without encroaching upon what is regarded by all Germans as essential to the dignity, efficiency, and actual success of any academical establishment whatever.

The freedom thus possessed and highly prized is not, however, mere exemption from control and interference on the part of the political authorities. It includes a liberty enjoyed by the academic teachers and their pupils, with respect to one another, which among ourselves would rather be considered license. The two parts of this franchise are distinguished by the Germans themselves as *Lehrfreyheit* and *Lernfreyheit*, liberty of teaching and of learning. The first consists in the absolute right of every authorized teacher, even of the lowest rank, to teach what he will, within the bounds of his own Faculty. The other is the corresponding right of the student to learn what he will, and for that purpose to select his own teachers. The prescription of a certain course of study, introduced into some German universities of late, is a departure from the theory and practice of the national system, and as such not entitled to consideration here.

This cherished freedom both of teachers and of learners, which has certainly contributed to give the German universities a marked distinctive character, excludes from their academical arrangements two of the features which among ourselves are looked upon as most essential to a well-ordered school of learning. One of these is the division of the students into classes, corresponding to the periods of a determinate prescribed course of study. The other is the distribution of the sciences or subjects taught into departments or professorships, for each of which some one man is responsible, and in which he is free from interference or encroachment on the part of any other. The first of these arrangements would be inconsistent with the freedom of the learner, the second with the freedom of the teacher. The German practice which has been described, so far as it relates to the teachers, leads to two results exceedingly unlike and almost opposite. The first is the extreme division of labour, and the attention given in some cases to minute parts of a subject

the whole of which, among ourselves, would hardly be expected to engross the time and labour of one teacher. It is hardly possible to take up a programme of the lectures at a German university without being surprised at the infinitesimal character of some of the subjects. A course of lectures, not on a single author merely, but on a single book, and even on a small part of a single book, is not uncommon. And the same is true of the minute subdivisions of the sciences and individual works of art, which are often made the subject of protracted academical prelections. That the minds of certain teachers should be drawn with special interest to such themes, is not so surprising as that their instruction should find patient hearers, a phenomenon explicable only from the peculiar character of German institutions which has thus far been only partially exhibited.

The other singular effect arising from this perfect liberty of teaching, is the frequency with which the same subjects are explained by different teachers at the same place and during the same term of study. This is no fortuitous concurrence, but in many cases a deliberate rivalry, and in all the exercise of what is reckoned an invaluable right. So perfectly familiar has this practice now become, that it probably would be thought an imperfection in the organization of a German university, if any leading subject in the Encylopädie were left to the exclusive management of one Professor. Such an arrangement would be viewed as an unwelcome limitation of the student's choice, and at the same time as involving a pernicious loss of stimulus and motive to the teacher. Such a state of things is probably of rare occurrence in any but the feeblest and obscurest universities. In all the more important institutions, it is prevented, if not by the number and selection of the regular Professors, by the constant succession of aspirants and probationers, who frequently desire nothing better than the honour of competing with some eminent Professor in his chosen walk, and thus establishing their reputation in the most difficult but for that very reason the most honourable manner possible. One thing at least is certain, that the German academic teachers are accustomed, from their very entrance on the work, to look for rivalry and competition, not in other schools or other walks of learning, but their own.

This brings before us what may be perhaps regarded as the grand internal difference between the English and the German

systems, a difference more profound than that of mere external organization, though in all probability occasioned by it. Common to both is an assiduous regard to emulation, as the mainspring of intellectual activity. But with this extraordinary difference, that the emulation which the English system stimulates and feeds is that of the pupil, whereas in Germany it is that of the instructor. Between the colleges and college-tutors of Oxford and Cambridge, there is, no doubt, a perpetual and active rivalry; but the test, by which their merit is determined, is the merit of their pupils. It is only as trainers of the candidates for academic honours that they come into comparison at all, and it may therefore be alleged with truth, that the emulation of the English teachers owes its existence to the emulation of the English students. To excite the latter and direct it is the object of a large part of the academic regulations. Prizes, examinations, and degrees, have all a bearing on this same great end, and the most enthusiastic excitements at the English universities—except such as are connected with great party questions in church or state—appear to terminate upon the question who are to be Wranglers or First Class Men. In Germany this state of things has no existence, but its very opposite. Among the students emulation is unknown. Examinations and degrees have reference to special objects, and are matters of business, not of honorary competition. The emulation of the teachers on the other hand, is carried to the highest pitch of ardour and intensity. It has relation not to the attainments of their pupils but their own. The party divisions of the German students do not turn upon the standing or performances of their fellows, but upon the talents and the reputation of their teachers. Whatever influence this practice may exert upon the elementary improvement of the pupils, it can hardly fail to elevate their literary standard and present a higher aim to their ambition. But this is not all. The effects of this cause may be traced still further. The peculiarity described reacts upon the very constitution which produced it, and gives rise to one of the most marked diversities between the English and the German systems. As the centre around which all revolves in England is the proficiency of pupils, so the circle of their studies is the bound and measure of the active literature of the university. Hence it becomes a training school for general education. What is done beyond this

is the voluntary work of individual scholars, and it certainly bears no proportion to their number or the wealth of the endowments which sustain them. In Germany, on the other hand, the constant emulation of the teachers, not as teachers, but as scholars, renders it impossible to make elementary science or literature the main object of pursuit. These are thrust back into the lower or preparatory schools, and the university becomes essentially and exclusively a place of professional instruction. This is one of the most striking points of difference between the cases which we are comparing. The English and German Universities are constituted with a view to the wants of different classes altogether. The English student carries on the studies which he had begun at school, and finishes the laying of a broad foundation for his subsequent attainments. But professional accomplishments he must seek elsewhere; if a lawyer, in the Inns of Court; if a Physician, in the Hospitals of London; if a clergyman, wherever he can find them. These remarks of course have no respect to very late improvements and additions to the means of instruction in the English Universities, but only to those institutions as they have been. And the highest English authority might be cited for the allegation, that at least till very lately the two great universities afforded no means of professional instruction, in any degree suited to the wants of their own graduates. Why so? Because the wealth and strength of these establishments has been for ages lavished on the elements of general education. On the other hand, the man who should resort to a German university in search of elementary instruction would be sadly disappointed, and if not forced to abandon the object in despair, compelled to seek it in the gymnasia and grammar schools, whose course of discipline is presupposed in the arrangements of the higher institutions.

There is one point in the organization of the German universities which may require further explanation. The description which has been already given of them as professional schools may seem to be inconsistent with the fact that the largest of the four faculties is usually that of Philosophy, corresponding to the Faculty of Arts with us, and comprehending all that does not fall under Medicine, Theology, or Law. It might indeed be properly described as the Faculty of General Literature and Science. From the analogy of our academical organizations it might na-

turally be inferred that this residuary Faculty was intended to afford the means of elementary or general instruction as preparatory to professional pursuits. But this is not, to any great extent, the case. The Philosophical Faculty is not more elementary than either of the others. The studies necessarily preliminary to the three professional departments are pursued at the Gymnasia. The fourth department is intended, no less than the others, to prepare men for professional activity, especially as teachers. It is here that those who have selected this as their employment carry on the studies which they have begun at school. Those in particular who aim to be Professors, here continue and complete their preparation. The lectures in this Faculty are also much frequented by the students of the others, either for the sake of general improvement, or of branches more or less connected with their professional pursuits. Enough has now been said to show that the Faculty of Philosophy is not, like that of Arts in England, introductory or subordinate to the others, but collateral and equal, so that what is said in general of them applies no less to this.

It now remains to be considered what peculiar advantages are claimed or really possessed by these two systems of university education. The two boasts of the English system are, that by its college discipline it furnishes the country with the most enlightened and accomplished gentry in the world, and that by its rich endowments it enables a great number of highly educated men to devote themselves without distraction to learned and scientific labour. The first of these pretensions is well founded. After all that has been said and written to the contrary, it may be set down as a certain fact, that no class of men engaged in secular pursuits receives so manly yet so liberal a training, one so invigorating yet refining, as the gentlemen of England. This is abundantly apparent in the high degree of taste combined with common sense which they exhibit, as compared with the corresponding class in any other country. An effect so marked and uniform can only be explained by their peculiar training, a large and important part of which is furnished by the universities. We hold it to be certain, therefore, that as places of general education for the young men of the country, these establishments have honourably answered the great end of their existence. This praise, however, extends only to that general foundation

which is common to the different professions. With respect to professional pursuits themselves, the English universities, as we have seen, are signally defective. The preference thus given to general over special or professional training may perhaps be owing to the unusually large proportion of educated men in England who have no professions in the proper sense, but either engage in public affairs or live as country gentlemen. Whatever be the cause, there can be no doubt as to the effect, to wit, that the English universities have been as unimportant in their influence on professional education as they have been effective in improving the general training of the English gentry.

The other claim asserted by the English universities is far from being so well founded. The effect of their immense endowments, as means for the advancement of science and the increase of the national literature, is not to be measured by the absolute number of accomplished scholars or of valuable books which have been thus produced, but by comparing these results with the abundance of the means employed and with the corresponding fruits of other systems. Apply the former of these tests, and even the most partial observation must be struck with the immense disproportion of the means used and the ends accomplished. Even supposing all the scholars who have been sustained in learned leisure to have spent their lives in faithful and successful study, how few compared with the whole number have added anything whatever to the stock of learning; and of the contributions made, how few have really advanced the boundaries of human knowledge. Take for example the important and extensive field of biblical learning, and consider what has been achieved or even attempted since the days of Kennicott and Lowth. Or if this be considered an unfair test, we may turn to a dèpartment where the English scholars have been really distinguished, that of Greek and Latin criticism. Even here, how little has been done, beyond the admirable classical training of the grammar schools, for permanent effect, except so far as the modern English scholars have been roused by the example and assisted by the labours of the Germans. Even here, where most has been accomplished, it is little in proportion to the numbers from whom something might have been expected, and to the means provided for their sustenance. Experience

has shown that learned leisure and large incomes, with all appliances and aids to boot, tend rather to stagnation than activity, without the stimulus of emulation.

The strength of the German system coincides exactly with the weak points of the English. Its great boast is, that it furnishes the best facilities for professional study that the present state of knowledge will allow, and that it constantly tends to the advancement as well as the diffusion of learning, not by rich endowments to sustain a class of learned men distinct from the teachers of youth, but by bringing the teachers themselves under such an influence as forces them to go ahead, instead of treading the same dull routine. This effect is secured by all those arrangements which excite the emulation of the teachers rather than the students. An instructor who is constantly exposed to competition in his own department, and dependent, for a part of his support and all his official reputation, on the preference of his pupils, cannot remain contented with his first attainments, but must keep up with the scientific progress of his times, and, if he can, add something of his own to the accumulations of his predecessors. It is therefore one of the most striking features in the present literary state of Germany, that a large proportion of her authors are academical teachers, and that their labours in this last capacity have constant reference to a wider public than the population of the lecture room. There are probably few courses of successful lectures which are not eventually given to the world as books, and still fewer books on learned subjects which have not been, at least in substance, uttered *ex cathedra.* This intimate connexion between authorship and academic teaching, when combined with the incessant stimulus of emulation acting on the latter, is the surest antidote to stagnant acquiescence in established forms and actual attainments, and the most effectual security for progress, both as to the matter and the method of instruction. In this respect, the German system far transcends the English and all others, as an engine to put mind in motion and to promote investigation and discovery. Where the academic teachers of a country are its most distinguished scientific writers, all the influence of criticism and popular applause is brought to bear upon the pupil in determining his choice and engaging his attention, and at the same time on the teacher in exciting him to new exertion. The aggregate effect of all these causes is a state of

intellectual fermentation, utterly unknown where teachers are authors, if at all, by accident, and where their whole strength is expended on the bringing of successive classes to a certain point, and that not a very high one, of mental cultivation.

But we have yet to consider the peculiar disadvantages of this same powerful machinery. A system of instruction so effective and so beneficent in one direction, may still from its onesidedness do harm or do nothing in another. The objections which may be most plausibly alleged against the German universities, are three in number. On the first of these we shall not dwell, as it involves a question not yet settled by our own experience. This is the want of discipline both moral and intellectual. That the German students are too much neglected and lost sight of, in the constitution and administration of the universities, is clear enough, and a practical admission of the fact is involved in certain late attempts at reformation. But it is not equally clear that the great end of the whole system would be better answered by the substitution of a rigorous school discipline for the Lernfreyheit of the German students. The necessity of such restraints in the earlier stages of instruction is admitted every where, and nowhere more distinctly than in Germany, the grammar schools of which have carried rigorous precision to its utmost verge. But it is part of the same system to allow the student who has passed through this disciplinary process an unshackled freedom, both as to his course of study and his mode of life. The abrupt transition is no doubt pernicious, and may well be urged as one of the most serious objections to the German practice. But it does not follow that the principle of freedom, under proper regulation, is essentially a false one, or unsuited to the other parts of this peculiar system. It is a thought suggested by experience to more than one among ourselves, that if the absence of all discipline in some of our professional schools, for instance those of medicine, has led to ruinous excesses, there are evils, no less real though entirely dissimilar, produced in other seminaries, by retaining too much of those academical formalities. which could not be dispensed with safely, in the earlier periods of education. The conclusion, to which these considerations seem to point, is the familiar one, that opposite extremes may be alike pernicious, and that the course of wisdom and of safety often lies between them.

The next objection springs directly from that very emulation which has done so much for the activity and influence of German teachers. It is a necessary consequence of what has been already stated, that the method of instruction is determined, not by the necessities of the pupil, but by the ambition of the teacher. The choice of subjects and the mode of treating them, which would be most improving to a class of young men fresh from the gymnasium, might not be the best adapted to gain éclat for the lecturer, or to produce a striking and effective book, or to eclipse and vanquish a competitor. Hence the unequal distribution of the sciences already mentioned, the extreme division of labour on one hand, and the multiplicity of rival lectures in the same department on the other. Hence it is that the young theologian may sometimes hear two or three courses on Isaiah, and none at all on Genesis, or vice versâ. Hence it is that he is under the necessity of plunging into the middle of a subject and of leaving it unfinished, if his teacher chance to be at work upon the sixth or seventh volume of a book that is to last as long as he does. It is truly wonderful how small a part of a complete course of instruction can be sometimes gathered from what seems to be the richest bill of fare, and from the labours of the most accomplished cooks in the republic of letters. To this anomalous arrangement German students easily accommodate themselves, because they are prepared for it, because they are acquainted with no other, and because the practical effect of the whole system is to make them care less what they learn than where they learn it or from whom. From the right man nothing comes amiss, while nothing from the wrong one is acceptable, the strongest proof and illustration of the fact so often mentioned, that the life of the German institutions is the emulation not of the learners but the teachers. The effect of this extraordinary practice on the mental operations and acquirements of the pupils, must be one which can hardly be neutralized or made good even by the salutary stimulus and elevated standard of attainment which it affords.

But this is not the worst effect of the extraordinary stimulus to which the German teachers are subjected. If it merely led to a distortion of the course of study, and a corresponding disproportion in the efforts and attainments of the pupils, it might be regarded as comparatively innocent. But the very character of German thought and German learning has been seriously mod-

ified by this peculiar feature of their public institutions. The incessant rivalry of the professors, and the urgent need of doing something to attract and hold the attention of the public, tends of course to generate a morbid appetite for novelty, and this when once indulged becomes more craving, till the means of sating it are no longer furnished by the rational and real, but must necessarily be sought in the region of grotesque inventions and imaginations. That this diseased aversion to familiar truths and preference of what is new, however false or monstrous, should be confounded by the minds which feel it with increase of strength and intellectual advancement, is entirely natural, but just as erroneous as the opposite extreme of denying all improvement and discovery. This view of the matter may account for the coincidence, which sometimes shows itself, between the vaunted fruits of German speculation and the crude attempts of youthful minds among ourselves. However impotent the cultivated English mind may be to such achievements, it sometimes bears fruit, during the process of its cultivation, very closely resembling these exotic products. There are some among us, as we verily believe, who may be truly said to have passed through the German state before they reached maturity. At any rate, there is a strong resemblance between what is thrown aside and left behind as childish on the one hand, and what is treasured up and almost worshipped as the highest wisdom on the other. This admits of explanation without any derogation from the native strength of either party. The incessant straining after something new and strange is enough to force even the most masculine and ripened minds into puerile extravagance, if not habitually, yet at times. And such a straining, as we have already seen, is but the natural effect of the position which the leading minds of Germany are forced to occupy. How far the same end is promoted by the exclusion of those minds from many occupations which in England and America afford a kind of vent or safety-valve for mental ebullition, it may not be easy to determine. But the concentration of so many effervescent intellects on speculative subjects would not of itself account for the specific character of their operations, without the additional solution furnished by the national modes of education and their tendency to foster a perpetual and restless emulation among teachers.

We may now return to the point from which we set out, the

organization of our own public seminaries. After what has been said, it may seem absurd to represent them as belonging to either of the systems just described. The moderate scale on which they are projected, and the absence for the most part of rich endowments, may be thought to distinguish them as strongly from the English universities, as other circumstances do from those of Germany. But the points of difference are in one case accidental, in the other essential. As to those things which divide the two great systems from each other, our schools resemble those of England. Here as there, the two essential features of the German plan are wanting, liberty of teaching and liberty of learning. Even in those cases where the method of instruction and the absence of coercive discipline approach most nearly to the German model, as for instance in our medical schools, there is still a prescribed course of study, and an exact distribution of the subjects taught among a body of professors, each of whom is strictly limited to his own department, and secure from rivalry or interference in it. In one case at least, the Virginia University, an experiment has been made upon the German method of allowing liberty of choice to the students. But the limitation of the teachers, on the other hand, is more than usually rigorous. And even the *Lernfreyheit* theoretically granted has been practically restricted, no doubt for good reasons and with good results. Nothing indeed can be more clear to us than the unsuitableness of this method to the earlier periods of general education. Its only proper place is in schools of higher or professional instruction, which, as we have seen, is the true character of the German universities.

The German system being thus unlike our own, the practical inquiry is, how far we may derive advantage from it. To know that there are other methods than the one with which we have been all our lives familiar, is worth something; but we naturally look beyond this to more tangible results, and ask, in what way the good qualities of this foreign system may be made available to us. The first way which suggests itself, and which has been already tried, is that of sending our young men to study there. There is a well known and material objection to this course arising from the risk of intellectual and moral aberration. This danger is so far real as to make it highly desirable that those who go abroad with this view, should be fitted for it by peculiar attributes of head

and heart. Soundness and strength of understanding, as distinguished from mere genius or mere liveliness of parts, and a well defined religious character, are the two grand requisites. But in addition to the danger which has been described, there is a difficulty of a literary kind, which has perhaps received less attention than it merits. It arises from the fact already stated, that the German course of education and our own are incommensurable, aiming at different ends by the use of different means. Nothing can therefore be more groundless than the hope of eking out in foreign schools a course of study left unfinished here. There are only two ways in which real benefit can be derived from such a residence abroad. The first is to commence in very early life and pass completely through the course. This would no doubt produce scholars of an elevated order, where the necessary talent and desire of improvement were forthcoming. But the scholars thus produced would be Germans not Americans. They would have scarcely any advantage over an imported German, except in the use of their own language; and even that might be impaired. Their spirit, turn of mind, and prejudices, would be necessarily exotic, and unfriendly to success at home. This is not only probable a priori, but determined by experience. So far as we know, there is no case of such early and thorough German training, in which the subject has been fitted by it for commanding influence or even useful labour after his return. On this account, the preference is due to another method, that of going not as early but as late as possible, without defeating the very end in view. Let the student pass not only through what is here considered a complete course of general education, but also through a full course of professional study, especially if he be a theologian. Thus prepared, he will at least know what he wants and what is to be had, and will neither waste his time in catching flies nor bring home wheelbarrows from Constantinople. To those who are deterred by these or other reasons from frequenting German universities, it may be some consolation to know, that in no other case of the same kind is the want of personal observation so easily supplied by means of books. The transition from the lecture-room to the press in Germany is not only easy but common, we may even say constant. There is very little valuable instruction orally imparted that is not, sooner or later, and in many cases speedily, rendered

accessible to all who read the language. This, it is true, does not compensate for the want of the impression made by oral delivery, or of the information gained by private intercourse. But these are not the usual attractions to our students, and apart from these, the German schools may act almost as powerfully at a distance as at hand. A striking proof and illustration is afforded by the fact that some of those American scholars, who appear to have derived most from the German sources, have never been abroad. In one or the other of these ways, we think it highly desirable that some of our younger theologians, who possess the prerequisites, both native and acquired, should make themselves familiar with the German erudition and the German methods of instruction. This necessity arises partly from the undeniable pre-eminence of Germany in certain walks of learning, which renders it impossible to keep up with the progress of the age and yet prohibit all intellectual communion with her. It arises also from the very evils which this intercourse has generated, and which must be remedied, not by blind denunciation, but by thorough and discriminating knowledge.

It is evident, however, that this method of importing German wisdom, even if it should become far more extensive than it is, would operate rather upon individuals than on the institutions of this country. It is still a question, therefore, whether these admit of any material improvement by the introduction of the German system, as we have considered it. The sheer substitution of that system for our own is out of the question. Were it ever so easy, it would be wholly undesirable. Though some of the evils which attend its operation in its native land might be corrected by our political and social institutions, there are others which would still exist, and some which would be aggravated, if not developed for the first time, by the action of the self-same causes. It would indeed be a sufficient objection to the system, as a whole, that it is foreign, that it did not germinate and ripen here, but in another soil and under other skies. Such institutions may materially influence the state of society, but they do not produce it. They only react upon that to which they owe their own existence. And the same considerations which thus show the revolution to be inexpedient, show it also to be utterly impracticable. The German education could no more be forced

upon this country than the German language. But it does not follow that our own institutions can derive no benefit whatever from these foreign methods. There are several ways in which a salutary use of them might be made, although not perhaps at present. One which has been suggested is the institution of a university on the German principle at some central point, not with a view to supersede existing institutions or even to compete with them, but for the purpose of supplying what is really our grand desideratum, some contrivance to encourage and facilitate the further prosecution of the studies now begun at college. The proper seat of such a school would be one of our great cities, and the best plan the old German one, in its naked simplicity, and with its Jachin and Boaz, liberty of teaching and learning. It would even be desirable to try the old way of dispensing with costly buildings and unnecessary forms. The teachers might be embodied first by voluntary association, and then perpetuated in the German way, and with the usual gradations. Such an institution, if it could be brought into existence, would probably do much for the advancement as well as the diffusion of knowledge. The grand difficulty would be to find hearers. Many might be willing to resort to such a school instead of the existing colleges; but few would probably resort to it as something in addition to them. The characteristic hurry of society and life among us, and the early call to active employment, leave but few, who have completed the accustomed course of study, willing to commence a new one. At the same time, it would be extremely difficult at present to supply such an establishment with teachers, at least in sufficient numbers to maintain the real German emulation. It would indeed be scarcely possible without a weakening draught upon the other institutions of the country, unless by some arrangement which should make it possible to employ the same talent in both ways. The very statement of these difficulties may perhaps suffice to show that the country is not ripe for any such experiment, even if it should be thought desirable. And yet the day may not be distant when such an addition to our existing means of intellectual improvement will be found not only possible but indispensable.

In the mean time, there is another way, in which the least objectionable features of the German plan might be transferred to some of our existing institutions, without any change what-

ever in their form or government, by superadding to the regular prescribed course of education, some provision for subjects not included in it, or for the further prosecution of others. These, forming no part of the curriculum required for graduation, would admit of being taught with all the freedom of the German method, both with respect to learners and teachers, both being left unshackled as to subjects. Even the principle of competition among teachers, which is so essential to the German system, might be recognised, as far as would be salutary either to the individuals concerned or to the progress of learning. The lecturers on this plan might be either the regular professors only, or these with the addition of such qualified coadjutors as might offer themselves and be approved by the competent authorities. By some such arrangement at a few of our oldest institutions, a great impulse might be given to the march of science, and provision made for supplying the deplorable defect of able teachers and professors. At the same time the literary standard of our educated youth would be raised, and many induced to tread the higher walks of learning, who, for want of such inducements, now waste their time and talents in doing nothing or worse than nothing.

With these crude suggestions we conclude a notice of the foreign universities which cannot but appear unsatisfactory and meager to those who are already familiar with the subject, but may possibly afford some interesting information to a larger class of readers, whose ideas, in relation to these matters, have been vague or founded on erroneous statements.

Art. III.—*An Earnest Appeal to the Free Church of Scotland, on the subject of Economics.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. First American from the Second Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1847. pp. 64.

This suggestive and teeming pamphlet has now been several months before the churches, and we presume in the hands of almost all our ministers. We cannot suffer ourselves to think that so much practical wisdom, enforced by the earnest eloquence of