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PHILIP MELANCTHON’S UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO EDUCATION

Introduction

THE PURPOSE AND PLAN OF THE STUDY

Theology is not an end in itself; theology and pedagogy both serve humanity, and therefore serve God and are to that extent both of the same rank. The minister deals with the older people, those who cannot be corrected, who misuse the sermons to their own self-justification; however, he who undertakes to serve the youth builds for the future.¹

These are the thoughts of Philip Melanchthon, one of the chief figures in the founding of Protestantism, and noted German educator and humanist during the age of the Reformation. Noted, that is, among students of education only, but not to the world in general. Philip Melanchthon as always stood in the shadows of both the giant reformer, Martin Luther, and the leading humanist of all time, Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam. All three were both humanists and reformers. Luther was more the reformer than humanist; Erasmus was more humanist than reformer; but Melanchthon was a perfect blend of the two.²

Philipp Melanchthon's career as a humanist, theologian, and educator has been studied in the past. In the 412 years since his death several biographies of Melanchthon have been written. The earliest, of course, was the De Vita Melanchthonis Narratio, written in Latin by Melanchthon's close friend, Joachim Camerarius. Because Melanchthon had fallen into theological disrepute, no biographies appeared until the seventeenth century, when, in 1662, a Dutch writer, Abraham van de Corput wrote one. In 1777 Theodore Strobel issued an edition of Camerarius's biography.

During the nineteenth century several biographies on Melanchthon appeared. An Englishman, Francis A. Cox, wrote The Life of Philipp Melanchthon in 1817. In Germany F. Galle

3J. Camerarius, De Philippi Melanchthonis orto, Totius Vitae Curriculo et morte, implicata rerum memorabilium temporis illius hominumque mentione at que indicio, cum expositionis serie cohaerentium: Narratio diligens et accurate Iochimi Camerarii Papeberg. Lipsiae cum privilegio. Lipsiae excudebat Ernestus Voegelin Constantiensis, 1566.

4Abraham van de Corput, Leven ende Dood van Phil. Melanchthon. (Amsterdam, 1662).


6Francis Augustus Cox, Life of Melanchthon (London: Gale and Fenner, 1817).
in 1840\(^7\) and K. Matthew in 1841\(^8\) wrote biographies of Melanchthon. Carl Frederick Ledderhose wrote his Life of Philip Melanchthon in 1855.\(^9\) Carl Schmidt published another German biography in 1861.\(^10\) J. W. Richard's English biography, *Philip Melanchthon, Protestant Precentor of Germany, 1497-1560*, appeared in 1898.\(^11\) Earlier, in 1889 Karl Hartfelder finished his definitive study of Melanchthon's life with specific emphasis on his contributions to education.\(^12\) Written in German, the book has never been translated into English and remains the study of Melanchthon's educational endeavors.

\(^7\)Fr. Galle, *Versuch einer Charakteristik Melanchthons als Theologe und einer Entwicklung seines Lehrbegriiffs* (Halle: Lippert, 1840).


\(^9\)Charles Frederick Ledderhose, *The Life of Philip Melanchthon*, Translated by G. F. Krotel. (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1855).


In recent years three books on Melanchthon's life have been written. Dr. Clyde L. Manschreck's volume, *Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer*, appeared in 1958.\(^1\) Essentially covering all of Melanchthon's life, Dr. Manschreck allocated a generous portion of the book to Melanchthon's contributions to education, utilizing facts gleaned from Hartfelder's book. Robert Stupperich's *Melanchthon*, another German biography, more limited in content, appeared in 1965.\(^2\)

In 1967 and 1969 Wilhelm Maurer's two volume work, *Melanchthon Zwischen Humanismus und Reformation*, which studied the humanist influence on the formation of Melanchthon's theological ideas, was published.\(^3\)

Many other books and articles concerning Melanchthon have been written. Some deal with his humanistic activities, but most concern his theological endeavors. Representative

---


of these are R. R. Caemerer's article condemning Melanchthon's use of reason, and Carl S. Meyer's analysis of Melanchthon as a Christian humanist. Most of Melanchthon's writings have been published in a twenty-eight volume work, *Melanchthon Opera, Corpus Reformatorum*, edited by Brentscheider and Bindseil, in the early nineteenth century. More recently Peter Fränkel and Martin Greschat produced a review of most of the recent Melanchthon studies in 1967, while Wilhelm Hammer in 1967 and 1968 published his massive all inclusive two volume listing of all books written by or about Philip Melanchthon.

Why, then, another volume on Melanchthon? As stated above, most of the material written about the man concerns his theological contributions. Though he is mentioned in most books dealing with humanist thought and education, only one,

---


book, that of Hartfelder's, is devoted specifically to his accomplishments in the field of education. No volume on this topic has ever been published in English.

The purpose of this thesis, then, is to study the life and writings of Philip Melanchthon, with the intent to isolate those facts of his life and those writings of his that show the evolution of his thoughts on education, culminating in his distinctive contributions to education. This study shall further trace these contributions through his work with the gymnasiums already existing and those founded during his time, as well as with the school systems of various German states. Melanchthon's contributions in the field of textbooks and pedagogical method shall also be studied.

One of the problems encountered in researching Melanchthon is the amount of conjecture biographers of his used. It is sometimes hard to distinguish the actual results of Melanchthon's endeavors from what the biographers felt might have happened. Older biographers, especially the Germans, tend to romanticize Melanchthon, when the reporting of cold, honest facts would probably do the job better. The writer hopes this study, through its review of Melanchthon's work as a reformer generally and as an educator specifically, will help brighten our picture of Philip Melanchthon and help give due credit to him for his endeavors as reformer, humanist, and, especially, educator.
PART I: PHILIP MELANCHTHON, A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Chapter

I. BACKGROUND, EDUCATION, AND CAREER
II. HIS PERSONAL LIFE
III. MELANCHTHON, THE REFORMER
CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND, EDUCATION, AND CAREER

What makes a man? Many philosophers at various times in history have offered different answers. Most agree that one's family background and one's early education contribute much to the shaping of one's personality. Later education, one's position in life, and one's private problems all add to complete the character which had taken shape over the years.

In order to truly understand Philip Melanchthon the educator, we must survey his early life, his education, and his religious development. As we do this, we will see gradually emerging a quiet, sincere, kind scholar whose outlook on life had been molded by the violent theological controversies of his day.

During his life-time, Philip Melanchthon was involved in many controversies. In death till this day he has been the center of still more controversies, ranging from arguments concerning such important items as the Eucharist to such trivia as "Did Luther actually post his ninety-five theses on Wittenberg's Castle Church door?"
Always standing in the theological shadows of the reformer Luther, serving as his consolidator and spokesman, Melanchthon has been the object of criticism because of his seeming tendency to compromise and because of his vagueness on certain matters, either accidentally or purposely. As an example, one of the most recent theses pertaining to Dr. Luther dealt with the above mentioned question concerning the posting of the ninety-five theses on October 31, 1517. Erwin Iserloh in his 1966 book claims they were not posted. If Dr. Iserloh is correct, someone must have started the falsehood. At whom does Dr. Iserloh point his finger? Philip Melanchthon! Iserloh claims that there is only one recorded mention of the incident - by Melanchthon in a preface he had written to the second volume of Luther's collected works, published after Luther's death in 1546. In it Melanchthon states: "Luther, burning with zeal for true piety, issued indulgence theses which are printed in the first volume of this series. He posted these publicly at the church door near the castle in Wittenberg on the vigil of All Saints Day in 1517."  

Since Melanchthon was both teacher and student at the University of Tübingen at the time of the supposed posting of the indulgences, he could have had no direct knowledge of the event. Concerning the accuracy of Melanchthon's statement, Luther historian Heinrich Boehmer says: "The famous preface is nothing more than a preface, that is a piece dashed off quickly without the use of any sources. Thus it has no value as documentation and is to be believed only to the extent that contemporary witnesses offer confirmation." Another historian, Hans Volz, called it "an untenable legend." Dr. Martin E. Marty, Lutheran scholar of today, concurs with Iserloh's findings.

More serious were the disputes during his lifetime concerning his altered version of Luther's doctrinal document, the Augsburg Confession, his unionistic tendencies, and the Flacian and Majoristic controversies after Luther's death, which we will look at later. In humanistic and educational matters, however, Melanchthon seemed above reproach.

2 Ibid., pp. 74-5.

3 Ibid., p. viii.
Background

Who is this Philip Melanchthon? To begin with, he was the son of George Schwarzerd, an armor maker of Brettan, in the German Palatinate, and Barbara nee Reuter, the daughter of the merchant and burgomeister, Johannes Reuter. The oldest of five children, two boys and three girls, he was born on February 16, 1497, four years after his parents' marriage. His father named him in honor of the reigning elector of the Palatinate. According to Hartfelder, as parental birth gifts, his father gave him a devout mind, honest ability, and a good family name. From his mother he received good sense, intelligence, piety, and devoutness. From his father he also received a life of serious conduct. His father was so earnest and serious that he never used an unkind or improper word. He was so devout that he would wake up in the middle of the night to pray.  

Because Philip's father, George, as an armorer found favor with the Elector, he aroused the professional jealousy of his fellow craftsmen. Once he was "accidentally" burned with some hot lead. The Elector at another time sent him to

4 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 4.
5 Ibid.
Nürnberg for special training. George's work was so superior that foreign powers such as the king of Poland and the Emperor Maximilian sought his help.

Philip's grandfather on his father's side was Claus Schwartzerd, a worthy, pious man who lived with his wife Elizabeth in Heidelberg. His uncle, John, was a locksmith. Philip's brothers and sisters included Ann (b. 1499), George (b. 1501), Margaretha (b. 1508). Philip's family name has variant spellings, such as Schwartzerd and Schwartzert.

Philip, his brother George, and one of his maternal grandfather's grandsons attended the town's only school. Grandfather Reuter took the children out of the school because of a prevalent malignant disease which the teacher also had. Manschreck identifies the disease as a "wicked and contagious disease", sometimes called the "French Plague".

---

6 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 29.
7 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
8 Ibid., p. 29.
10 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 31.
which William Brown identified as syphilis. Reuter then had the boys privately tutored at his house by a John Unger from Pforzheim. Unger was a good grammarian. He used the popular Baptista Mantuanus as a textbook. Melanchthon had to construe twenty to thirty verses at a time from it. Unger was a rigid disciplinarian. Nevertheless Philip liked him: "He loved me as a son. I loved him as a father." Grandfather Reuter bought the boys a missal in order that they could learn the Church’s hymns. The boys also had to take their places in the choir on all holy days. Reuter continued to take an interest in Philip. Not only did he continue to provide books to help Philip study, but whenever the Bachanti, the so-called roving scholars, visited

---


12 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 4.

13 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 31.

14 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 16.

15 Ibid.
Brettan, Reuter would send Philip to dispute with them. 16 Philip, an able debater, once defeated one of these scholars. 17

His grandfather through these acts increased in Philip the will to study, fostering his boldness and daring. 18 Philip had a quick mind, a good memory, and an ability to express himself forcefully, despite a tendency to stammer. 19 He continually engaged in asking questions during school hours. Afterwards he would look for his friends in order to talk more about what he had learned. Peculiarly amiable and modest, Philip, in his early life, could easily be irritated. 20

In 1507, when Philip was only ten, first his Grandfather Reuter and then his father died. Four years earlier his father had drunk some poisoned well water while in Mannheim, Neuberg, the town to which he had been summoned by the

16 Ibid.

17 Manschreck, op. cit., 31.

18 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 5.

19 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 31.

20 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 17.
Margrave in preparation for the Bavarian War. From that time until his death he remained an invalid. Philip, together with his brother George and cousin Johann Reuter, went to live with his maternal grandmother, Elizabeth Reuchlin Reuter, sister of Johann Reuchlin, the distinguished scholar of Hebrew and other languages.

Reuchlin, who resided at Wurtemberg, was president of the Swabian Court of Confederates. He took delight in Philip, calling him his son. Reuchlin gave Philip books which were both beautiful and useful. Once he gave Philip a chestnut colored Doctor's hat, placing it on the boy's head. He recognized Philip's diligence and ingenuity. At another time he gave Philip a Greek grammar book, challenging Philip to earn a Greek lexicon by preparing Latin verses. He did, and he got the lexicon.

21 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 5.
22 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 30.
23 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 18.
24 Ibid., p. 19.
Philip and another colleague once studied a Latin school comedy which Reuchlin had written while at Heidelberg. As a surprise to his grand uncle, Melanchthon staged it at a banquet which the monks at Pforzheim gave in Reuchlin's honor. This act of Melanchthon's pleased his grand uncle to the extent that the grand uncle declared that a common name like Schwartzerd, German for "black earth", no longer fitted such a clever young man. He should rather be called its Greek equivalent, Melanchthon. Philip did not use the name right away. When he enrolled at both the universities of Heidelberg and Tübingen, he used his German name, Philip Schwartzerd. Gradually "Melanchthon" took shape. Melas, Melanthonis, Melancton are all variants that he used at some time. Melanchthon, used chiefly by his friends, won out. Ledderhose claims that after 1531 Philip wrote it "Melanthon" because it was easier to pronounce.

26 Ibid.
27 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 33.
28 Ibid.
29 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 19.
People at that time usually changed their German names to Latin or Greek equivalents because the German names were hard to pronounce. This practice became a custom with the humanists, who felt themselves citizens of ancient Rome or Greece. The Latin or Greek name also labeled a person as one knowledgeable in both languages. The humanists found parallels in Roman history, where some took the names of their teachers. Humanists also found precedent in the Bible. In the Old Testament God himself named Abraham and Sarah, discarding their old names, while in the New Testament Christ called Simon "Peter" and changed Saul's name to Paul. Melanchthon's nephew, Sigismund, later a professor of physics and medicine at Heidelberg, assumed the name of Melanchthon. Sigismund's father, George, who was Melanchthon's brother, kept the name Schwarzerd.

Philip's grandmother enrolled the boys at the Latin school in Pforzheim, near Stuttgart, a school she considered better than the one in Brettan. Johann Reuchlin had graduated from this school, which was at that time the most important school in southwest Germany other than Schlettstadt. The origin of the school, according to Hartfelder, is veiled in

---

30 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 10.
impenetrable obscurity. It is not known, for instance, if the school was municipally connected or if it was associated with the castle church of Pforzheim - St. Michael's. 31

The school was under the supervision of George Simler from Wimpfen and John Hiltebrant from Schwetzingen, 32 both followers of Reuchlin and both excellent teachers. 33 Both Simler's and Hiltebrant's students praised them. The historian Friedlieb, or Irenicus, a colleague of Melanchthon's, praised Simler, saying that he was a man cut out to be a teacher. It was from Simler, Friedlieb states, that he really learned Greek and Latin. Melanchthon said essentially the same things, adding that Simler was like a father. 34 Simler also taught Greek extra-curricularly to favored students who could participate in these private lessons. Melanchthon belonged to this select group. With his communicative, kind ways, Melanchthon gained the love of both teacher and fellow students. 35 Melanchthon's colleagues at Pforzheim

33 *Manschreck, op. cit.*, p. 32.
34 *Hartfelder, op. cit.*, p. 7.
were also an inspiration to him. 36

When he left Pforzheim, Philip Melanchthon could write with facility in either Greek or Latin and had a thorough acquaintance with the subjects which were part of the usual sixteenth century Latin school curriculum - grammar, arithmetic, rhetoric, dialectic, history, and geography. 37 By the time Melanchthon was twelve, Manschreck says, he had these imprints - superstition, piety, and Latin. 38

Melanchthon came into contact with two other influences while living in Pforzheim. One was the Printing Company of Thomas Anshelm, located there since the beginning of the sixteenth century. Here he came into contact with humanistic writings which Anshelm printed. The other was the home of Johann Reuchlin. Although Reuchlin actually lived in Stuttgart at this time, he visited Pforzheim often, coming into contact with his nephew. 39 At the age of thirteen Philip Melanchthon was ready for the university.

36 Ibid., p. 12.
37 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 33.
38 Ibid., p. 32.
39 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 6.
University Education: Undergraduate Studies at Heidelberg

In 1509 Philip Melanchthon enrolled at the University of Heidelberg. He went to Heidelberg because it was close to his home in Brettan, it was the land university for the Palatinate, and his grand-uncle Reuchlin still had ties with the university which could have been of use to Melanchthon. He was enrolled on October 14 under the rectorate of Juristen Johan Weiser vom Eberspach.

The university, located in the city that was the home of the Palatinate electors, had come under the influence of Italian humanism. Peter Luder of Kislau, the "frivolous, unscrupulous" poet, stayed there for a while, but not long. Johannes von Dalberg, or Camerarius, who had studied at humanist Erfurt and in Italy and who later became bishop of Worms, and Dietrich von Plenningen, or Plinius, had lured Rudolf Agricola of Friesen, whom they knew in Italy, to Heidelberg. Dalberg's house was a meeting place for humanists: Konrad Celtist, the German chief humanist; Jacob Wimofeling,

40 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 33.
41 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 11.
42 Ibid., p. 12.
43 Ibid., pp. 12-3.
the patriarch of the German education system; Johannes Wacker, or Vigilius, the university's professor of law; Johannes Reuchlin; Abbot Johannes Tithemius; and Judge Adam Werner von Themar.

However, the humanists did not make permanent inroads at Heidelberg. The older faculty's ideas were stronger than the Elector Philip's partiality. As the years went by some of the humanists left Heidelberg and others died. As the teachers left, so did the students.

Of the teachers Philip Melanchthon had, he praised Johann Sorbillo, a brilliant writer of Greek who headed the department of Greek, and Dalberg, who had re-introduced good Latin writing in Germany and furthered the cause of dialectic through a newly-found method of his. Melanchthon also thought highly of Celtist for having reawakened poetry in Germany. Another favorite was Prince Hermann von Neuenaar, or Comes Novae Aquilae, who, in spite of his religious training and position as canon of Cologne and Lüttich, was a follower of Reuchlin. Melanchthon dedicated his Greek Grammar (which, however, was never printed) to him. Melanchthon also wrote

\begin{footnotes}
\item[44] Ibid., p. 13.
\item[45] Ibid., p. 14.
\end{footnotes}
two dedication letters in his honor in 1516 and 1529. Although Ledderhose claims that Melanchthon learned astronomy from a Dr. Caesarius, Hartfelder asserts that he learned this subject from Cunradus Helvetius, a student of Caesarius. Hartfelder believes that Melanchthon also learned rhetoric from younger instructors like Master Peter Günther, a member of the Wimpfeling circle.

Two names, however, stand out as having great influence on Melanchthon during his Heidelberg stay - one was alive at the time, the other long dead. The living influence was Dr. Pallus Spangel, the professor of theology at whose home Melanchthon stayed. Spangel had served as vice-chancellor of the university and four times as rector. He had been official spokesman for the university in the 1479 dispute with Elector Philipp about allowing unmarried laymen to teach in the medical faculty. Though the Elector agreed, the university made no changes until a papal bull allowing both

46 Ibid., pp. 15-7.
47 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 21.
49 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 21.
unmarried and married laymen on the medical faculty as professors was passed. 50

Spangel, according to Hartfelder, was similar in character to Wimpfeling, whose teacher and friend he was. Spangel was an opponent of scholasticism. However, he was not a spokesman for the new humanism. He had little inclination to disturb the clerical character of the university in order to prepare places for humanists on the faculties. Humanism was only a formality to Spangel. Like his friend, Werner von Themar, who sent his Latin stories for lecture material to him, Spangel looked at humanism as a new "housing", or means, to give the old thoughts a new, timely cloak. 51 Spangel embraced humanism as a method. He, according to Hartfelder, really stood in the old church scholastic tradition. He was a diligent scholastic who was well acquainted with the Thomistic system. The new learning was to him just a means of placing these teachings in better Latin, which Rudolph Agricola had led him to believe was the only working means to foster the teachings of the church. 52 Spangel's main glory is that he

50 Hartfelder, op. cit., op. 18-9.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid., p. 23.
had a personality that drew students to him, students who eventually became bigger than their teacher. Among these was Jacob Wimpfeling, already mentioned earlier, and, of course, Philipp Melanchthon.

Rudolph Agricola had already been dead twenty-four years when Melanchthon arrived at Heidelberg. When faculty members failed to stimulate Melanchthon, he and others turned to the school's library where they were exposed to Agricola's works. Agricola had been the guiding light for the humanism that had flourished briefly at Heidelberg. Melanchthon's grand-uncle had known him personally. Reading Agricola's books and hearing others talk of the man whose lectures on Aristotle and translation of Lucian were well remembered left an imprint on Melanchthon.

Agricola represented a break with scholastic logic and dialectic. However, since only the newer universities (Tübingen, Wittenberg) promoted humanism, while the older universities (Prague, Vienna, Erfurt, and, of course, Heidel-

53 Manschreck, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
55 Manschreck, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
berg) upheld scholasticism, Agricola was considered an enemy within the camp.  

Possibly in 1510, but probably later while at Tübingen, Melanchthon received a three volume set of Agricola's Dialectics as a present from his friend Oecolampadius. Melanchthon studied these books avidly and memorized large portions of them. Not only did he adopt Agricola's order of argument, but the books led him to discover new depths in the classics. Later, when Melanchthon published his own book on rhetoric, it was obviously influenced by Agricola.  

Among the people Melanchthon knew at Heidelberg were Peter Sturm, brother of Jacob Sturm of the Strassburg gymnasium fame, who had left Heidelberg the semester before Melanchthon arrived; Diebold Gerlach, called Billicanus after his birthplace, Billingham; Johann Brenz von Weil, later a reformer at Wittenberg; and Martin Butzer from Schlettstadt, at this time a "Konventuale" at the Heidelberg Dominican cloister and once a scholar at the Schlettstadter Latin school. All of these, especially Butzer, were humanists.  

58 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
Melanchthon took the required courses and examinations as quickly as possible. He was not one who took many courses without taking the associated examinations as some at his time did. He realized that passing the examinations would allow him to teach at a university. 59

His fellow students gave Melanchthon the nickname "The Grecian". 60 Once, when a professor could not explain a problem because of his deficiency in Greek, he asked his students where a Greek could be found. Without a dissenting voice the students cried "Melanchthon! Melanchthon!" 61 At another time a teacher became sick during his class. He asked Melanchthon to take his place. This caused Melanchthon to cry, since he was so shy and timid. 62

Philip Melanchthon, however, was critical of his professors. He felt that he learned nothing outside of the empty dialectic and a bit of physics while at Heidelberg. He believed himself more intelligent than some of his teachers.

60 Ledderhose, op. cit., p. 22.
61 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 35.
He felt that they did not at anytime understand the concepts of the speeches he gave. He thought they were lazy not only in their lectures, but also in their private study. He believed that they mangled ideas pertaining to worldly and spiritual matters. He further believed that the teachers themselves had read none of these old orators. 63

Melanchthon tried to compensate for what he missed in formal study through private study of his own. In an introduction to a collection of his complete works, published by Herwagen in Basil in 1541, Melanchthon wrote the details of these private studies. 64 At Pforzheim he taught himself how to write Latin verse as it would be taught at a real poetry school. This resolution to study poetry further led him to other reading matter which he associated with poets, historians, or playwrights. He read seemingly all of the named authors indiscriminately without logical order, and without any direction from any teacher or professor. The result was that Melanchthon, in spite of all his diligence, ended up on wrong paths, believing that some of the poorer

---
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poets, who used affected and adorned expressions, were examples of the highest standards of Latin poetry.

More a boy than a man, Melanchthon sought a job as teacher at Heidelberg. He became the tutor of the sons of Count Ludwig von Löwenstein. 66 These two, Ludwig and Frederick, later matriculated at Heidelberg, June 16, 1511. 67

While at Heidelberg Melanchthon published his first poem, honoring a noted, highly respected minister of the day, Geiler von Kaiserberg. Jacob Wimnufeling included it in his biographical sketch of Geiler. Wimnufeling also published Melanchthon's second poem in which he called on the gods and muses to yield to the only true wisdom that could teach man about the universe and lead him to piety. Professor Manschreck points out that it is significant that both Wimnufeling and Geiler were only half way humanists. They were critical of ecclesiasticism and interested in the researches of the new learning, but still loyal to the church. 68
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Melanchthon took his Baccalaureate examinations in his fourth academic year. Before taking these examinations, he had to have absorbed the subjects of the traditional curriculum - the Trivium and the Quadrivium. The school had a definite procedure to follow concerning the examination, the rules of which were printed in the university's official statutes. After the scholar enrolled for the examination, he had to swear an oath concerning several points. First, he must have learned the first and second part of the Doctrinale Alexandri, the proper grammar book of Latin in the second half of the Middle Ages, or he must have been adequately instructed in Latin. Second, he must have attended a definite number of philosophical lectures about different writings, especially those influenced by Aristotle. Third, he had to have participated in many disputationes. According to August Thorbecke, the historian of the University of Heidelberg, the scholarly cultivation was not confined to the three day lectures, which the student heard, but also on the regular exercises, of which the disputationes carried much weight. It required that the candidate engage in twenty debates - once as an attentive listener through the entire disputation, and to participate directly in six debates, three times on the affirmative and three times on the negative side. Fourth, he had to have written proof that he attended lectures for at least one year.
and did the required exercises and presented the examiner appropriate gifts to make up for the classes he cut. At a later date the faculty also admitted that the examinee paid an honorarium for lectures he really did not attend. If he could satisfy these set requirements, he would be allowed to take the examinations - the admissio ad baccalaureatum in artibus.

Before he finally took the examination, the examinee had to take yet another oath which covered the behavior of the candidate, and - after the examination - on the fees that were due, on the attendance to the lectures and participation in exercises throughout the coming year. 70 From 1454 to 1523 one could be examined at Heidelberg in both divisions of scholasticism - realism and nominalism known also as antiquity and modernism. In each year each division had two examination dates: the "new" way (nominalism or modernism) in January and July and the "old" way (antiquity or realism) in May and November. 71 According to school records, Melanchthon was accepted for examination in the old way on June 10, 1511. The examinations themselves were held on June 18, 1511. 72

---
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The examination committee consisted of Master Johannes Billicanus, theologiae baccalaureus; Master Johann Kub from Heidelberg; Master Johann König from Offenburg, utriusque iuris baccalaureus; and Master Johann Lenckmantel, utriusque iuris baccalaureus. The examination concluded with the so-called "determinacio," or solemn address, delivered by those who had passed the examination at a banquet attended by both examiners and guests. Melanchthon passed the examinations and was awarded the Baccalaureate degree.  

Heidelberg's rules stated that one could apply for the Master's degree within the space of one year after passing the baccalaureate examination. Melanchthon studied the prescribed courses diligently for a year. The professors, however, did not want to allow Melanchthon to apply for the Master's because he was too young. Although university records say nothing about this, Camerarius in his biography agrees with this report. Nothing, however, can be found in university records against this report either. Furthermore, whenever the rejection of Melanchthon's application—which
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was never formally submitted - is conjectured, scholars believe it must have had something to do with the humanistic inclinations of the students, including Melanchthon, on which the faculty did not look with favor. Both reasons - Melanchthon's youth and his humanistic tendencies - seem plausible. Ledderhose claims Melanchthon left because he felt no instructors there could help him. This would bear witness to what Hartfelder claims.

In the summer of 1512 Dr. Spangel, with whom Melanchthon lived and whom he admired, died. A fever which attacked Heidelberg each spring hit Melanchthon. These happenings, coupled with those reasons stated above, caused Melanchthon to turn to the University of Tübingen.

According to Hartfelder's account Melanchthon was at Heidelberg for not quite three years. This stay was part of his period of development. Melanchthon took with him many fond memories of the university. Already at this time Philip showed some well prized qualities of teaching ability which his contemporaries envied and which foreshadowed his later
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versatility. "Where else do we see," Hartfelder quotes the to-the-point Richard Rothe as saying at an address in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Melanchthon's death on October 5, 1860, "a so surprising intelligence? Melanchthon always keeps himself busy really acquiring immediately what he learns, and over which he has absolute command. All his studies work together in him into an enviable happy memory, that is both fast and sustained, with an overall clearer, more mobile, more highly active understanding, so that he is able to store every newly won bit of information at the same time and certainly in better order in its new place." 80

At the same time, Hartfelder continues, the talent of dialectical thought, which would spell success or failure in his life, stirred already in Melanchthon. Meanwhile he practiced the same on the scholastic problem of academic disputations, and to the bewilderment of his fellow students, the boyish student untied "the subtle questions Middle Age philosophy that seemed more difficult than the Gordian Knot." In such scholarly battles he sharpened that right instrument of a dialectically schooled spirit which he later adapted to the Wittenberg theology and philosophy of the new (Lutheran)

80 Ibid., p. 34.
University Education: Graduate Studies at Tübingen

The University of Tübingen, to which Melanchthon turned for his graduate study, was barely thirty-five years old when Melanchthon matriculated there on September 17, 1512. Founded by Duke Eberhard of Barte in 1477, the university had a more active scholarly life than the older University of Heidelberg. Humanism and scholasticism had entered here in a friendly alliance. The scholastic, Konrad Summenhart (died 1502), a friend of Wimpfeling's, and the humanist, Heinrich Bebel from Justingen, taught side by side with the best of understanding. When Summerhart died, Bebel even composed an elegant Latin Sophic ode, lamenting his death and exhaustng his contributions to Tübingen.82

In either 1496 or 1497 a chair for the humanistic studies of poetry and eloquence had been set up and the above mentioned Bebel was transferred to it. One of the more honored Latin masters of his time, he stayed at this position for about twenty years, working for the purification of Latin, inspiring others in lectures and writings, and not only building up hu-
manism's reputation, but also defending it against any at-
tacks.

Manschreck reports, however, that the university was
divided in its opinions between nominalists and realists.
The nominalists supported the neo-Aristotelian view that
ideas do not exist apart from their particulars. Therefore,
they claimed, an idea like "church" has no existence, except
as a name. Ideas apart from real existence are merely names.
In contrast, the realists advocated the Neoplatonic view of
the world. The Idea, they said, is more real than the parti­
cular, because the idea transcends time, existing in the Di­
vine Mind. Students at the university were assigned to dormi­
tories reflecting their beliefs. Disputes between students
of these two schools of thought often ended in fights.

Scholastic realists at the university were using
Aristotle to support their views. While at Tübingen Melanch­
thon began to re-edit Aristotle in Greek to show that the
realists were mistaken. A professor of philosophy, Francis
Staden, encouraged him. He proposed that Melanchthon bring out
a new edition of Aristotle in Greek to replace the earlier,
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poor scholastic Latin translation. Even though others at the university promised to help him, Melanchthon had to lay aside the project because of his involvement with his granduncle Reuchlin's dispute with Pfefferkorn. Manschreck claims that Melanchthon's interest in a correct Aristotle text showed his early revolt against the Scholastics, who, he claimed, had "maimed, mutilated, and translated" Aristotle into "barbarous Latin." 85 These early impressions helped shape a point of view on Melanchthon's part based on his belief that the Scholastic teachings were untrue because they were based on mistranslations.

Besides the university's emphasis on humanism, the fact that his two teachers from the Pforzheim Latin school, George Simler and Johann Hiltebrant, now taught at Tübingen, prompted him to seek graduate study there. Melanchthon took philosophy courses from Simler, who first taught humanistic subjects and later became a professor of Roman law. It was through Simler that Melanchthon was directed toward the Greek text of Aristotle. Hartfelder believes that the intimate relationship between Melanchthon and Simler spurred the latter on to write the first Greek Grammar in Germany. 86

85 Ibid., p. 37.
86 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 37.
reflects the excellent relationship of the two men in his
description of their sorrow filled parting when Melanchthon
left for Wittenberg. Hartfelder believes Melanchthon's
rapport with Hiltebrant was just as good, but no evidence
remains of it.

Several other teachers influenced Melanchthon during
his stay at Tübingen. Among these was the above mentioned
Heinrich Bebel, who taught Melanchthon how to write an ele­
gant Latin letter and how to treat any arbitrary subject
from any point of view in the Latin language according to
the rules of rhetoric. When Bebel died, Melanchthon wrote a
short Greek poem in his honor. At a later date, after he had
matured scholastically, Melanchthon no longer thought too
much of Bebel's knowledge of antiquity.

Melanchthon also studied under the astronomer and
astrologer Johannes Stöffler from Justingen. Stöffler
impressed Melanchthon so much that throughout his life he be-

87 Camerarius, *Vita Melanchthon*, p. 25, as referred to

88 Ibid., p. 37.

89 Ibid., p. 36.

90 Ledderhose, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
lieved in astrology. Melanchthon wrote some verses to accompany Stöffler's publication, the *Elucidatio fabriceae usque astrolabii*. At the time Melanchthon was studying the *Oekolampad Hesiod* and looking for information about the pleiads, Stöffler helped him. Stöffler also led Melanchthon to translating Aratus into Latin, a project which Melanchthon undertook with great enthusiasm. Melanchthon dedicated his *Oratio de artibus* to him. In this ovation held at Tübingen, he thanks Stöffler for all his help. Years after his death Melanchthon declared his debt to him in Book XI of the *Corpus Reformatorum*. At other times he related anecdotes and sayings of Stöffler to his listeners, so intense was Melanchthon's memory of him. 91

Another influence was Franciscus Stadianus (referred to above as Francis Staden), who had urged Melanchthon to produce an unadulterated Greek original text of Aristotle without the mistranslations and added medieval scholastic comments. Staden, with the assistance of men like Johannes Reuchlin, Willibard Pirckheimer, George Simler, Wolfgang Fabricius Caputo, and Johannes Oekolamped, were to help Melanchthon produce this text. If he had completed the text, Me-

---

lanchthon would have been as important in the scholarly world as Erasmus who had contributed much to theology through his translation of the New Testament. 92

Staden, who served as a rector of the university, was known for his diligence. He was no humanist, but was friendly to them. As time went on, he became a trusted friend who was not ashamed to learn from his students. Melanchthon studied dialectic with Staden from one to two years. 93

Hartfelder quotes Camerarius as mentioning the humanist Johannes Brassicanus from Constance as another influence. But records show, Hartfelder continues, that Brassicanus was not a teacher at the university, but in the town's Latin school, which Melanchthon apparently never visited. Brassicanus died in 1514. Hartfelder believed that Camerarius might have mistaken the father for the son, Johannes Alexander Brassicanus, who became famous much later.

Melanchthon's course of study at Tubingen reflected the curriculum of a medieval university. The distinction between the learners and the learned, Hartfelder says, was not

92 Ibid., pp. 38–40.
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as sharp then as today. This was especially true in the fourth faculty, of the Arts, which served as preparation for the other three courses of study - law, medicine, and theology. The arts faculty was considered at that time to be inferior to the other professional faculties. It had teachers who were also students seeking advanced degrees. Melanchthon was one of these.

Melanchthon also supplemented the professors' lectures with self-study. To supplement Bebel's instructions in poetry, he studied Vergil and Cicero. First Melanchthon read Vergil, whom he valued as much as Homer. Next he studied Terence, whose five comedies he himself used as subject for lectures, and which eventually served as material for his first literary endeavor, an edition of Terence, published by Anshelm in Tübingen in 1516. A student, Paul Gerräander, helped him with the proofreading. The dedicatory epistle, according to Hartfelder, was an erudite and excellent insight into the history of ancient dramatic poetry. Melanchthon believed Terence to be a teacher representative of correct
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style and of the truths of life, deserving to be read by every age. Later Melanchthon held lectures in eloquence and taught Cicero and Livius, six books of whom he interpreted. He also studied Greek grammar.

On the side, Melanochthon also studied such other subjects as theology, jurisprudence, and medicine. In theology, he studied under Professor Lemp from Steinhem near Marbach. Lemp was once heralded as the most noted teacher at Tübingen. Melanchthon was impressed by Lemp's use of visual aids - blackboard drawings - to illustrate the transubstantiation theory of the Mass. Melanchthon felt Lemp to be a teacher superior to the position he held. Although Lemp once had an argument with Brasicanus about offensive examples in his Latin Grammar in which he mocked Lemp by naming him Pannutius (Latin for "Lump"), others, including Simler, Jacob Spiegel, and Reuchlin admired him enough to dedicate books to him. To supplement Lemp's instruction, Melanchthon studied nominalism.

To increase his knowledge of nominalism, Melanchthon studied William Occam (1280?-1349), who pointed out that uni-
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versals do not exist outside the mind because they are subjective, being intentions of the mind. They do not correspond to objective realities which call them forth. Occam concluded that reason is almost useless as a foundation for revealed dogma. He would accept church dogma by faith without reason. Occam was not a forerunner of the Reformation, but forerunners of the Reformation did use his system of thought. Occam pointed the way to scriptural authority. However, he remained faithful to the Roman Catholic Church, even believing the transubstantiation theory of the mass simply because the Church taught it, even though it was not in Scripture and could not be demonstrated by reason. Martin Luther labeled himself an Occamist. Melanchthon followed Occam at first, but later found the intricacies of Occam's system unsatisfying.

Melanchthon also studied John Wessel (1419-89) who had embraced nominalism and influenced Reuchlin and Rudolph Agricola. Wessel rejected the church as an institution for the dispensation of the treasures of the sacraments. He defined the church as a communion of all who are united with Christ in one faith, hope, and love - an invisible church.
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The pope and the external church were to him incidental and not necessary. He further believed that ecclesiastical vows had no binding power and indulgences had no efficacy. Wessel pointed to the fallibility of the Church with its "pestilential errors" and called submission to such an institution blasphemous and irrational, since he considered the visible institution incidental anyway. Wessel believed that the sacerdotal priesthood had little value since all depended on the relationship of the individual to God. John Wessel's goal was to rediscover the primitive church by getting rid of the accumulated additions of the centuries. This also became one of Melanchthon's goals. Manschreck points out the significance of Melanchthon's having studied Wessel before he met Martin Luther. The study prepared him for the conversations with Luther. It also prepared him for his early rejection of transubstantiation, a step in which Melanchthon anticipated Luther.

Another author who influenced Melanchthon was Rudolph Agricola, mentioned above in the section devoted to Melanchthon's career at Heidelberg. Records are vague on just when Melanchthon was influenced by him. Hartfelder places this

influence in the Tübingen period. 102

Though the nominalism problem weighed heavily on Melanchthon, he remained neutral in the controversy which raged at Tübingen. He sought to avoid any heated confrontation on the matter. Camerarius believed that Melanchthon tried to unify the factions through his own character and scholarship, a device that foreshadowed his later participation in the tumult of controversy over church doctrine, causing him many sorrowful hours. 103

Melanchthon attended lectures in the areas of medicine and jurisprudence, not for any particular fame, according to Camerarius, but to get the knowledge and utility of the subjects. 104 He virtually memorized Galen. 105

The basic course of study leading to the Master's degree at Tübingen, was, as stated above, rather rigid, reflecting the rules of the typical medieval universities. Students had to adhere to them to get an academic grade and rank. To begin with, the degree received at the previous
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university had to be recognized. The applicant had to have fulfilled many conditions before being allowed to enter. Again the oath—always important in medieval schools—played a big part. This time Melanchthon had to confirm by oath or by the production of his diploma that he had a baccalaureate degree from Heidelberg. 106

The Master's examination, the *examen pro magistrandis*, was given only once a year. To prepare for the examination, he had to have taken a course of study with specifically required subjects, consisting of lectures and exercises and containing mainly the subjects of the Quadrivium. On St. John the Evangelist's Day, December 27, Melanchthon had to declare his intentions and four days later he had to start them. 107

After admission to the examination was granted, the candidate, or magistrand, had to give another oath to the dean, comprising six different points, ranging from, first, the proper reverence and obedience to the professor to, sixth, the promise to study one more year at Tübingen. In connection with the examination, the examinee had to participate in a


disputation, a requirement set to help keep a proper tone to the examination. It was forbidden to treat the opponent roughly with words and phrases such as heretic, suspicious in belief, or erroneous in faith, or to call his opponents statements or propositions asinine, irrational, false, or the like. The entire project ended with a solemn Master's banquet in which the professors took part.

On January 25, 1514, Melanchthon, at the age of seventeen, received his Master of Liberal Arts degree, the first in rank of eleven students. The degree gave him the title of Privatdocent, with the right to lecture on the classics at the university.

Melanchthon stayed at Tübingen until he received the appointment at Wittenberg. On the death of Bebel, Melanchthon
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was invited to take his place and teach rhetoric. While teaching and continuing his studies, he made many friends. Franciscus Frielieb (In Greek, Irenicus von Ettlingen), a colleague of Philip's at the Pforzheim Latin School, was one. He had much in common with Melanchthon, being of the same age and having the same likes and dislikes. Frielieb complimented Melanchthon in his widely read history, *Exegesis Germaniae*, calling him his other teacher next to Simler, filled with diligence, scholarship, honesty, and furnished with so many skills, and instructed in so many knowledges. Frielieb asserted that the talent to learn had not failed him.

As proof of Melanchthon's teaching ability, Frielieb cites the case of Kaspar Kurrer and Bernardus Maurus, who under Melanchthon's supervision had become very learned men. Hartfelder points out that Kurrer, however, since he arrived at Tübingen in 1516, only two years before Melanchthon left for Wittenberg, was not too long in his influence. However,
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under Melanchthon's supervision, Kurrer had finished a Latin translation of Greek authors, a project many humanists were interested in because of the expansion of knowledge of the Greek language in Germany.

Melanchthon's oldest surviving Latin speech, de artibus liberalibus, and a Latin translation of St. Luke, an undertaking which he had finished through Kurrer and probably published by Anshelm in 1518, steered Kurrer also to a literary contribution, a Greek distichon, which was a Latin translation of an Orphic hymn in metrical form. Kurrer did not follow Melanchthon to Wittenberg, but stayed at Tübingen, where he became a teacher of Greek and a notary for the university. Even though he remained true to Roman Catholicism, his relations with Melanchthon continued. At a later date Melanchthon found a manuscript of an anonymous medieval historian, who in his opinion had written on a subject which had not received an accurate treatment - the tragic battle between King Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII. Through an intermediary he sent a copy of the manuscript to Kurrer for his opinion. He gave Kurrer permission to publish the manuscript if it was

\[113\]
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worth anything. Because he found it authentic and worthwhile, Kurrer, with the financial help of two Catholic patrons, had it printed in Tübingen in 1525. Because he was afraid of enraging his Catholic patrons, he never mentioned Melanchthon's name as the finder of the manuscript, and he published only part of Melanchthon's letter. After being published a second time by L. Schradin in 1533, Schradin, with the help of the chronicler, Hirsaugniense von Trithemius, discovered that the historian was Lambertus Schafnaburgensis, or more correctly, Hersveldensis.

Though we have no exact information concerning their friendship, Bernardus Mauras, another scholar of Greek must have been a good friend. Melanchthon dedicated his Latin translation of Plutarch's *Nota Pythagorica* to him in 1517, his Hegenauer edition of the *Institutiones Graecae Grammaticae* of 1518, and (from Wittenberg) his three books on dialectic in 1519. 115

When Melanchthon arrived at Tübingen, he became acquainted with a monk five years older than himself from the Benedictine monastery Alpirsbach in the Württemberg Black


Forest. The monk, Ambrosius Blarer, the son of a famous family of the imperial city of Constance, had been sent to Tübingen as a thirteen year old boy. On December 23, 1511, he received his baccalaureate degree and on June 24, 1513, his Master's degree. There are no records of how the two met. After the monk returned to the monastery, the two kept up an exchange of letters, indicating a warm friendship.

At first many of the letters concerned requests for each others writings, interpretations of passages, or the meaning of certain words. Later religion became the topic. Blarer was undecided whether he should leave the monastery to join his brothers who had already joined Melanchthon in the Reformation movement at Wittenberg. Melanchthon advised Blarer that as long as his arguments were against custom and tradition and not against doctrine he should remain at the monastery and try to pacify things as much as possible. Blarer, however, did leave, working for the Reformation in Constance, Memmingen, Württemberg, Ulm, Elsslingen, and other towns. These letters of Melanchthon mark the transition from humanistic to religious topics. 117
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Other friends at Tübingen included Johannes Hausschein (or Oekolampadius) with whom Melanchthon studied Hesiod and other Greek works and who had given Melanchthon the three books by Agricola; Johannes Icolampadius, to whom Melanchthon dedicated his *Epistola über die Leipziger Disputationen* in 1519: Secerius, later to be the successor to the publisher Anshelm at Hagenau; and Johannes Knoder from Rottenberg, whom Melanchthon knew from the Pforzheimer Latin School, and who later became chancellor of Duke Ulrich of Wittenberg. 119

Which of these friends belonged with Melanchthon in the Sodalitas der Neckar Genossen, one of the societies founded by Konrad Celtis during his journeys, we do not know. Either is little known concerning any teaching clubs at the time. 120

Of course, Melanchthon and his grand-uncle Reuchlin often visited each other. Melanchthon utilized Reuchlin's library. His grand-uncle gave him a Latin Bible to read, which he read Sundays in church while the priest spoke his sermons. 121


119 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-5.


When printing was in its infancy, printers and scholars were on more intimate terms. Most of the printers and their proofreaders were first of all learned men. Since 1511 Thomas Anshelm from Baden had a printshop in Tübingen. Professor Hiltebrant, mentioned earlier, was Anshelm's original proofreader, probably having had the job while Anshelm was in Pforzheim (see above). When Hiltebrant died in 1514, Melanchthon took over his job. The first printing that bears Melanchthon's name is a publication of August, 1514, Bartoomaus Coloniensis's *Dialogus Mythologicus*. Since Anshelm's Press printed mostly humanist books, Melanchthon became more involved in the humanist movement.

Anshelm left Tübingen in 1516 for Hagenau, two years before Melanchthon. Their relation did not end, for Melanchthon had Anshelm print his Greek Grammar at his Alsace shop. For years afterwards, Melanchthon continued using Anshelm's services.

Another humanist whom Melanchthon met through his work at Anshelm's was Paul Altmann (or Geraänder), of Salzburg, who entered Tübingen in September, 1514. Melanchthon dedicated

---


his edition of Terence, mentioned earlier, to him because he provided the proof readers for his text. Ger"ander was a Reuchlinist. Later he went to Rome where he helped Reuchlin in various ways. As one reviews the various friendships Melanchothon made during his stay at Tübingen, one can see the emerging pattern of humanism in his life as well as a foreshadowing of the religious problems that lay ahead.

Melanchothon's literary career was launched at Tübingen. At Heidelberg he had had a few poems published. At Tübingen his literary output increased. Reuchlin's book, an answer to Pfefferkorn's and the Cologne professors' denunciation of his (Reuchlin's) work with Hebrew classics, including the Kabala, printed by Anshelm in 1514, contained prefaces by both Hiltebrant and Melanchothon. In his preface, written during the days he was taking his Master's examination, Melanchothon begs the readers to read the book as an example of style which next to Quintilian is worth imitating and also reveals himself as the spiritual heir to Reuchlin. The more popular Letters of Obscure Men, published in 1515 in de-
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fense of Reuchlin was said to have been authored in part by Melanchthon. Later research reveals that though Melanchthon helped edit the book, he was not an author of it. 127

Melanchthon wrote prefaces, usually complimentary, to many writings of others. Melanchthon's style as a collaborator can be seen in some of the humanist books on grammar published by Anshelm, an example of one being the Institutiones des Aldus Manutius. Melanchthon's later emphasis on grammar can be traced to the emphasis on the subject both at the university and through the many publications at Anshelm's, where he had also been exposed to a pedagogical book of Italian humanism, Mapheus Vegius's De educatione liberorum of 1515. 128

Besides his edition of Terence, Anshelm also published Melanchthon's, earlier mentioned, oldest surviving Latin speech, de artibus liberalibus. In it Melanchthon compares the arts with the strings of Mercury's lyre. For every art worthy of respect, knowledge will seek a muse or patron. First is found the three beginnings of wisdom, the Trivium - grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. Then follows the Quadri


geometry, music, and astronomy. The two remaining muses, Klio and Kalliope, are then set above Literature and Poetry, since no other writers would be read with more utility than historians and poets. All the arts however are instruments with which the human spirit can grasp the wisdom born of the gods and sent from heaven. The job of youth is to make these collective arts their own. These thoughts lead to a concluding section in which a translation of a Lucian dialogue which Melanchthon's student, Kaspar Kurrer, had finished is found.129

Tübingen, according to Hartfelder, is important in Melanchthon's life for several reasons. First, he was strongly influenced by the humanist writings of Rudolph Agricola. Second, he became prominent as a student and gained much fame as a teacher. Third, the Tübingen Grammar Circle influenced him to urge the use of grammar later. Fourth, he was a confirmed second generation Reuchlinist who broke completely with tradition, which Reuchlin himself did not do. Finally, the last year of his stay at Tübingen, with its continuing humanistic influence, made him ripe for Luther.130

129 Ibid., p. 59.
130 Ibid., pp. 60-1.
Melanchthon's studies during his youth were throughout universal - no branch of knowledge remained wholly unfamiliar to him. This universality, for which his remarkable talents fitted him, led him to adopt a point of view which would influence his ideas in his educational career at Wittenberg.

More condemned than praised, more unknown than known, Philip Melanchthon seems to have always stood in the shadows of the background. Whenever the Reformation is discussed, be it in religious, historical, or philosophical circles, the conversation turns swiftly to Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. When northern humanism is mentioned, thoughts turn quickly to Erasmus. If education is the topic, John Sturm's Strassburg school or Jesuit education comes first to mind.

As a true teacher, Melanchthon seems unknown today simply because he did his job so well that we believe today that things were always so - that they were never different. However, there was a beginning, and Melanchthon was there to help launch Germany's education system, setting it on its humanistic course which it has maintained for centuries.

What ingredients make up such a leader? In Melanchthon's case it was pious parents, a solicitous grand-uncle,
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a humanistically inclined education on both the secondary and university levels made universal through his choice of subjects and extra readings, and humanist teachers and friends. Add to these his ambition, diligence, inquisitiveness, and perspicacity, without which he would never have recognized the opportunities which lay before him.

Whatever Pforzheim, Heidelberg, and Tübingen offered which seemed helpful Melanchthon took. If items were lacking, he headed for the library, there to attempt to find his answers. It was during these early years that Melanchthon became dissatisfied with those elements of scholasticism which had perverted Aristotelian truth. His dissatisfaction in this area, balanced with the truths he became exposed to through humanism, led him to question Scholastic truths and methods in general. By the time he accepted the position at Wittenberg, Melanchthon was a complete humanist. His dissatisfaction with Scholasticism had, however, led him to question the other areas of thought which it touched, especially theology. Woodward concurs that Melanchthon, already by 1517, was interested enough in the ecclesiastical controversy to support Erasmus
and Hutten. It remained for Martin Luther and Wittenberg, however, to supply the correct answers to Melanchthon.

His Educational Career at Wittenberg

Philip Melanchthon became more and more dissatisfied with conditions at Tübingen. First of all, the university became more and more ecclesiastically conservative. The relative freedom of teaching had disappeared and Melanchthon was looked upon as dangerous. Secondly, Melanchthon saw no future as a teacher there. On July 12, 1518, he wrote an impatient letter to Reuchlin, stating that he wanted to be delivered from his "house of bondage," where, occupied in unimportant labor with boys, he felt himself fast becoming a boy again. Melanchthon indicated he would go wherever Reuchlin would send him.

Reuchlin had already at an earlier date recommended Melanchthon to his personal friend, the Elector Frederick of

---


Saxony, who had asked him if he knew of a suitable Greek teacher for his university at Wittenberg. In his reply to the elector, Reuchlin had written, "I know of no one among the Germans who surpasses him except Master Erasmus." Following Reuchlin's recommendation, the Elector chose Melanchthon over Peter Mosellanus for the position.

After leaving his family in Brettan, Melanchthon rode to Augsburg where he presented himself to the elector. He then journeyed to Wittenberg, stopping off at Nuremberg and Leipzig, where friends helped him celebrate his new position. He finally arrived at Wittenberg on August 25, 1518.

Melanchthon officially received the position of first professor of Greek language on August 26, 1518. During those first days, the new professor of Greek was introduced to the other faculty members, including Martin Luther. Melanchthon sensed a coolness on their part, which Manschreck believes was due to their preference for the above-mentioned

Mosellanus, an established Greek scholar-teacher of Leipzig.

On August 29, 1518, Philip Melanchthon delivered, as was customary in those days, his inaugural address before the assembled students and faculty of the university. The topic of his declamation was "Correcting the Education of Young People." In his speech he attacked vigorously those barbarians who arrogated to themselves the titles and privileges of doctors in the schools--those who cried out that Greek was a danger to idle minds and Hebrew a danger to faith, and those who felt that philosophy would be neglected because of the study of these languages. Melanchthon stated that it was a colossal task to struggle against this ignorant herd. However, he begged his hearers to join him in recovering the "Letters" from sloth and squalor.

Next, the new professor traced for his audience a history of learning. He highlighted the extinction of the Muses through the Gothic and Lombardian devastations. He included
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Bede among the few learned men in the era after the church fathers. Melanchthon noted the literacy revival after Charlemagne's importation of Alcuin from England. The professor of Greek now showed his humanistic, anti-scholastic side by emphasizing that after Alcuin learning again deteriorated. Aristotle was now studied in a degenerated form. Better study was being neglected while a new system of education was imposed on the youth, resulting in the destruction of both Church morals and the study of literature. Melanchthon felt that if either had been left, the other might have been restored. He especially condemned the late Middle Age's practice of relying on commentaries and secondary sources.

After further condemning scholastic education, Melanchthon detailed the present progress of studies along humanistic lines. He accentuated the need for Greek and Hebrew next to Latin because they were the pure sources for excellence in both sacred and secular scholarship. He felt that the life
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of a Christian would thus be renewed, for he would be drawing directly from the Biblical teachings of Christ. Melanchthon concluded his declamation by outlining plans to broaden training in history, mathematics, and science.

The new Greek professor’s proposals for revising the University curriculum and goals of education drew strong approval from Luther, who had come to hear the young professor. The lecture, a tremendous success, helped Melanchthon gain stature in the eyes of the Wittenberg faculty. He had successfully combined the goals of the humanists with the concerns for Luther’s young reform movement. Luther, as revealed in his correspondence with Spalatin, now recognized Melanchthon as a providential addition to the Wittenberg family. He also felt the university was not paying Melanchthon an adequate salary.

Philip Melanchthon soon came under Martin Luther’s in-
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fluence.\textsuperscript{149} Out of love for the Scriptures\textsuperscript{150} and because his Master's of Arts degree did not allow him to lecture on theology,\textsuperscript{151} Melanchthon studied for the lowest theology degree.\textsuperscript{152} His thesis, submitted to a disputation with Peter Fontanus, Dean of Theology, on September 9, 1519, reveals his pro-Luther, anti-Catholic tendency.\textsuperscript{153} Melanchthon received his degree on September 19.\textsuperscript{154} Luther's influence on Melanchthon will be detailed in later sections of this paper. Cox mentions that Melanchthon was Luther's instructor in Greek.

In general, Melanchthon's educational work at Witten-
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berg consisted of lecturing on ethics, logic, and physics, and giving critical interpretations of many of the Greek and Latin classics. In theology, he lectured mainly on the exegesis of the New Testament, but he also read on the Old Testament and on dogmatics. 156

Von Raumer claims that "Melanchthon undertook the theology lectures contrary to the dictates of his own inclination. He wrote Spalatin in regard to religious matters, "I cannot hesitate to follow whither thou leadest, even to become a keeper of cattle. Nevertheless, I would wish in this one respect to be free." 157 Von Raumer thinks it noteworthy that Melanchthon never sought a doctorate of theology or did ever preach, even though Luther frequently urged him to do so. 158

However, "Melanchthon did accept Luther's teachings and interpretation of Christian doctrine, as will be detailed later in this paper. He helped formulate many of the Lutheran creeds and represented Luther, and later Lutheranism, at religious colloquies. His greatest work was with the schools. He, to-
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gether with Johann Bugenhagen and others, implemented Luther's ideas in reorganizing the educational system in the German Lutheran states. As will be explained later, Melanchthon took Luther's basic ideas, added his own, and put them into practice. Melanchthon was the humanistic systematizer of Luther's educational ideas.

Melanchthon, who was fourteen years younger than Luther, survived him by fourteen years. Both died at the age of 63.159 Toward the end of his life, Melanchthon's lot became poorer and poorer. His wife passed away in 1557 while Melanchthon was at Worms meeting with Roman Catholics in an attempt to work out a basis of union.160

His participation in the various religious controversies had taken its toll on him. On April 4, 1560, after returning from Leipzig on business for the elector, he caught a cold. By April 8, his fever was high. Dr. Peucer, believing Melanchthon's kidney infection had returned, prescribed warm poultices and a bath. On the next day, Melanchthon remembered the omen of death the position of the stars gave. Although he
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did feel stronger in succeeding days, by April 19 he was again very weak.

According to Von Raumer, Melanchthon, on his death bed, was comforted by the Bible passage, "As many as received him, to these gave he power to become Sons of God." In undertones, Melanchthon repeated these words from the last prayer of Christ: "that they may all be one, even as we are one." Also on his death bed, he answered Peucer's question, "Whether he desired anything," with "nothing but heaven; let me rest and pray. My time has almost come." Philip Melanchthon died about 7 p.m. on the evening of April 19, 1560, while friends prayed and students stood outside the house.

According to the custom of the time, Lucas Cranach painted his portrait the next day. Hundreds of people passed
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by the coffin in respect to the dead Praeceptor of Germany. Paul Eber preached the funeral sermon, while Veit Winsheim delivered the graveside Latin oration. Philip Melanchthon was buried in the Wittenberg Castle Church, by the side of Martin Luther.
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Chapter II

HIS PERSONAL LIFE

His Personality

Melanchthon was shy, extremely sensitive, obsessed with a feeling of inferiority, and, according to Graves, lacking in creativity. He was thin and slightly built.  

His chest was broad, with his neck somewhat long. His face was expressive, with a high forehead. His blue eyes were full of beauty, intelligence, and gentleness. He was a moody person by nature; he believed that things were much worse than they really were. Melanchthon had a speech impediment and a hitch in the shoulder when he walked. In his early years, Melanchthon suffered from sleeplessness. In his later years, he suffered from sharp pains of the gravel, a kidney disease.
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Once when he was asked how he envisaged the Apostle Paul, Luther answered with what Bainton calls an affectionate guffaw, "I think he was a scrawny shrimp like Melanchthon." Bainton adds, however, that when Melanchthon opened his mouth, he was like the boy Jesus in the temple. Ledderhose claims Melanchthon was very animated in conversation.

Two items contributed to Melanchthon's constant poor health. The first was his constant near poverty; the second was that he drove himself too hard. Luther felt he had the answers for both. First, he was able, through George Spalatin, the Elector's adviser on University matters, to get an increase in salary for Melanchthon. His salary was doubled from the 100 Gulden he received in his first year at Wittenberg to 200 Gulden. In 1536, Melanchthon received a second raise to 300

---
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Gulden. In 1541, his salary was 400 Gulden a year. Melanchthon never became rich, however, because he would never say "no" to any cause. He never turned anyone away. He gave whatever was needed -- a recommendation, food, or money. One reason for conducting his "schola privata" at Wittenberg was to help him enhance his income.

Secondly, Luther found a wife to help take care of Melanchthon. At first Melanchthon did not want to marry, feeling that he was robbing himself of time which could be much better devoted to study and pleasure. But he eventually became engaged to the suggested young lady, Katherine, daughter of Hieronimus Krapp, the mayor of Wittenberg. Even though Melanchthon felt he was unworthy of her, the two were married on November 25, 1520, following a short three month engagement.

Melanchthon was weighed down by family problems. Two
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of his children died at an early age, and another one was sickly most of his life. The perverse behavior of his son-in-law, George Sabinus, also disturbed him. Later, the death of his wife added to his sorrow. 15

Von Raumer questions Melanchthon's moodiness. Was Melanchthon overwhelmed by the fearful responsibilities which devolved upon him? The added sorrow of being persecuted and being forsaken by his own friends also weighed him down. 16

Melanchthon had a clear, but quiet voice. During his early years he stuttered. He eventually conquered the problem, but weak traces remained. 17 Usually a soft and mild-mannered man, Melanchthon could flare up, especially because of some misunderstanding or ill will. He became especially angry when his carefully thought out ideas found unexpected or foolish opposition. He had no desire to argue or answer questions on things he considered self-evident in private or public lectures or disputations. If he saw that someone
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wished to argue over some obvious or petty point, he showed his disinclination to do so. If anyone, on the other hand, had a weak or trifling argument against him, Melanchthon turned into a shrewd dialectician, returning such sharp arguments against his opponent, that he, Melanchthon, easily won. On many occasions, he would tell someone who had very weak arguments to quit and give someone else the time to speak. Hartfelder warns, however, that the latter point was related by Ratzeberger, who was an opponent of Melanchthon's and therefore extremely critical of him. Luther, however, likened Melanchthon to Jeremiah, saying that he scolded too much.

Melanchthon liked moderation in debating. At the Leipzig debate between Dr. Eck and Luther, the question came up as to whether stenographers should be employed to take notes. Eck said no. He believed that taking the stenographers into account would chill the passionate heat of the debate. Melanchthon replied: "The truth might fare better at a lower
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temperature. Melanchthon was constantly worried about his sins. Bainton reports that Luther once told Melanchthon, "Sin for all you are worth. God can forgive only a lusty sinner!" Bainton feels Luther was only jesting with Melanchthon, implying that it might do Melanchthon good for once to spoil his record.

His Family

Philip Melanchthon had four children through his marriage with Katherine. The oldest was Anna, born either September 4 or September 20, 1522, according to Manschreck, or August 29, 1522, according to Maria Hörtter. At 14 she married George Sabinus, a young gifted poet who had been recommended to Melanchthon by Erasmus. He had become a close friend of the Melanchthon family, staying with them for two years before he married Anna. Melanchthon and Anna did not
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care for Sabinus's excessive ambition, which had been causing friction between the married couple. Sabinus's spendthrift habits caused him to neglect his family. After dropping his appointed position of professor of literature at the university at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, he took, on August 17, 1544, the position of first rector of the new University of Königsberg, an appointment he received through the recommendation of Camerarius. Three years later, in March, 1547, Anna died. Her three daughters and son eventually came to live with the Melanchthons. 24

Second oldest was Philip, Jr., born January 13, 1525. Always a sickly person, he nevertheless lived to be eighty. Even though he was not too brilliant, he served as notary at the University of Wittenberg. 25 When he was nineteen years old, and a student of law, he was betrothed to a woman of Leipzig without the knowledge of Melanchthon or his wife. 26
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25 Ibid., pp. 95 and 305.
26 Ibid., p. 200.
Another son, George, was born on November 25, 1527, while the Melanchthon family lived at Jena. An unusually gifted child, he died to the sorrow of Katherine and Philip on August 15, 1529, at the age of two. 27

The last child, Magdalen, was born on July 18, 1533. At nineteen she married the noted physician, Dr. Caspar Peucer, who wrote extensively on medicine, mathematics, and theology. After Melanchthon's death, Peucer became a ranking professor at Wittenberg and physician to the elector of Saxony. He collected Melanchthon's works and propagated his ideas. Peucer himself took a Calvinistic and spiritual view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Ultra-Lutherans incensed Elector Augustus against Peucer, who along with others was persecuted and imprisoned. Magdalen died in sorrow at Rochlitz, July 18, 1576. In 1586, Peucer was liberated, but he never was the same. He was often observed weeping at public worship services. 28
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His Family Life

In spite of the early death of his second son and the later problems of his older daughter and son-in-law, Philip Melanchthon had a good family life. He loved his children. He was kind and cheerful, true and single-minded in his relations with friends. Thoughtless in regard to the worldly goods, he was able to save nothing to bequeath to his family or friends. 29

Manschreck gives the following description of Melanchthon's life style. He usually woke up at 2 a.m., said a brief prayer, read portions from the Bible, and looked at an almanac to see what Saint's Day it was. Next he answered his correspondence. Melanchthon made it a habit never to read a letter before retiring, in fear that it might disturb his sleep. He had no luxurious diet. Soup, fish, vegetables, and eggs were his usual fare. He ate only two meals, frequently just one a day. "We Germans eat ourselves poor, sick and into hell," he would say. However, he did enjoy conversation and humor at the table. Before each meal he returned thanks, coupled with the Apostles' Creed. 30

29Raumer, op. cit., p. 182.
From 6 a.m. on, he spent the time studying, lecturing, or counseling with students. He spent the evening hours with his family or with students. He enjoyed a glass of wine before retiring. During the evening hours, he ignored all business and would not even read any late mail. He usually retired about nine o'clock. Melanchthon often conversed with Luther on a shaded stone bench behind his house. Luther's house was at the end of a path leading from the garden wall separating the two properties. Melanchthon had many visitors. One friend reported that at one supper, he had guests who spoke twelve languages. Melanchthon believed in regular church attendance, not only to set a good example, but because he knew that the Holy Spirit worked through the word of God at the services in which he believed the Son of God to be present.
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One can see here a picture of a quiet, religious intellectual teacher who enjoyed the routine of studies. One can also conjecture that this same person, constantly thrown into the limelight of controversy, would -- if he could -- retreat into the quiet world of scholarly pursuits, an endeavor that was more and more to be denied him as the course of the Reformation went on.
Chapter III

MELANCHTHON THE REFORMER

Luther's Co-Worker

Since the purpose of this dissertation is to examine Philip Melanchthon's educational contributions, his career as a reformer and as assistant to Martin Luther will not be treated in detail. But the topic cannot be entirely ignored, since his work as a reformer was related to his work as a scholar and teacher. Melanchthon's religious philosophy will be examined in a later chapter. Here we will only survey his activities.

As was stated earlier, Melanchthon had already become dissatisfied with Roman Catholicism while at Tübingen, as his correspondence with the monk, Blarer, indicated. His inaugural address labeled Melanchthon an anti-scholastic in Luther's eyes, and his Baccalaureate theses reflected Luther's and Wittenberg's influence on him. In it, Melanchthon accented the depravity of human nature, man's hate toward God because of man's failure to obey the law and his fear of the consequences, the righteousness of Christ, the futility of good work, the inability of the human will to force the intellect to give "assent" (or faith or wisdom), without the love of Christ, the superior authority of the Scriptures in contrast...
to the inferior authority of councils and other articles of faith, and the role of God as the sum of all things. Luther praised these theses in a letter to Staupitz in 1519.

As the work of the Reformation went on, Melanchthon became more and more involved in it. He accompanied Luther to the debate with Dr. Eck at Leipzig in June, 1519. Later in the year, the theses mentioned above came into the possession of the same Dr. Eck, who labeled them heresy.

Melanchthon became Luther's helper, defender, and editor. As he did, Melanchthon's acquisition of Luther's ideas and point-of-view continued. Melanchthon edited some of Luther's printed work and added his own prefaces to others. For a while he turned away from the Aristotle he had admired
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for so long because of Luther's antipathy toward him.  

Melanchthon also helped Martin Luther in his translation of the Bible. Melanchthon wrote letters and talked to numerous people in an effort to find German equivalents for Roman and Greek coins. He searched the classics for idioms. He even wrote to farmers to find out about the characteristics of grains. After the New Testament was published, Melanchthon planned to get maps of Palestine for later editions. He asked the University of Wittenberg for funds for the project.

Besides writing and publishing religious books of his own, Melanchthon became the official representative of Protestantism at almost every colloquy in Germany from 1529 to 1560. He helped write the protest that gave Protestantism its name. His works have influenced almost every major development in Protestantism. Historians generally rank him second only to Luther and Calvin.
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The problems at Wittenberg concerning radical extremism, while Luther was in hiding following his banishment by the Emperor at the Diet of Worms in 1521, foreshadowed Melanchthon's incapability to handle extraordinary situations. Nevertheless, he represented Luther at the diets held in Speyer (1526) and Marburg (1529), in which the principle of the individual princes' determination of the religion of their lands was discussed. He engaged with Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, in a separate colloquy at Marburg later in the year on theological matters, especially the Protestant interpretation of the Lord's Supper.

Melanchthon represented Luther at the Diet at Augsburg in 1530. For it Emperor Charles V had requested that the "dissenters" prepare a statement of their faith. Luther and the Wittenberg theologians first met at Torgau to draw up a preliminary draft in which the articles on which they would not yield would be placed first, while those on which negotiation were possible would be placed last. Melanchthon then
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took these, now known as the *Torgau Articles*, and summarized and revised them to make them both clear and concise. Though many had worked on the project, the *Augsburg Confession* was Melanchthon's work.

On May 11, 1530, a draft of the *Confession* was sent to Luther for approval. Luther, who could not attend the Diet because of the imperial ban placed on him earlier at Worms, endorsed it, saying that it pleased him very well. He did not know how he could improve or change anything nor would he find it fitting to do so. Stupperich reports that Luther liked Melanchthon's wording "for I cannot tread so softly and gently." On June 25, 1530, the *Augsburg Confession* was read in German by Dr. Christian Beyer, the Saxon Vice-Chancellor, to the Emperor and an assembled throng in the Chapter Room of the bishop's palace. Manschreck states that there are conflicting reports as to its reception by the Emperor. Justus Jonas claimed the Emperor listened intently,


while John Brentz reported that the Emperor fell asleep. 15

The Catholic theologians present prepared a Confutation to the Confession, presenting it to the Emperor on July 8. In the months that followed, the two groups, with the Protestants led by Melanchthon, negotiated. Melanchthon seemed willing to yield to many Catholic points for the sake of peace, since he feared any political disruption. He wanted to press only for the Protestant stands on the Lord's Supper and clerical marriage. Facing the increasing scorn of the assembled Protestants and seeing that the Catholics would not mellow in their stand, Melanchthon finally stayed with the original ideas of the Confession. In his prepared reply to Confutation, he stuck with the original principles, supporting them with theological principles and scriptural proofs. In general, the document, now known as the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, formulated more exactly the Protestant view of the Catholic Church's abuses. 16

Moderation was the key word in Melanchthon's religious negotiations. According to Stupperich, Melanchthon unwillingly

15 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 194.

became the spokesman for the Evangelical estates. In various letters to emissaries within and outside Germany, he maintained that peace could be maintained if the extremists were excluded.17

Melanchthon turned to humanist friends to try to achieve peace and harmony. Because he believed deeply in the idea of one church, he was sure that the various parties involved in the negotiations were attempting to end the unity. Erasmus much earlier looked at Melanchthon as one who worked for peace. If he had the health, Erasmus said, he would gladly have united Melanchthon's efforts with his own. Melanchthon also bore witness to Erasmus in a letter, stating that he followed Erasmus's guidance in judging dogmas and most controversial questions.18

Humanists within the Roman Catholic Church from such countries as France, Poland, and Italy invited Melanchthon to accept positions within their countries.19 Francis I invited Melanchthon to Paris for doctrinal discussions. Though Luther backed him, the Elector of Saxony, looking for favors from
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King Ferdinand of Austria (and brother of Charles V), did not let him go. 20

Henry VIII of England also sought Melanchthon's advice. The King asked Melanchthon's opinion on a divorce he sought from Catherine of Aragon who had failed to provide him with an heir. Melanchthon advised polygamy rather than divorce as a solution because the former was not forbidden by law, while the latter was. As history shows, Henry VIII did not take Melanchthon's advice, preferring the divorce recommended by his own theologians. 21 Melanchthon took a similar view in regard to Philip of Hesse's marital problems, recommending - as Luther also had done in this case - bigamy. Both Luther and Melanchthon suffered somewhat in stature in the eyes of their followers as a result of their advice to the Landgrave. 22

Melanchthon also had received an invitation to visit Henry in England to discuss the Reformation. Because the Elector again disapproved, Melanchthon met with English re-
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presentatives in Wittenberg instead. For the meeting in 1536 Melanchthon composed a set of articles on faith bearing the title \textit{The Wittenberg Articles}. The King, whose main interest was really joining the Smalcald League for political purposes, was informed that he could not join the League unless he accepted the articles. Henry never accepted the articles or joined the League.\footnote{Stupperich, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 105.} Though Melanchthon never did get to England, Alexander Aless, a refugee from Scotland, brought copies to King Henry and to Archbishop Cranmer.\footnote{Manschreck, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 228.}

Melanchthon was involved in many meetings, colloquies, and council meetings concerning the new faith. He met with Martin Bucer of Strasbourg at various times between 1534 and 1536, resulting in the \textit{Wittenberg Concord}, which dealt with the Lord's Supper, but which was not accepted for long by the Swiss.\footnote{Stupperich, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 105-6.}

Philip Melanchthon was present at the Diet of Smalcald in 1537, where Luther's Smalcald Articles were to be presented...
to the Emperor. Melanchthon accepted Luther's ideas, but added that he would allow the Pope to remain as head of the church, should he accept the gospel as presented by the Lutherans, since this would make for peace and general unity. Instead of Luther's Smalcald Articles, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and Melanchthon's newly written On the Power and Primacy of the Pope were submitted. In the last mentioned document Melanchthon refuted the Pope's claim to superiority and asserted the right of churches everywhere to ordain for themselves pastors and church officers. This position contradicted Melanchthon's earlier statements concerning the papacy.

Other conferences Melanchthon attended included those at Dresden and Frankfort (1539), Smalcald (1540), and Worms (1541 and 1545). Stupperich maintains that Melanchthon's views on church politics show that he was no realistic statesman, and that the actual situation usually did not correspond
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to Melanchthon's preconceived opinion. The Roman Catholics, however, admired Melanchthon, and would have liked to have had him on their side. Once Campegius, the Papal legate in Germany, sent his secretary, Nausea, to sway Melanchthon from Luther in order to join the Heidelberg faculty. Because Melanchthon was involved in so many of these religious meetings, Sell called Melanchthon the secretary of state of the Wittenberg Reformation.

Melanchthon Alone

Because Luther was at Mansfeld at the time of his death on February 18, 1546, Melanchthon was not at his side when he died. On February 19, the day he received a letter informing him of Luther's death, Melanchthon, instead of lecturing on Romans, told his class with pathos of the details of the death. On February 22, after Bugenhagen preached the funeral sermon, Melanchthon delivered the customary Latin oration in which he praised Luther's work, placing him in the company of Abraham, Elijah, the apostles, Augustine, and others. He extolled Luther for bringing to light the true and necessary doctrine of justification by faith alone. He did not slight

31 Ledderhose, op. cit., pp. 54-5.
32 Sell, op. cit., p. 11.
Luther's faults, but neither did he accent them. He concluded by warning of the confusion that often follows the death of an illustrious man. 33

Melanchthon might have had an omen concerning the future, for his words at Luther's funeral were never more correct. In the fifteen years after Luther's death Melanchthon faced many crises. Controversies over the correct interpretation of adiaphora (or non-essentials), the Lord's Supper, good works, and justification by faith haunted him. Melanchthon was branded a traitor to Lutheranism, a weakling, and a compromiser with the papal anti-Christ. Manschreck labeled these charges character assassination. 34

In 1546 Emperor Charles V declared war on Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Melanchthon had finally given up on the Emperor, publishing tracts against him. 35 To Melanchthon's sorrow, the Emperor won. John Frederick, who lost most of his land, transferred his university to Jena. The new Saxon elector, Maurice, however, called Melanchthon and other Wittenberg professors to rebuild the Uni-

34 Ibid., p.15.
versity. The deposed Duke Frederick and his faithful Saxon nobles at first hated Melanchthon for staying at Wittenberg, since they wanted him to guide their new university at Jena. Melanchthon, however, did guide its founding, advising the duke as to which professors to call. Melanchthon stayed at Wittenberg because he felt it to be a vital symbol of the entire Reformation. If it were destroyed, barbarism would engulf the churches.

Emperor Charles issued an edict, the Augsburg Interim of May 15, 1548, which sought to get agreement in essential matters of religion and let the government dictate the nonessential matters. Melanchthon opposed it. After months of negotiation, another edict, the Leipzig Interim, was proposed for the Saxon lands. It provided, among other things, that men receive what the church teaches "as she shall and cannot command anything contrary to the Holy Scriptures," that ministers obey the bishops, that baptism, confirmation, and extreme unction be practiced as in the early church, that ministers may or may not marry, that certain holidays be observed, that clergymen wear distinctive clothes, and that the idea of

36 Ibid., p. 124.


38 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 279.
meritorious sacrifice be omitted from the mass. Since meritorious sacrifice was to be eliminated, Melanchthon himself could accept the proposal, since he regarded all else as nonessentials. But his Lutheran opponents denounced him, and as a result, Lutherans did not accept the Leipzig Interim. According to Stupperich, Melanchthon refrained from further resistance to avoid rebellion.

Melanchthon was supposed to have gone to the meeting of the Council of Trent in 1552, but he never got there. He and Camerarius prepared some documents stating the Lutheran position for the council. Early in 1552 he waited in Nuremberg for further instructions and a letter of safe conduct to Trent. But the rumors of war became more persistent and Melanchthon therefore never went. The Treaty of Passau which promised an imperial diet regarding religious questions led to the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, which granted, finally, the territorial princes' free choice of religion, establishing the premise followed in Germany thereafter of "one country-one religion."

During Melanchthon's final days, internal dissension

39 Ibid., pp. 280-7.
40 Stupperich, op. cit., p. 129.
41 Ibid., pp. 130-2.
broke out among the Lutherans. Led by the so-called Gnesio-Lutherans, Matthias Flacius, professor first at Magdeburg and then at Jena, and the first great church historian of Lutheranism, and Nikolaus von Amsdorf, the first Lutheran Bishop of Naumburg, the anti-Melanchthonians sharply criticized Melanchthon for his attempts to compromise with Rome by accepting the Leipzig Interim. Both Flacius and Amsdorf sided with Melanchthon in his dispute with Andreas Osiander (of Nürnberg and Königsberg) who had defended "imputed" against "inherent" righteousness. 42 Both, however, attacked Melanchthon for weakening the Lutheran conception, mixing predestination into justification. 43

On Melanchthon's side was Caspar Cruciger and Paul Eber of Wittenberg, and Georg Major, whose statement that good works are necessary for salvation caused the so-called Majorist dispute. Amsdorf countered Major's assertion by declaring that good works were actually harmful to salvation. 44

---


43 Stumpelrich, op. cit., p. 139.

44 Hildebrandt, op. cit., p. xvi.
Others who opposed Melanchthon were Johann Brenz, who, however, sided against Amsdorf and Flacius in regard to Osiander; Justus Jonas who opposed Melanchthon's stand on the interim; Johann Agricola, who is known for the three antinomian disputations in which Luther defended Melanchthon and forced Agricola to recant; and Martin Bucer. 45

In 1557 another diet, to attempt to reconcile the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, was held. The meeting of this diet revealed that the Lutherans were hopelessly split. Melanchthon could not keep them unified. In 1559 the Heidelberg Eucharistic Controversy further split the Lutheran factions. John Calvin wanted Melanchthon to express himself on the Lord's Supper. The Flacians, as the followers of Matthias Flacius were called, waited for Melanchthon's answer, hoping to brand him a Crypto-Calvinist. However, Melanchthon declared he did not share Calvin's views. 46 Paulsen felt that Melanchthon may well have thought that the argument over the wording of the details of the Eucharist might have signalled a return to the Scholastics' errors of verbal hairsplitting from which he had

45 Ibid.
46 Stupperich, op. cit., pp. 141-5.
escaped at the beginning of his teaching career. Melanchthon himself, according to Stupperich, lost faith in general synods. He preferred instead a standing authority, like a consistory.

Melanchthon became angered by the Jesuits' tactics, methods, and procedures. They had sent a questionnaire with thirty-one questions to Evangelicals in order to induce them to forsake their faith. Melanchthon was so angry that he published the questionnaire, adding his own vigorous introduction. Realizing that that was not enough, he wrote a book in which he not only attacked Roman dogma, but also condemned the Flacians, Anabaptists, and Anti-Trinitarians. Known as the *Reply to the Bavarian Inquisition*, it was published in August, 1559, his last written testimony.

One of his last important acts concerned his gathering of his more important writings at the request of the Leipzig Consistory. He regarded the altered *Augsburg Confession*, the *Apology*, the *Saxon Confession*, the last revision of his *Loci*,

---


49 Ibid., pp. 145-7.
the Examination of Ordinands, the Reply to the Bavarian Inquisition, and the Declaration Regarding the Doctrines of Stancar as important enough to be included in the collection, titled the Corpus doctrinae.50

Lutheranism After Melanchthon's Death

The Flacians continued their attacks on Melanchthon even after his death. Karl Sell states that the University of Wittenberg became stronger than ever and that Melanchthon's doctrines were more influential than ever. However they awakened the anger that was to subdue Melanchthonianism after his death. According to Sell, only the universal and basic foundations of scholarship and education kept Lutheranism together, stopping it from degenerating into multitudinous little sects.51

Education plus the nascent church music helped solidify Lutheranism, which continued to be structured along the principles of "one country-one religion" allowed by the Peace of Augsburg, helping it to survive the German religious wars, culminating in the free thoughts of Lessing and Kant and in the deep thought world understandings of Herder and the Humboldt brothers, and finally in the classical poetry and living ideali-

50 Ibid., pp. 147-8.
ism of Goethe and Schiller. 52

Melanchthon's Work as a Reformer --

A General Evaluation

In regard to his work as a reformer, Manschreck states that Melanchthon was under suspicion in his own day. His gentleness was mistaken for weakness. His scholarship was regarded as questionable rationalism. His refusal to accept Luther without discrimination was looked on as rebellion. His struggles to unify Christianity were called pro-papalism. Melanchthon's recognition of John Calvin's worth was slurred as Crypto-Calvinism. Manschreck cites R. R. Caemerer's 1947 label of Melanchthon's use of reason as a "blight" which is the "source of the abridgement of the essential vitality of Luther's thought," and which led to a cultural and political lag in Germany, the Thirty Years War, and the collapse of Lutheranism under Hitler. 53 The Lutheran Cyclopedia even blames Melanchthon for fostering the ethical attitude of the German people which tended to confine religious impulses to the sphere of Church and Heaven, away from participation in civil life. 54 Manschreck, however, feels that in this last instant

52 Ibid., p. 27.
53 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 15.
Melanchthon followed only a practice implied by Luther's own teachings. 55

From 1574 to 1760 suspicion, reproach, prejudice, and slander clouded Melanchthon's reputation. Manschreck reports that Melanchthon's supporters were deposed and imprisoned and his writings condemned and suppressed. In 1610 the government ordered his Loci stricken from the list of approved textbooks. Not until the eighteenth century was Melanchthon looked upon with any favor. 56

To say the least, Melanchthon's role in Lutheran history is controversial. Standing in the deep shadows of Martin Luther, he has been one of the least understood figures of the Reformation. Forced by circumstances into the role of systematizer and statesman, he had to his sorrow been pried away from the educational studies he loved so much.

His character has given us some idea as to the reasons for some of his actions. Always looking for peace, harmony,

55 Interview with Clyde Leonard Manschreck, author of Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer, March 14, 1972.

56 Manschreck, Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer, p. 15.
and moderation, the shy, quiet scholar had faith in education and educated people— a faith that backfired in some of his relations with the Catholics, the Emperor, and some of his fellow Lutherans. Sell, as stated above, believed this very education saved Lutheranism through its darkest hours.

What made the man? Pious parents, relatives who were concerned, teachers who recognized genius and helped develop it. What made the man? His own keen insight, native intelligence, inquisitiveness, the longing for what is right. What made the man? The world situation in which he found himself, others' recognition of his potential, others' discoveries of his weakness. What made the man? The cry for immediate aid which forced him time and again to delay doing the things his heart and mind believed important, the cries of rage and anger by others who saw in his position things he knew were not there, the despondency caused by verbal lashings received from his theological opponents, the yearning to know that God looked favorably on his tortured soul. What kind of man was made? To find the answer, we must examine his thoughts on those areas of most concern to him.

In this section we have outlined Melanchthon's work as a reformer. We will be able to get a more complete picture of him, and perhaps solve the enigma of Melanchthon, as we look at his philosophies of religion, history, and education in detail.
PART II: MELANCHTHON'S PHILOSOPHY
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HIS VIEWS ON RELIGION

As an educator in the early sixteenth century Philip Melanchthon was exposed to several cross-currents of thought. The new humanist ideas battled the concepts Scholasticism advocated. The Reformation also screamed its indignation at the so-called falsities of the older teachings. In this section we will examine Melanchthon's philosophy of religion, history, and education in the light of scholastic, humanist, and the new theological influences.

Scholasticism and Humanism

What shaped Philip Melanchthon's philosophy of religion? Who were the people who influenced him, and to what extent did they help mold his religious ideas? An easy answer to the first question would be the Reformation movement, and to the second question, Martin Luther. Anyone taking this position would be correct. However, we have seen that Melanchthon had already some ideas of his own concerning the situation of the Roman Catholic Church while at Tübingen. His growing humanism did influence his religious ideas. And as part of this humanistic influence stands the figure of Desiderius Erasmus.
First, however, we shall briefly examine Renaissance humanism and sixteenth century scholasticism in order to determine Melanchthon's position in relation to these two philosophies. Perhaps if we accept Dr. Paul Kristeller's definition of humanism, we might better understand Melanchthon's role as a humanist. Dr. Kristeller contends that in addition to humanism, Platonism and Aristotelianism make up the body of Renaissance thought. Instead of using the term "scholasticism", Kristeller refers rather to "Aristotelianism" and "Platonism". He believes that Aristotelianism remained strong during the Renaissance, especially in natural philosophy. Platonism, too, continued as a philosophy from its inception through the Renaissance, usually combined with other systems of thought, like Aristotelianism, influencing scholars both directly through its (Platonism's) dialogs and indirectly through its followers.


2 Ibid., pp. 45-6.

3 Ibid., pp. 51-69.
According to Kristeller, humanism as known in Renaissance times was limited to a clearly defined cycle of scholarly disciplines: grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy. The study of each of these subjects was to include the reading and interpretation of its standard ancient writers in Latin, and, to a lesser extent, in Greek. Kristeller claims that humanism was not a philosophical tendency or system, but rather a cultural and educational program which emphasized and developed an important but limited area of studies, the center of which was philology. It edged into one philosophical discipline—morals. Kristeller defends his theory by showing that those who were considered humanists, or considered themselves humanists, basically were teachers of the humanities in the secondary schools and universities, tutors, or secretaries to princes or cities—all jobs connected with the areas of grammar and rhetoric, concerned with writing or speaking eloquently. Keeping Kristeller's definition in mind, one can see why Melanchthon could be both a humanist and Aristotelian. We can understand also

4 Ibid., p. 10.

5 Ibid., pp. 11 and 122.
the controversy in which he was engaged while he was a student at Tübingen (see above).

Melanchthon opposed the Scholastics, or "Sophists" as he liked to call them, because of their dependence on natural morality, or philosophical virtues, and their advocacy of Aristotle. He also criticized Cicero for the same reason - deriving the standard for law (the "laws of nature") from the nature of man. Melanchthon blamed these "Sophists" for teaching works-righteousness, satisfactions, and philosophical virtues. Though Melanchthon praised the ancients, he recognized in them, too, a self-glory and self-satisfaction as an end for their righteousness. Even Aristotle is singled out as having in general a passion for wrangling. Melanchthon feels that it is not appropriate to place him among the writers of hortatory philosophy, not even among the last.

As a humanist, Melanchthon was always interested in the practical, ethical living, and so scoffed at the Scholastics who they (the humanists) felt wasted much time on futile


7 Ibid., p. 34.
speculation. Melanchthon insisted that "no faithful man has ever satisfied his mind with Scholastic theology, which has become polluted by so many human arguments, nonsense, tricks, and trifling traditions."  

Since Scholastic theologians concentrated on doctrine, they mistrusted the Humanists who they believed disregarded orthodox dogma. And since they were both theologians and philosophers, the Scholastics used the language of philosophy liberally. German humanists also considered themselves philosophers, but they disliked the intricacies of scholastic philosophy. Instead, they advocated the "philosophy of Christ," a mixture of biblical teachings and ethics with a Platonic tint, which they inherited from the Neo-platonism of the Italian Humanists. They believed this point of view to be practical, not speculative. They believed, too, that this philosophy freed them from the clutches of their baser passions, allowing them to participate in the true life. Melanchthon especially reflected this ethical interest in philosophy and

---

8 Rogness, op. cit., p. 5.

Furthermore, Scholastic theologians considered practical living on a different plane than the humanists. The Scholastics looked to the accumulated traditions of monastic morality and its merits, which the Humanists, of course, shrugged off as irrelevant, turning instead to the simple advice and example of Jesus himself.

Each side had a sharply different point of view concerning Church History. The Scholastics looked upon their age as the highest point in the development of Christian thought. The Humanists returned to the sources for their standards. They found their goal of Christ-like, spiritual living first of all in the Bible, and secondly in the writings of the Church Fathers of the succeeding centuries after Christ. The Humanists believed that the Scholastics had strayed too far from the sources. Humanists loved especially the principle of "Sola Scriptura," or Scriptures alone.  

---

10 Rogness, op. cit., p. 5.

11 Ibid., pp. 5-6.

12 Ibid.
Both had different views of faith. The Scholastics took the traditional point of view. Faith for them was intimately connected with the sacramental structure of the church. One was to cling to the system of grace given in the sacraments. Humanists, on the other hand, disliked the church's bureaucracy and its ceremonies. They avoided the outward show, and instead looked inwardly to a union with Christ.\footnote{13}{Ibid.}

In Melanchthon one sees especially humanistic influences in his interest in the sources. His dispute with the Scholastics concerning Aristotle is involved more with their adherence to the incorrect translations of the Middle Ages. As we have seen in Melanchthon's work as a reformer, he was more tied down to the past, and so did not worry too much about outward trappings of the church. Church hierarchy and ceremony to him were not among the necessities. He would have allowed even the Pope to remain, as long as inward change - the freedom to preach what one thought to be correct - were allowed.\footnote{14}{Sell, \emph{op. cit.}, pp. 11-12.}

Hartfelder emphasizes that Melanchthon was not a member of a small group of men who set the world along new paths. Ra-
ther, as a humanist he was a member of a circle which at his
time had been in existence over one hundred years. A rich
inheritance had already been accumulated, awaiting only a
resourceful person who would raise these treasures and know
their worth. Melanchthon was an heir to that treasure of
humanism which had been gathered by such people as Rudolph
Agricola and Disiderius Erasmus.

Influence of Erasmus

Agricola's influence on Melanchthon while Melanchthon
was at Tübingen has already been described. Erasmus, however,
was a greater influence. In general, Erasmus's work as a
humanist impressed Melanchthon. Erasmus influenced Melanch­
thon's work in theology and education equally. Erasmus's work
in bringing forth a new correct Greek text of the New Testament
and his commentaries on the state of affairs within the Church
probably did affect Melanchthon. In regard to the controversy
concerning the Mass, Melanchthon agreed with Erasmus who
pointed out that the concept of substance is not a Biblical
truth, but a scholastic sophistication. That is one reason
why Luther had no use for the term in relation to the doctrines

15 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 327.
of transubstantiation and consubstantiation. Luther himself did not use the term "consubstantiation" to mean the coexistence of the body with the bread and the blood with the wine, preferring the term "under" to show the relationship.

Already in 1516 at Tübingen, Melanchthon had praised Erasmus in a Greek ode. Whenever he wrote Oekolampad, he sent along greetings to their mutual friend, Erasmus. Oekolampad, in turn, called Melanchthon a second Erasmus, worthy of Erasmus's love. In 1519, Melanchthon, in one of his writings, made references to Erasmus's new Greek text of the New Testament without citing his source. Dr. Eck reported the incident to Erasmus. Melanchthon wrote Erasmus, asking for his forgiveness. Erasmus acknowledged the letter, commenting that he had read some of Melanchthon's work - e.g., writings in which he had praised Aristotle and other antiquarians - and praised it. Erasmus also wrote Petrus Mosellanus who had interceded for Melanchthon: "Melanchthon needs no intercessors for him.

16 Bainton, op. cit., p. 108.

17 A Short Exposition of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1912), p. 25.

It would have to be something worse to sever the relationship." When Melanchthon married, Erasmus in a letter to Justus Jonas stated that there was nothing left but to wish him well.20

Melanchthon's admiration for Erasmus can be seen in relation to Luther's dispute with Erasmus concerning the doctrine of free will. Erasmus was, in general, not happy with Melanchthon's participation in the Reformation movement, as he told Justus Jonas in a letter in May, 1521. Erasmus did not want to lose Melanchthon from the cause of humanism. On September 6, 1524, Erasmus had written Melanchthon informing him that he had read his *Loci* and recognized his talent. He further told Melanchthon that Cardinal Campeggius had visited him in order to get Melanchthon, through Erasmus's influence, a call to another university. Erasmus had expressed to the cardinal his wish that Melanchthon would stay out of the theological argument, but that this was really up to Melanchthon.21

Melanchthon tried his best from that time on to hold down any conflicts between the Catholics and the Evangelicals.

19 Ibid., pp. 110-12.

20 Ibid., p. 112.

21 Ibid., pp. 112-13.
But the Free Will argument continued. Earlier in the year 1524 Melanchthon had had a chance to visit Erasmus at Basil while returning from his home in the Palatinate to Wittenberg, but he did not take advantage of it. Hartfelder believes that Melanchthon did not want to give any wrong impression to the Evangelicals, since Erasmus had already broken with Luther.22 For a while Erasmus discontinued his correspondence with Melanchthon. After the Free Will Controversy died down, the two resumed their exchange of letters until Erasmus's death in 1536. Although the letters after 1528 became warmer and more friendly, Melanchthon and Erasmus, however, never actually met.23

After Erasmus's death, Melanchthon praised him in declamations and lectures. In 1557, Melanchthon prepared a lecture for Bartholomaeus Kalkreuter from Crossen in which he extended the praises of Erasmus, enumerating the things Erasmus did in his life.24 Melanchthon in 1522 once contrasted his two idols, Luther and Erasmus. Luther preached true,

---

22 Ibid., p. 113.
23 Ibid., p. 115.
24 Ibid., pp. 117-18.
evangelical, Christian preaching, unknown to the world and to human reasoning. Erasmus taught good morals, the chaste life - the subject matter of the heathen philosophers; but Erasmus was superior to the ancients.

Erasmus admired Melanchthon also. While Melanchthon was at Tübingen, Erasmus had written praises for the young scholar because of both his knowledge of Latin and Greek and his eloquence. In his Responsor ad epistolam apologeticam, Erasmus praised Melanchthon's ingenious candor and his zeal in advancing knowledge.

However, Erasmus was not happy with some of the stands Melanchthon took in his Loc. In an urgent letter to Erasmus, Melanchthon told him that some of his thoughts were in fact borrowed from him (Erasmus). Melanchthon told him that he did not want to awaken any more quarrels, since he still admired him. In a June 6, 1536 letter, Erasmus told Melanchthon that he needed more discretion in his writings because he did not realize what a clear-sighted, ingenious, shrewd person

25 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 115.


could read into his writings. 28

Erasmus contrasted Luther and Melanchthon. To Erasmus, Melanchthon was a worrier, easily disturbed by the great currents of world affairs, while Luther said that great affairs did not bother him because he says to himself, "This is beyond you, you cannot grasp it, so let it go." Luther therefore fretted about little things. Melanchthon, however, was too cautious, too tactful, too apt to see both sides of a question - and he worked far too hard. Luther thought it is better "to speak and hit out like a boy" - and not to work all day Sunday like Melanchthon. Still Luther strongly maintained that the results of Melanchthon's "grubbing and grinding" were indispensable to the evangelical cause. 29

Stupperich maintains that Erasmian humanism was built upon the foundation of the Sermon on the Mount, as he himself confirmed in his Manual of A Christian Soldier (1501). It was partly through Erasmus's influence that German humanism had a religious outlook. Perhaps it was this element that caused

28 Ibid., pp. 116-17.

Melanchthon to confess himself grateful to Erasmus. In general, Melanchthon was the willing, dedicated humanistic student of Erasmus, in religion as well as in education.

**Influence of Martin Luther**

Of the two greatest influences in Philip Melanchthon's life, one, Desiderius Erasmus, he never met (as was mentioned above), while the other, Martin Luther, became his closest friend, companion, and co-worker. On the surface this may seem perfectly normal. But as one looks more carefully at the two men, Melanchthon and Luther, one begins to wonder how two men with such vastly different interests, temperaments, and personalities could have become and remained such close friends.

Both Sell and Cox believe that Luther and Melanchthon actually complemented each other. Cox calls Melanchthon a check on Luther, since Melanchthon supplied the material to make up for Luther's deficiencies, corrected his errors, and regulated his impetuosity of character. Sell labels Melanchthon an alter-ego of Luther's. Martin Luther himself stated that he (Luther) was born to fight the rotten and the Rotten.

---

30 Stupperich, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

31 Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
devil. Therefore his books are stormy and warlike. But Philip Melanchthon, Luther affirms, goes soberly and quietly there, building and planting. He sows and sprinkles according to which God had richly given him gifts.32 Fosdick feels the two made a strange team. Luther, according to Fosdick was robust, stormy, and sometimes crude, while Melanchthon was gracious, gentle and conciliatory.33 Hildebrandt feels the only conceivable comparison of Luther and Melanchthon would be Luther and Calvin.34

Cox feels that Melanchthon was inferior to Luther in courage, but equal to him in ardent piety, and superior to him in personal virtues and literary attainments.35 Manschreck believes that even though Melanchthon and Luther were lifelong friends and did work closely together, Melanchthon was not a mouthpiece for Luther.36 Cox further likens Melanchthon and

32 Sell, op. cit., p. 2.


34 Hildebrant, op. cit., p. xv.

35 Cox, op. cit., p. 5.

36 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 55.
Luther to Aaron and Moses, with Melanchthon being the cautious Aaron and Luther the bold Moses. Writers with a strong belief in divine providence, Manschreck says, have frequently said that God brought Luther and Melanchthon together to accomplish an otherwise impossible reformation.

Paulsen, however, feels that Melanchthon's friendship was not an intimate one. For Melanchthon it rested on a reverence of Luther's bravery and sincerity. A small amount of fear might also have been mixed in with this veneration. On Luther's side it was his frank high esteem of Melanchthon's intellectual gift and scholarly achievements that drew Luther to Melanchthon.

How Luther and Melanchthon met has already been described above. Melanchthon originally did not go to Wittenberg because of any interest he had in either Luther or his cause. McGiffert feels that Melanchthon had apparently given no special thought to religious matters, but that he was soon captured by Luther's robust personality, and completely won over.

37 Cox, op. cit., p. 33.

38 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 55.

39 Paulsen, op. cit., p. 212.
to Luther's support.\(^{40}\) Manschreck reports that some historians felt that the young Melanchthon was taken in by Luther. They felt that Luther abused the young twenty-two year old professor's easy disposition, and availed himself of all the talent that should have been devoted to service in the Catholic Church.\(^{41}\) Otto Kirn, professor of dogmatics at the University of Leipzig, believes that Luther impelled Melanchthon to work for the Reformation while Luther scattered the sparks among the people. Melanchthon, by his humanistic studies, won the sympathy of the educated people and scholars for the Reformation.\(^{42}\)

Fosdick and McGiffert accent Luther's dependence on Melanchthon. Just as Calvin formulated and systematized Zwingli's teachings, McGiffert affirms, Melanchthon formulated and systematized Luther's.\(^{43}\) Luther's major service to theo-


\(^{41}\) Manschreck, op. cit., p. 55.


\(^{43}\) McGiffert, op. cit., p. 71.
logy, according to Fosdick, was to slough off the old scholastic approach to dogma and to found doctrine primarily on the scriptures. Melanchthon, then, with his systematic thoroughness presented the results of this startling innovation in his book, the *Loci Communes*. Fosdick believes that modern minds simply cannot readily imagine what Melanchthon's book meant to those who first read it.

What did Luther think of Melanchthon? We have seen earlier that Luther was concerned for Melanchthon's well-being, providing him with both a decent salary and wife. Once when Melanchthon was very sick, Luther, according to his "Tischreden", supposedly prayed him back from death. We have also read what Luther thought of Melanchthon's physical appearance. In general, Luther, according to Hildebrandt, wanted to picture himself as the barbarous peasant in comparison to the learned scholar, Melanchthon. Luther at various times ridi-

---

44 Fosdick, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
45 Hildebrandt, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.
46 Ibid., p. xvii.
culled the image of the scholar by good naturedly making fun of his young friend. Luther, himself, never thought himself as enough of a scholar to be troubled by what he called the scholar's peculiar sins and failings. Luther also compared himself and Melanchthon to two of Christ's disciples: "In the Acts of the Apostles you have this picture: James denotes Philippus who with his modesty would gladly have retained the law; Peter signifies myself who brought it to fall. Why do you worry? Philippus proceeds in charity, and I in faith. Philippus suffers himself to be eaten up, I eat up everybody and spare nobody." In another instance he likened himself to Isaiah, and Melanchthon to Jeremiah, who always worried that he scolded too much.

Only once did Luther blame Melanchthon for being too rigid, and that was in Melanchthon's capacity as examiner of students. Otherwise Luther thought Melanchthon "too easily taken in. His little scholarly instruments are not good enough; the trunks demand an axe."

---

48 Hildebrandt, op. cit., p. xix.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
Luther admired Melancthon's writings - the Dialectica, the commentaries - particularly Romans and Colossians, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Loci Communes. He said that the Loci deserved to stand next to the Bible. "He who has the Bible and the Loci," Luther believed, "is a theologian immune from the devil and all the heretics". Luther felt that the Loci comprised the sum of religion or the whole of theology better than any existing books on the subject. He called all the Fathers and commentators "nothing" compared with the Loci.

Once when Melancthon was charged with corruptibility for accepting a royal donation from England, Luther defended his passionately. In general, Luther believed Melancthon was not compensated enough for his works: only in heaven would he be well rewarded. Luther, however, did not like Me-

---
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lanchthon's habit of dedicating his books to high officials of church and State (e.g. The 1535 edition of the *Loci* to Henry VIII and 1532 *Commentary on Romans* to Albrecht of Mainz). He once commented "I regret that Magister Philippus has dedicated his best prefaces to the naughtiest boys." 56

Since Luther believed Melanchthon to be doctrinally sound, he tolerated some of Melanchthon's hobbies, like astrology and dream analysis. He himself believed these to be rubbish. 57

What did Melanchthon think of Luther? When Luther's impending death was reported to Melanchthon, he said, "I would rather die than be separated from this man; nothing more trist could happen than to have to do without Martinus." 58 At another time he says, "Martinus seems to be driven by a spirit.... impossible for me not to fall in love with him." 59 However, he did not care for Luther's harsh language. Once he called it a "grievance to him". At another time he tells Luther


"This could be pleaded in a more civil way." Melanchthon did hold Luther's polemics responsible for driving many people to the other side. In general Melanchthon sought appeasement. As stated earlier, Luther recognized his shortcoming, mentioning it in his approval of Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession.

Kirn believed that any strained relations between the two grew out of religion, not rank and family. Luther and Melanchthon repelled and attracted each other, Kirn states, "because nature had not formed out of them one man." Luther never openly criticized Melanchthon, Kirn continues, but Melanchthon criticized Luther.

Melanchthon believed Luther and his teachings. "I have never had any doubt whatsoever about Luther's integrity or the truth of his doctrine," he once said. While both opposed scholasticism, Luther was not happy with certain aspects of humanism either. He rejected the exalted role of man's part
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in salvation, fostered by many humanists. Melanchthon's ingrained piety and his early study of the Bible kept him from displacing God and accepting unreservedly the humanist's ideal of man's universal domination. Manschreck believes that Melanchthon neither did deify man or believe that man could merit his own salvation. However, Manschreck continues, Melanchthon could not condone Luther's ideas of predestination nor could he emphasize the "alone" in Luther's doctrine of justification by faith.

Pauck maintains that Melanchthon shared Luther's conviction that human nature is such that if any man, even the best, relies on his own moral powers and on his own religious capacities, he cannot help but expose himself as an unrighteous sinner.

Both Luther and Melanchthon were united in their attack on the whole existing system of good works. Both utterly destroyed the idea of human glory, giving to God his righteous place. Melanchthon himself wanted real goodness. He was fu-
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rious with churchmen who thought this real goodness could be achieved through outward performances and pious legalisms while their inward lives remained uncleansed, unregenerated, and undedicated. 68 Faith to Melanchthon was the same as to Luther -- not mere intellectual assent, but vital, personal self-committal.

As time went on, Melanchthon differed more and more with Luther on the concepts of "Predestination" and "Free Will." On Predestination, Melanchthon felt that Free Will would be an illusion if God indeed had predestined everything. To Melanchthon's mind this meant that God also predestined evil. This he could not accept. If this were true, then men could not be held responsible, since they had no choice. In spite of what Augustine or Luther said against this stand, Melanchthon accepted it. 69 In 1543 he began to teach that a man's final testing is not predestined from all eternity, but that, while God's grace comes first, man has the power to accept or reject it. 70 After 1548 he used Erasmus's definition of

68 Fosdick, op. cit., p. 127.
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"freedom" - "the capability of applying oneself to grace." 71 These ideas, as has been shown earlier, brought him into conflict with the Gnesiolutherans.

Melanchthon felt that he differed from Luther on adiaphora, or non-necessities, on which the two had, in fact, agreed to disagree. He felt, however, that he could emphatically claim to be the true and genuine representative of the Lutheran tradition. 72 Melanchthon's statements at various times show that he felt his contribution to Lutheranism was to both complete and to polish what Luther said. He saw it as his job to summarize and harmonize the doctrines of the Reformation; he felt it his task to restate the case in the proper language. 73

Hildebrandt feels that Melanchthon seemed to be on the defense at all times. Luther, it seems, was so sure of Melanchthon that he could trust Melanchthon's interpretation of his lectures and writings. Melanchthon felt just the opposite. He would have felt uneasy with Luther in his audience. He
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would feel that he would have to prove his orthodoxy. If Luther would have taken notes, Hildebrandt maintains, Melanchthon would most surely have corrected them. Melanchthon is uncertain where Luther is certain; he tests where Luther trusts.  

Kirn believes that the difference between Luther and Melanchthon is not so much in Melanchthon's ethical conception, as in his humanistic mode of thought which formed the basis of his theology and made him ready not only to acknowledge moral and religious truths outside of Christianity, but also to bring Christianity into intimate contact with them. Melanchthon thus becomes the mediator between Christian revelation and ancient philosophy.  

Furthermore, Kirn continues, Melanchthon's ideas are really a modification of Luther's. To Melanchthon law is not only the correlate of the gospel by which its effect on salvation is prepared, but it is the unchangeable order of the spiritual world which has God himself as the basis.  

---
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thon did not draw on mysticism as Luther did, but emphasized the ethical and intellectual elements.

Influence of Zwingli and Calvin

Because of Melanchthon's views on the Lord's Supper, and because of his various meetings and his correspondence with first Zwingli and later Calvin, some opponents of Melanchthon have accused him of being influenced by them. Details on these charges are found in other sections of this paper dealing with the various items.

Melanchthon and Zwingli had much in common, McGiffert believes. Both had the same conception of the authority of the Bible, of the relation of natural and revealed theology, of the oneness of law and gospel, and of the nature of faith. Zwingli was, however, not as much of a scholar as Melanchthon. He was also more of an originator, rather than a formulator like Melanchthon.

Except for Melanchthon's later views on predestination, their general tendencies were alike. This was not because of any influence of one over the other, but because both Melanchthon and Zwingli came to Evangelical Christianity through the
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conviction that his gospel was Biblical and therefore true. Neither had had a profound personal religious experience such as Martin Luther had. 79

Melanchthon's Divergence from Luther's Point of View

Melanchthon's views on predestination and free will have been discussed in an earlier section of this paper. His involvement in an argument concerning the Lord's Supper with the Flacians has also been reviewed. In connection with this last item, Melanchthon has throughout the centuries been condemned by many for writing an altered version of the Augsburg Confession. Originally published in 1530, the Augsburg Confession appeared in a new edition in 1540. Melanchthon had altered the tenth article, eliminating the section in which the principle that the body and blood were offered with the bread and wine was stated. Because by 1540 Melanchthon had discussed the subject with John Calvin, some received this deliberate alteration as being brought about through Calvin's influence. Sell acknowledges that Melanchthon had become more Calvinistic and unionistic in viewpoint. But he maintains that Melanchthon's idea was always to express himself more clearly and
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distinctly. Therefore Melanchthon's only purpose for writing the altered version was for clarity. Sell admits however, that Melanchthon in his alteration made the Confession doctrinally obscure. 81

Bainton further condemns Melanchthon, stating that he (Melanchthon) was ever ready to place upon Luther's teaching an alien shade of meaning. After Luther's death, Bainton reports, Melanchthon translated the Augsburg Confession into Greek for the Patriarch of Constantinople. In doing this, Bainton claims that Melanchthon actually transmuted Luther's teaching of justification of faith into the Greek concept of the deification of man through a sacramental union with an incorruptible Christ. 82

Kirn summarizes Melanchthon's divergence from Luther's ideas as follows: Melanchthon did not draw on mysticism as Luther did, but emphasized the ethical and intellectual elements. Further, Melanchthon foresook determinism and predestination, favoring instead to give man a certain moral freedom, ascribing three causes as working together in the work of con-
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82
version - the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will, not as a passive element, but as an active agent resisting its own weakness. Kirn feels that through his correlation of the divine and human will, Melanchthon lost sight of Luther's concept of the basic religious experience - that the desire and realization of good actions is a gift of divine grace. By dividing faith into knowledge, assent, and trust, he made the heart's participation follow after the intellect's, giving rise to point of view within later Lutheran groups that the establishment and acceptance of pure doctrine should come before the personal attitude of faith. Corresponding to this intellectual view of faith is his belief that the church is also the only communion of those who adhere to the true belief. For Melanchthon, then, the visible church's existence depends upon the approval of her unregenerated members of her teachings. 83

Hildebrandt maintains the riddle of Philip Melanchthon lies in the disharmony between the concessions and the confessions. He feels this is precisely the fate of those who, through no choice of their own, are children of both the Reformation and Humanism. Melanchthon, as already stated, hated dissensions. He believed that the Church could never

settle its differences through the ways and means of the world. Only through steadfast and patient witness for the truth, he continues, quoting I Peter 2, v. 15, can the ignorance of foolish men be put to silence.

Manschreck believes the answer to the riddle of Melanchthon lies in Melanchthon's recognition that human beings are finite. Because they are, no human being has final truth, no human action is final, and the gospel simply cannot be absolutely translated into human thought and action. In Melanchthon's view, man stands in a relationship of faith with God which breaks through all the forms of human finiteness. Man therefore does not contain, but is rather himself contained.

Manschreck believes that because Melanchthon negotiated he appeared weak; because he rejected some of Luther's ideas, he appeared to be anti-evangelical; because he used Renaissance culture, he appeared to be humanistic; and because he changed his opinions on some matters, he appeared
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vacillating. Like Hildebrandt he believes Melanchthon's problem was that he was a son of both the Renaissance and the Reformation, the former with its accent on reason and the latter with its accent on faith.

Finally, it is interesting to note that Melanchthon never tried to get his mother, who had remarried twice since Melanchthon's father's death, to forsake Catholicism. His reason for not doing so is that he throughout his life believed himself to be a reformer within the church.

His Published Works on Religion

In the area of religion, Philip Melanchthon wrote many letters, declamations, tracts, lectures, and prefaces to religious works, covering a wide range of topics. In his capacity as negotiator in the various religious colloquies, Melanchthon wrote many outlines and propositions. For his Schola Privata he wrote a Handbook of the Elements of the Faith for Children. Melanchthon wrote two catechisms, the Catechesis nuerilis (1532), a Latin religious manual for young students, and one
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in the German Language (1549), which was like Luther's in content.

Melanchthon was the author of the following major Lutheran Confessions: the Augsburg Confession (1530), The Apology of the Augsburg Confession (1531), the Variata (altered) Augsburg Confession (1540), and the Confession of the Saxon Churches, which was a repetition of the Augsburg Confession and is also known as the Saxon Confession (1551). All of these have been discussed elsewhere in this paper.

Philip Melanchthon's most personal statement of his faith in his Loci communes. Unlike those works listed in the previous paragraph, the Loci communes, or "common places," was written by Melanchthon alone without reference to preliminary writings of Martin Luther or other followers of Luther. Throughout his life he revised it several times. Using a technique common to Renaissance humanists of placing subject matter in various categories, or places, Melanchthon issued his first version in 1521. McGiffert, Kirn, and Stupperich all

89 Kirn, op. cit., p. 284; also Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 590 and 604.
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label it a deposit of his youthful ideas of faith as they emerged in his encounter with Luther. Written in Latin, Melanchthon based his statements and arguments on the Bible. Melanchthon's humanism shines through in his smooth Latin exposition, his Greek words, and his classical allusions. None of the teachings found in it have any direct basis in Aristotelian thought. However, he liked to find analogies to scriptural truth in the lives and maxims of various pagan philosophers.

The Loci is essentially a listing of the fundamental principles of Luther's gospel, with a discussion of certain practical matters affected by it. Doctrines which had no direct bearing on life were omitted altogether. The Loci reflected Melanchthon's early humanistic dualism of body and reason, and of fleshly and spiritual natures. Humanists saw

---
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sin primarily located in the flesh or body. Man's reason, spirit, or soul was inherently noble, the humanist reasoned. It might be held down by the sins of the flesh, but it was not the seat of sin, and it reached upward to escape the clutches of lust. Humanists, because of this belief, generally did not take sin as seriously as did Reformers, since they believed only the lower natures of man were innately sinful. Rogness claims that Humanists could not as a rule understand Luther's spiritual torment. Humanists generally further believed that since sin was the oppression of man's flesh over his reason and spirit, the purpose of Christ's redemptive work was to free man's higher nature from its enslavement to its lower nature in order that man's spirit could join in enlightened harmony with God's spirit.94

In this 1521 edition of the Logi, Melanchthon had already divided man into two parts. The first included man's "capacity of knowing, by which we perceive, understand, and reason" (man's cognition). The second are man's "will," "affections," or "appetites" - the origin of our feelings, emotions, drives, and passions. Melanchthon argued that, first of all, man's reason is controlled by his will. In taking this

94 Rogness, op. cit., pp. 9-10.
stand, Melanchthon differed from both the scholastics and the humanists who in various ways, believed in the supremacy of the will. Secondly, he continued, the will is not sovereign. Love, hate, and similar affections control both our reason and will. Third, self-love is the primary and chief affection of human nature and is itself sin. Melanchthon traces this sin of self-love back to Adam's fall, labeling self-love as Godless egoism—loving himself more than God—a condition handed down to all men since Adam as the sin of man's origin—original sin. 95

In another writing, *St. Paul and the Scholastics*, Melanchthon stated that there is a strife going on, whether occasioned by reason or law; in our unhappy state we carry on perpetual war with ourselves. 96 Rogness claims that phrases such as "strife going on" and "perpetual war with ourselves" were typical Humanist terminology. The body, or flesh, drags man down into sin; the reason, or spirit, struggles upward. One of the two might conquer or dominate the other, but the two were intrinsically opposite each other. Because of this


one was faced with constant strife and perpetual war. Luther, however, did not believe in dualism. To him the fight within encompassed the whole man - both reason and flesh. In his early theological career, Melanchthon was a dualist. Later in his life he no longer adhered to this belief. He eventually arrived at the idea that the deep passions of sin enslave the reason as well as the body. 97

In his treatment of Luther's doctrines, Melanchthon watched against possible misunderstandings of Luther which might lead to practical abuses of one kind or another. His Humanist background, which accentuated ethics, is seen again and again, particularly in the sections dealing with the place and province of law, in which he is extremely careful to insist on a Christian's leading a holy life, renouncing anything of a libertine nature. The book did not refer to Luther's distinction between the Word of God and the Scriptures. Melanchthon gives no doctrine of the Bible, but quotes it extensively as if all parts of it were of equal authority. 98

97 Ibid., pp. 11-2.

98 McGiffert, op. cit., p. 74.
In general, this first version of the *Loci communes* presented with clarity the Protestant position which was new and challenging at the time the book was written. Melanchthon had presented the results of this new innovation in religion with systematic thoroughness. People of today cannot readily imagine the impact the book must have had on its readers. At least seventeen editions of the Latin text appeared between 1521 and 1525, besides several reprints of a German translation. Luther called it "an invincible book, worthy not only of immortality, but of being placed in the Canon." The *Loci* and its successive revisions held first place as the theological textbook of the Protestant universities for over half a century. Only in 1610, when Melanchthon fell into religious disfavor, was the *Loci* removed from the list of approved textbooks. At the University of Cambridge, which once hoped to have Melanchthon become its Religious professor in the Divine Faculty, it was required reading. Queen Elizabeth I
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virtually memorized it in order to acquire the "foundations of religion, together with elegant language and sound doctrine."

In 1535 Melanchthon brought out another edition of the Loci communes, revised and structurally reorganized. Again he took Scriptures alone as the basis. He began each section with witness from the Bible. To these he appended the ideas and judgements of the early church fathers. He emphasized more the role of the free will of man. Influenced by St. John Chrysostum's statement, "God draws men, but he draws only willing men," he called attention to man's decision in the matter of faith, an act which left him open to charges of synergism.

The newer version did not, however, present a systematic work that connected the individual parts into a unity. In general, the sections are merely placed one after another. Melanchthon's purpose was to compose both a text book that would be clear as possible and a book, which like the later Augsburg Confession, was to furnish proof that Evangelical Christianity stood in a continuity with the ancient church. Encounters with John Campanus, the Anabaptists, and Michael
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Servitus's anti-trinitarian treatise persuaded him to believe that it was necessary for him to expound in detail the doctrines of the Trinity and Christology, which he had not treated in the 1521 edition. Melanchthon also discussed the difference between natural and divine law, the relation of law and gospel throughout the Bible, the role of good works as fruits, or results, of faith, baptism, repentance, private confessions, and the Eucharist. A final revision appeared in 1555. This edition emphasized the theoretical and rational elements of religion. Taylor believes that in structure, the Loci, when it reached its final form, followed closely the arrangement of Lombard's Sentences and Aquinas's Summa.
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McGiffert believes that Melanchthon's recognition of reason and revelation as coordinate sources of theology gave the formula for all later Protestant dogmatics. Natural theology, McGiffert maintains, prepares the way for revealed theology, and therefore the study of the sciences should precede the study of the Bible, promoting true faith. Reason and revelation cannot be out of harmony, since revelation does not contradict natural theology, but rather supplements it. It became a tendency to view Christianity as a purely intellectual matter - supernatural communication of divine knowledge.\(^{111}\)

In tracing the history of this one most important personal contribution of Melanchthon's to theology, one can see the gradual divergence of Melanchthon's ideas from those of Luther's. Others saw these differences more readily than Melanchthon who usually ascribed his differences to the realm of non-necessities. Nevertheless, as Sell maintains, in Melanchthon's *Loci* one can see the seeds of points of departure in the areas of predestination, free will, good works, self-righteousness, and the Eucharist\(^{112}\) - seeds that sprouted later.

\(^{111}\) McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

into full grown fruits of dissension.

In his last religious tract, the "Reply to the Bavarian Inquisition" (1558), Melanchthon attempted to set the record straight by finally clarifying his stand in relation to Roman Catholics, Calvinism, and the other religious bodies. By that time it was too late. Melanchthon's reputation as a reformer had already been established.

In general Melanchthon's role as Luther's assistant and spokesman put him into the position of having to write much for the new cause. As the Reformation's "Secretary of State," he influenced many through his tracts, speeches, and negotiations. His eloquent style, putting Luther's "rough" ideas into smooth, easy-to-read or listen-to sentences helped the movement immensely. It is hard to imagine what impact Lutheranism would have had without Melanchthon. Many scholars feel that Luther's influence among certain classes of people - especially the scholars - would have been far less. Many feel, however, that Melanchthon obscured some of Luther's teachings through his (Melanchthon's) quest for the perfect word, and still others charged him with everything from pro-Catholicism to Crypto-Calvinism.

Sell concludes his thoughts on Melanchthon by stating that Luther's work goes on while Melanchthon's job is done.
Melanchthon's fate, says Sell, is like any other good teacher whose job it is to make himself superfluous. Protestant dogma and the Protestant church - states which were his creations, are no more. His religious writings are read no more. Not the professor and the man of culture, Melanchthon, but the Prophet, Luther -- the man of unalterable will who bows only to God, who fears not to any truth such as harmless free will, and who is happy for the moment of luck in the battle tomorrow-- will light the way. 113

Melanchthon's contributions to education, however, are lasting. His reputation in that area of life, even though dimmed, has not been forgotten. As we will see in a later section, his reputation will broaden as his efforts are recognized by more and more educators.

113 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
Chapter V

HIS VIEWS ON HISTORY

Influence of Humanism

As a historian, Philip Melanchthon was influenced by both humanism and religion. Historiography in the time of the Reformation grew out of practices fostered and perpetuated in the Middle Ages. The link between rhetoric and history was inherited from the Middle Ages, during which time history had been subordinated to grammar and rhetoric in the schools. Some medieval historians were basically grammarians and rhetoricians. The Renaissance custom — continued throughout the Reformation Era — of princes and cities appointing official historians traces itself also to Medieval Italy.¹ Historiography in the Renaissance era differed from its medieval counterpart in its new found concern for style and good Latin and in its application of philological criticism to the source materials of history. Kristeller labels Renaissance humanist historians the predecessors of modern historians.² Humanists

¹ Kristeller, op. cit., p. 106.

² Ibid., p. 105.
were the historiographers of cities, countries, and ruling families. They also wrote biographies of businessmen and statesmen and declamations, either for themselves or for the government, praising or blaming their government or the enemy's government, depending on the need of the situation.

Melanchthon with his humanist background ranked history under eloquence, his definition of eloquence in this case being "an education in language," which was the main goal of his teaching. But he was also influenced by Christianity and by Luther. The chief figure of the Reformation movement stressed the theological, moral, and practical uses of history. Whatever philosophy, intelligent people, and the whole intelligence could reveal or teach, history with its examples and stories shows forcefully, placing it right before one's eyes as if one actually was there and saw it as it happened. In history one finds how people fared, how they read and lived, were pious and wise or bad and unwise, were rewarded or punished. Melanchthon, too, did not neglect to accent history's


4 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 197.

5 Ibid., pp. 206-7.
utility. In his lectures on the classical historians he stated over and over that a knowledge of history is very profitable. Melanchthon believed that without this knowledge we remain permanently children; without the light of history we grope in the dark.

Melanchthon reflected both his humanistic and Christian background by stressing the moral utility of history, which teaches better than philosophy as to what is beautiful or ugly, good or bad, useful or not. Examples, he said, are more impressive than naked commands or dry regulations. History, he felt, certainly leads one to examples and comparisons. The stories of David, Kyrus, and Scipio are good examples of men whose plans did not materialize as they wished them to. Excellent historians have reported incidents of virtue where famous people shrank away from self-righteousness and tried to prevent harm. Melanchthon quoted Thucydides' belief that a historian is an eternal treasure, out of which one can take at all times examples serviceable to life. History, then, warns us of evil and teaches us all kinds of rules showing that horrible deeds could be punished horribly. Melanchthon believed that the person who read history knew that at all

times blasphemy, perjury, insurrection, robbery, and the like would be punished. 7

Greater than the moral value is the religious, or -- in Melanchthon's use of the word -- theological usefulness. History could serve as a guide to correct teachings and to a knowledge of the first pure church. One can see also how blindness and confusion grows out of error. Melanchthon believed it necessary for Christians to read history to understand Holy Scriptures better. History, with its horrible pictures of God's wrath and punishment against all depravity, would admonish one to believe and fear God. 8

As a humanist Melanchthon was influenced by the practical aspects of history. Those who later want to serve the state should study it, he believed. The world could more easily do without the sun than a knowledge of civil life could do without history. One must take out of history only that which is necessary, Melanchthon thought, and leave the unnecessary. Princes have the duty to study history in order to make themselves more capable for thier position. In prefaces Melanchthon wrote for other historians' works and which he ad-

---


dressed to members of the nobility, he presented these ideas many times. He showed the regents examples from history which would remind them of virtues the nobles should have. Opponents of history, Melanchthon stated, countered his arguments with the idea that chance regulates the world. To these Melanchthon answered that it would be senseless to mark the wise teachings of history if blind luck regulated human things. He noted, too, that there are many among the nobility that have no standards for their actions, allowing themselves to be driven aimlessly from wind and weather. However, even as medicine cannot help all sicknesses, human weakness requires the teaching of history as an effective prop.

Melanchthon fervently believed that God divinely intervened in decisive moments of history. He reflected this belief in his historical writings. Karl Sell states that Melanchthon had the double gift of the historian's brains --

9 Ibid., pp. 199-200.

10 Ibid., p. 200.

to see the things of one's own life in historical perspective, and to see the historical perspective as part of one's own life. \(^{12}\) In his teachings Melanchthon showed that man's knowledge is a moving factor in the history of the world. He accentuated also the powerful historical position of the Gospel, which shows that man has freedom and happiness both inwardly and outwardly. \(^{13}\)

Another guiding factor in Melanchthon's view of history is the mood of doom which was prevalent in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. A menacing comet, the threat of the Turks, and catastrophic happenings within the German Empire all were considered foreshadowing of doom by many contemporaries of Melanchthon. He too felt that way. \(^{14}\)

Melanchthon was one of the first thinkers of Northern Europe to attempt a systemic account of his own epoch and see it in terms largely acceptable to the twentieth century mind. In his *Chronicon*, which will be discussed in more detail later, he set out to give a clear definition of the Renaissance, with-


in the larger framework of the development of human life on earth, which he considered a part of an even greater cosmic picture. Melanchthon traced the rebirth to the Florentines of Italy who allowed the Byzantines, fleeing from the Turks, to enter their city. The Florentines were intelligent enough to understand the importance of the Byzantine studies -- the Greek and Hebrew knowledge and learning they brought with them -- and its worth as a basis for a good literary education. Melanchthon proposed the year 1453 as the beginning of humanism and the renaissance of both ancient scholarship and neo-platonic philosophy. The Renaissance and the Reformation according to Melanchthon (and Reuchlin) was the new era. Melanchthon's ideas on this topic were regarded as valid until the twentieth century.¹⁵

Melanchthon's view of history also reflected his extreme patriotism - his love for his Fatherland. In his dedication of his edition of Tacitus's Germania to Johannes Luther, Martin Luther's son, Melanchthon showed his sorrow concerning the fact that the old German histories had no writers of their

¹⁵Cantimori, op. cit., p. 156.
own better than the Greeks and Romans. He consoled himself with the idea that Germany's old princes were more absorbed with doing something great than with making something great out of themselves.16

In stressing the aesthetic qualities of history, Melanchthon again betrayed his love for his fatherland. No part of history made for more enjoyment than the German. No humans exist, claimed Melanchthon, who are so hard-hearted that they have no longing after a knowledge of the past of their people. He asked, "If we study the history of other folks, how much more should we study the history of our people?" The national history catches our spirit more, he believed, because we are the heirs of the reputation of our fathers.17

In his patriotism Melanchthon stood again in the tradition of German humanism. Members of this circle, such as Wimpfeling, Pirokheimer, and Celtis, did not feel Roman life to be more honorable than Germany's. Though they worked to plant the study of the Greeks and Romans into Germany, they

17 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 201.
little cared to supplant the praise for their own people for that of the Romans. 18 Though he believed patriotism to be instituted by God, Melanchthon was not chauvinistic. He admitted to Germany's faults, but blamed both foreign countries and irresponsible German princes who had not learned from the past. 19

Melanchthon's view of his time as being the dawn of the modern era, his accent on the utility of history, and his patriotism all reflect his German humanism. His ideas concerning God's intervention in the lives of humans and his thoughts on history's relation to Christianity reflect his Christianity. In his aesthetic point of view, in addition to his humanists values, he is, according to Hartfelder, in harmony with Aventius, the Italian humanist father of scholarly history, with whom he corresponded much concerning problems on historical writing. 20 Melanchthon stated that according to ancient writers all the muses were born out of rememberance. To Melanchthon this meant that each subject

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., pp. 305-6.
20 Ibid., pp. 202 and 303.
of knowledge is actually derived from history. \(^{21}\)

Melanchthon advocated the reading of ancient historians. \(^{22}\) He recommended Tacitus to be read because of his history of early Germany. Tacitus shows Germany's greatness as reflected in the respectibility and honorability of the people. No adultery was to be found among the ancients. The youth of Germany, Melanchthon believed, could learn from Tacitus. \(^{23}\) He also advocated Salust (but censored his use of obscure words), Livius (for rhetoric and style, but did not like that he wrote only Roman history), Justin (for his moral lessons, lives of great men, and history of state affairs), and Plinius (for his Natural History, language, and style). He did not recommend Julius Caesar for anything -- style or morals. \(^{24}\) Among Biographers he recommended Plutarch for both language and moral needs. While at Tübingen he had already translated part of Plutarch into Latin. He used

\(^{21}\) Ibid., pp. 200.

\(^{22}\) Raumer, op. cit., p. 180.

\(^{23}\) Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 383.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., pp. 384-5.
Plutarch in his lectures at Wittenberg.  

**His Published Work**

Philipp Melanchthon could not himself tear away from the medieval concept of historiography. He tried to show facts and reasons for the development of phenomena, but he could not show any trend. History to him was only a chronology analytically described.

As a historian, Melanchthon busied himself in many undertakings through publication and revision of historical works written by others, through historical presentations in many forms, and through lectures with historical content. Already at Tübingen, he revised a book by Johann Nauclerus -- The Chronik, known as the "Big Tübinger Book." While working as proof reader for Anshelm's, he corrected many texts, including historical books such as Nauclerus's.

---

25  

26  

27  
Among the classical publications which Melanchthon himself either published or wrote prefaces for were Justin, Tacitus (including Germania), and two monographs of Sallust.

Melanchthon's discovery of an ancient history text at Wittenberg has already been discussed above. He also helped publish, with the help of the Palatinate Duke Ruprecht, the so-called Ursperger Chronik, a history of Germany in the twelfth and thirteenth century. 29

Other writings with a historical content which he either supported or which had his recommendation were de bello Rhodio, printed by his friend Setzer at Hagenau (1537); Inscriptiones S. Sanctae Vetustatis rel. Apiani et Barth. Amantii (1534); Pauli Iovii Turcicarum rerum commentarii (1537); Paul Eber's Contexta popoli Judaici historia a reditu ex Babylone (1548); Georg Spalatin's Chronica und Herkommen des Hauses Sachsen (1533); Wolfgang Kraussen's Stamm und Ankunft des Churl und Furst. Hauses Zu Sachsen (1554); Helmoldi Historia de Conversione Slavorum edi A. Sig. Schorkelio (1556);

28 Ibid., p. 295.

29 Ibid., p. 296.
Melanchthon also wrote several declamations with either an historical or biographical content. Among these are: *De Maximilio Caesare*, *De Friderico Electore*, *De Henrico III imperatore*, *De Ionne Cuce Saxiniae*, and *De Friderico Barburossa*. The intent of many was to show the patriotism or piety of the person featured. Other declamations such as *De Aristotlele* and *De Platone* concerned renowned theologians, scholars, and men of other knowledges. He also wrote a declamation against the Turks, *Exhortatio Maximiliani Caesaris ad Bellum Turcis inferendeum*, and a declamation praising Charles V, *De Electione et Coronatione Caroli V*.

Beginning in 1552, Melanchthon wrote sketches based on current events of varying importance—the arrival of a new count, the induction of a friend, Paul Eber, at the University of Wittenberg. Only chronology connected the events. Many entries make no sense to the reader unless he knows the

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., p. 297.
32 Ibid., p. 299.
thoughts of the writer. 33

Melanchthon frequently used historical anecdotes about events or personalities in his lectures and speeches. Several reflected his patriotism and piety. Many of his contemporaries valued them enough to collect them. 34

The name of Philip Melanchthon is connected with one important historical work—the Chronik Carions. It was originally written by Carion, a native of Bietigheim, Württemberg, and a student of both Luther and Melanchthon. Carion later became a professor at the University of Frankfurt on the Oder, and still later became official astrologer at the court of Brandenberg, though remaining true to Roman Catholicism. He sent his manuscript to Melanchthon for advice and correction. The book was published in 1532 by Georg Rhou in Wittenberg. Favorably received, it was widely distributed and translated into French and Spanish.

After Pastor Hermanus Bonnus of Lübeck translated it into Latin, Melanchthon hit upon the idea of reworking the whole project. Melanchthon finished the first volume of his

33 Ibid., p. 300.

34 Ibid.
version in 1558, and the second in 1560, shortly before his death. Peucer finished the last two volumes, which detailed Charles V's life. The Archbishop of Magdeburg, who held the books in high esteem dedicated the two volumes which Melanchthon had written. Melanchthon enjoyed especially his work on the first volume because it necessitated his study of the Old Testament and various Greek authors, a project he loved. 36

In preparing the book, Melanchthon used no other help besides his original sources. 37 By 1625 the Chronik went through eleven editions. It was translated into French and German. Many universities such as Heidelberg used it for illustrations of the use of historical examples in teaching ethics. 38

Melanchthon's philosophy of history, as well as his labors in this area again revealed his humanist background. His stress on the utility of the subject and his return to

35 Ibid., p. 301.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid., p. 303.
38 Ibid.
original sources were typically humanist. His belief in divine intervention, however, reflects his Christianity, while his interest in German history mirrors his patriotism. His approach to writing history, in which he did not attempt to show or interpret trends, placed him in the same category as the medieval historians. From this standpoint Melanchthon did not contribute anything significantly new to the field of historiography.
Chapter VI

THE ROOTS OF HIS EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

Influence of Scholasticism and Humanism

Melanchthon's ideas on education, like his thoughts on religion and history were influenced by three movements -- Medieval Scholasticism, Renaissance humanism, and Reformation Christianity. The Middle Ages provided Philip Melanchthon with the idea that grammar was the source of all language ground work, that dialectic and rhetoric provided the logical education for thought and speech, and that all studies were really one unity.¹

Medieval Scholasticism however was Melanchthon's enemy. Like Rudolph Agricola and Erasmus, he believed that Scholasticism was barbarity. He blamed the Scholastics for the loss of a correct Aristotle text due to the poor unintelligible Latin translations characteristic of the time. He censured exponents of Scholasticism contemporary to him who he claimed sought to convince youth that language study was difficult and useless. Melanchthon, claiming that many of these Scholastics received their doctorates through force and

¹ Cohrs, op. cit., p. 10.
deception, labeled their work as fraud and sophistry.  

Humanists, Melanchthon proposed, looked upon Scholastic knowledge as fit only for dogs, full of deliberate fraud and deception. It was the Scholastics' fault, he stated, that the writings of the ancients, the only fountain of a better knowledge, had not become available to scholars. He blamed the Scholastics for sophistry in the curriculum. He hated those who played with truth to enhance their own fame—men who did not seek the truth, but were out only to prove or disprove perpetually items they happened to speculate as possible. Whatever pleased them, they glorified and whatever displeased them, they rejected as worthless. They, according to Melanchthon, united that which should have been divided, and split that which should have been united. They used clear and well-defined terms to express nothing. What they loved they drove into monotony; what they did not, they scorned.

---


3 Ibid., p.156.

4 Manschreck, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

5 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, p. 156.
In general, Melanchthon condemned the Scholastic obscurantism. One who has had only a Scholastic-dialectic foundation could not say exactly what he thought or perceived, Melanchthon claimed, and he also could not teach others. The obscurity was so great that the Scholastics themselves did not understand about what they were arguing. Melanchthon felt that the Scholastics seemed happy in their obscurantism. The monks, whom Melanchthon viewed as the representatives of Scholasticism, he called lazy and ignorant. 6

But Melanchthon did not condemn the Scholastics completely. He recognized that goals were often large and that they had fostered several studies. He felt, however, that their striving itself was wrong -- they spent too much time and labor on useless things which no one, learned or unlearned, would or could use. He felt furthermore that in theological study and education the Scholastic doctors could not discuss disputed questions because of their inability to understand the language of the Bible and their ignorance of antiquity. Melanchthon particularly opposed the Scholastics because their errors which ranged from philosophy to theology.

6 Ibid., p. 156 and 158.
logy and the other studies of dialectic, rhetoric, ethic, and grammar. He noted that Scholasticism had even found new converts among the Protestants who were uninformed about medieval Scholastic theology. Melanchthon never resorted to sarcasm or satire in his denunciations of Scholasticism. He attacked it with logic and facts. One should not laugh at evil, he believed, but should stamp it out.

As stated in previous chapters, the humanists were basically scholars whose goal it was to become highly educated and cultured persons. In Northern Europe, humanism was deeply colored by the piety and mysticism of the later Middle Ages, fostering a return to the Christ-centered life of Christian love and finding an expression in the educational endeavors of the Brethren of the Common Life. The academies and universities were the humanists' laboratories. Looking toward the enlightened scholars of ancient Greece and Rome for their ideals, they buried themselves in the philosophy, literature, and culture of that era. Their primary task was to learn languages, which for them was Plato's Greek and Cicero's

7 Ibid., p. 158-9.
8 Ibid., p. 159.
Melanchthon, as stated earlier, had been exposed to humanism since his university days. It has been shown that humanism influenced Melanchthon's outlook on religion and history. In the area of education the humanistic influence also centered on the scholars' return to original sources and their choice of subject matter for the secondary and higher schools.

In general, Melanchthon reflected the humanist ideal of eloquence and utility. Eloquence had become a goal in the Renaissance, and Quintilian, who believed that an orator should have breadth as well as depth of subject matter, became, next to Cicero, the humanists' ideal. Quintilian believed that a man who is not a good person could not be a good orator. He further believed that only in philosophy was the correct and good life shown. Humanists generally adopted Quintilian's Institute of Oratory in their system of pedagogy. Rudolph Agricola, who had learned of Cicero and Quintilian during his stay in Italy, brought his knowledge to Germany. In his writings he accented the ideas of the two in addition

---

9 Rogness, op. cit., p. 3.
to those of Aristotle. Eloquence was to be the password of the new schools. Because his new teachings found much opposition, Agricola had to defend it in his writings. Melanchthon had become acquainted with and had become influenced by Agricola's teachings while a scholar at Heidelberg.

Erasmus's influence on Melanchthon has already been shown. Erasmus's scholarship, literary output, and philosophy had deeply influenced Melanchthon, who admired specifically Erasmus's eloquence, fineness, and taste of presentation. Melanchthon saw in Erasmus's presentation the ideal pedagogical functions -- that students would become eloquent in specific ways.

Dr. Carl S. Meyer feels, however, that Melanchthon was not completely dependent on Erasmus. Melanchthon, for example, valued the study of history more than Erasmus did. Furthermore, Meyer believes that when Melanchthon placed greater emphasis on rhetoric than on dialectics, he showed his dependence on Aristotle and his independence of Erasmus.


Besides Erasmus, Melanchthon had many other friends in his Humanistic circle. Among these was the already mentioned Johannes Reuchlin, his granduncle, who had been fundamental in getting Melanchthon his position at Wittenberg. Reuchlin's influence continued during the years Melanchthon stayed at Tübingen. It was Reuchlin who instilled in him a love for the ancient languages. Reuchlin was not happy about Melanchthon's friendship with Luther. When Reuchlin received a professorship at Ingolstadt, he asked Melanchthon to join him. Reuchlin promised him Eck's forgiveness if he did. Melanchthon refused the offer. Reuchlin then indicated that his grand-nephew should no longer write him. When Reuchlin died on July 30, 1522, he willed his personal library, which he had originally promised to Melanchthon, to St. Michael's Church. Melanchthon consoled himself by believing the book collection to be worthless. Later he rationalized that it probably would be best for all if the books were kept in a certain place, like the high school at Pforzheim, for all to see, in order that the books would not be lost or des-

13 Ibid., p. 642.

14 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 52-3; cf. Maurer, op. cit., pp. 14-44.
Members of Erasmus's circle of friends with whom Melanchthon corresponded included Michael Hummelberg of the Imperial City of Ravensburg in Upper Swabia. Hummelberg was a pastor with an Italian and Parisian humanistic background. Happy that Melanchthon received the position at Wittenberg, he was on Melanchthon's side in his dispute with Dr. Eck. Between 1520 and 1525 the two exchanged letters, containing the usual humanistic questions. Hummelberg, who remained a Catholic, died suddenly in 1527.

Another member of the circle was Beatus Rhenanus of Schleifstadt who died in 1547. Hummelberg wanted Rhenanus and Melanchthon to become good friends. But Rhenanus never did become too friendly towards Melanchthon. Ulrich Zäsi (or Zasius) from Constance was not a close friend of Melanchthon, but the two had the same mutual friends -- Erasmus, Spalatin, Pirckheimer, and others. Zäsi was head of the Latin School in Freiburg, Secretary of State, and professor of Jurispru-

16 Ibid., pp. 119-122.
17 Ibid., pp. 122-3.
idence at the University of Freiburg till his death in 1535. He was a humanist juror and a follower of Luther. However, the Peasant's War influenced him to return to the Catholic Church and become antagonistic against Luther.

Another member of this circle was Nicholaus Gerbel from Pforzheim. He too had attended the Pforzheim Latin School. He also studied at the universities at Cologne, Tübingen, and Vienna. At Vienna he became involved with a humanistic poetry group, becoming acquainted with Conrad Celtis, the German humanist. Upon meeting Melanchthon and Gerbel became good friends. Gerbel became a follower of Luther and did not forsake him as other humanists had done. He stayed at Strassbourg during most of his life until his death in 1560. He was one who provided Melanchthon with many classical texts.

Wilhelm Nesen, another German friend of Erasmus, met Melanchthon in April, 1523 in Wittenberg. Nesen intended to study law and theology for a doctorate. The two became such good friends that Melanchthon wrote poetry dedicated to him.

18 Ibid., p. 124.
19 Ibid., p. 125.
Once Melanchthon accompanied Nesen on a trip to Frankfort, Melanchthon going only as far as the Palatinate. On the trip they saw three ravens circling overhead. The superstitious Nesen asked Melanchthon for an interpretation. Melanchthon, who had been thinking of his own sickly self, predicted that one of them would die. Weeks later, on July 5, 1524, Nesen dreamt that he had fallen into a stream. Again he asked Melanchthon for an interpretation. This time Melanchthon claimed the dream had no significance. That same night Nesen drowned in the Elbe River.  

The last member of the Erasmian humanist circle to which Melanchthon belonged was Ludwig Carinus, a friend of Nesen's whom Melanchthon met on the trip to Brettan mentioned above. Melanchthon dedicated both his translation of Demosthenes and his first Olynthistic speech to him. Although Carinus had a falling out with Erasmus, he and Melanchthon remained friends.  

Melanchthon belonged to another circle of humanist friends at Nuremberg, the first German city to embrace hu- 


manism. Among these is included Willibald Pirckheimer, who was at various times a jurist, statesman, orator, historian, translator, and even commander-in-chief. His house was a meeting place for humanist writers. Ever since his stay at Tübingen, Melanchthon sought Pirckheimer's acquaintance. He called Pirckheimer the Mercury and Hercules of Humanism. Both men exchanged compliments in poems and dedicatory prefaces. Pirckheimer not only took Melanchthon into his circle of friends but also placed him among his closest associates. Melanchthon however did not meet him personally until 1518 when he stopped off at Nuremberg on his way to Wittenberg. Although Pirckheimer did not care for Luther, he did not want to lose his friendship with Melanchthon because of Luther. When his two sisters, both nuns, were being annoyed in their cloisters by the Reformers, he asked Melanchthon for help. In his later years, Pirckheimer's opposition to the Reformation lessened. 22

Christopher Scheurl, who had studied law in Italy, but who had become a humanist while studying at Heidelberg, was another humanist friend of Melanchthon. Scheurl had

22 Ibid., pp. 131-5.
taught at Wittenberg till 1512 when he accepted a position at the University of Nuremberg. A Catholic, he remained at the university till his death in 1542. Scheurl, who was at first happy about Luther, was also a friend of Dr. Eck. Melanchthon first met him personally in 1518 while visiting there. Since Nuremberg was a source for books, Scheurl was one who acquired a Greek Bible and other books for Melanchthon. Scheurl thought highly of Melanchthon. When Camerarius and Melanchthon visited Nuremberg to establish a Latin School, they were invited to a dinner at Scheurl's. Scheurl's friendship with such opponents of the Reformation as Eck and Witzel ultimately led to a break in relations with Melanchthon. Later, when Camerarius was stationed at Nuremberg, Melanchthon, in his letters to Camerarius, sent his greetings to Scheurl. 23

Melanchthon also had two humanist friends at the University of Leipzig - Peter Schade, or Schad, also called Mosellanus after his homeland, and Andreas Francus Camitianus, whose name was really Andreas Franke from Kamenz. Mosellanus was the teacher of Greek whom Luther had wanted for the Greek chair at Wittenberg which Duke Frederick had already given to Melanch-

thon. Mosellanus and Melanchthon, upon meeting, became good friends. The two met again at the Leipzig disputations. In the Erasmus-Eck situation of 1519, Mosellanus acted as intermedior. Although Mosellanus stayed a Catholic, he and Melanchthon remained good friends. Melanchthon name Mosellanus's *Dialogs* as textbook for the Second Class of the Saxon schools. Mosellanus's gravestone bears words praising him composed by Melanchthon.

Camitianus, who became a councilor for the Saxon princes, George, Henry, and Moritz, came to odds with Melanchthon because of the Reformation movement. After 1539, Melanchthon, however, tried to renew their old acquaintances.

Johannes Turmaier, also known as Arentinus, after his hometown of Abensberg, was another of Melanchthon's humanist friends. He studied at Ingolstadt and at Paris, where he became acquainted with Beatus Rhenanus. Since 1509 he served as educator to the Bavarian princes. He joined the Evangelical church at Regensberg, almost becoming a martyr to the cause. Turmaier left Bavaria for Saxony, where he wanted to undertake the writing of a history of Germany based on mater-

---

24 Ibid., pp. 139-142.

25 Ibid., p. 143.
ials he thought were available in the cloisters taken over by the Reformers. Melanchthon, however, advised him that there were no records available in the cloisters. Melanchthon volunteered to help finance the history, however, but Turmaier died in 1534 without completing the work. There is no record of any exchange of ideas between Melanchthon and Turmaier, even though Melanchthon was interested in history. 26

Melanchthon also corresponded with Ulrich von Hutten concerning Reformation problems. 27 Another correspondent was Johann Sturm. No one knows when the two first began corresponding, but letters are in existence dating from 1534 on. It was Sturm who wanted Melanchthon to come to Paris to talk to King Francis I, an event mentioned above. At another time Sturm wrote Melanchthon that he was envious of Melanchthon's wider participation in the Reformation movement. Melanchthon answered that Sturm's endeavors of filling the hearts of youth with the holy teachings of God, of the nature of things, and of good rules was more useful. Sturm offered Melanchthon a position as lecturer in theology in 1556. Melanchthon, be-

26 Ibid., p. 144.

27 Ibid., pp. 146-7.
cause of his thorough absorption in the Lutheran movement and because of his age, declined the call. The two however remained friends.

Melanchthon, then, was thoroughly steeped in humanism. He had been exposed to it as a youth at the Pforzheim Latin School and at Heidelberg and Tübingen. He belonged to several circles of humanists. One cannot, however, forget that he also had humanist friends from a younger generation too -- his own students. His work with Luther and Lutheranism drew Melanchthon away from many of his humanist friends, but not from all. His friendship and love for his friends were based on mutual interests and similar goals, and so endured under the strain of theological disputations. Hartfelder comments that humanism was a bridge that connected Catholicism and Protestantism in the first half of the sixteenth century, only to be broken in the second half.

**Influence of the Reformation**

Although the Reformation movement and Dr. Martin Luther did influence him, Philip Melanchthon probably influenced the

---

movement and Luther much more. As already shown earlier, Melanchthon had definite ideas concerning the state of the Roman Catholic Church before he came to Wittenberg. After he came under the influence of Martin Luther, Melanchthon asserted his ideas more aggressively, joining Luther in the theological fray. Luther was not the humanist Melanchthon was. But because he was anti-scholastic, Luther found in humanism the tools needed to battle Scholasticism and Catholicism. Education was one of these tools, and Melanchthon was the craftsman.

For Luther, as well as Melanchthon, humanism was to serve both God and the state.31 God and Germany occupied all of Luther's thoughts. Because he felt that both the worship of God and the well being of a country required an educated person, he began to take an interest in education. The humanist teaching of Rhetoric seemed to him to best provide the higher education he wanted. He also felt that the humanist emphasis on Latin was not only good for the church, but also for Germany's business affairs.32

Luther, who himself was a product of university train-

31 Cohrs, op. cit., p. 21.
32 Bolgar, op. cit., p. 343.
ing, recognized the scholarly superiority of Melanchthon. Just as Melanchthon learned from Luther in things spiritual, so Luther accepted Melanchthon as the authority in questions of knowledge. Luther's letters and speeches reflected his complete acceptance of Melanchthon's educational views.33

Luther's influence in getting Melanchthon to serve on two faculties, the Arts and Theology, led to Melanchthon's actualization of his ideal of using the classics to serve and promote theology. This method became the distinctive characteristic of the German evangelical schools which Melanchthon established.34 Luther agreed essentially with Melanchthon's views concerning the classics. Luther believed that no one really knew why languages came into being. He felt that during one's life one saw only part of God's grand design. Until one is able to see the rest of the picture, it is the Lord's will that languages should serve as the containers in which are preserved the work of the Holy Spirit. The languages are the baskets in which one was to view the "bread, fish, and morsels" of God's Word. We would be doing wrong if

33Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 204.
we were to neglect the languages (Greek and Hebrew especially, but also Latin and German), since we then would not only lose the Gospel, but also our ability to read Latin or German correctly. He warned, however, that the languages themselves did not make theologians, but were only a help. Accenting the languages brings such a light and does such great things, Luther continued, "that the whole world wonders, and must recognize, that we have the Gospel so open and pure, almost as the apostles had them". 35

In general, Melanchthon influenced Luther more in education than Luther influenced Melanchthon. However, in bringing Melanchthon into the service of the Reformation movement, Luther channeled Melanchthon's energies specifically to the cause of Evangelical Christianity. One can only speculate whether Melanchthon's fame would have been greater or lesser had he not been active in the Reformation movement.

His love for Aristotle drove Melanchthon away from the Scholastics who he claimed had obscured Aristotle's thoughts through poor translations and commentaries to the humanists who sought to produce better texts by researching

35 Hartfielder, op. cit., pp. 204-6.
older, more correct sources. Because Melanchthon had been influenced from his youth by humanists and later by the Reformers, his philosophy of education gradually assumed the shape of Christian humanism, which we will analyze next.
Chapter VII

HIS GENERAL IDEAS ON EDUCATION

On Education as a Whole

Eloquence and utility coupled with piety are the key words to Melanchthon's philosophy of education. As a humanist, eloquence and utility were to him extremely important. As a Christian, piety was for Melanchthon indispensable. His ideal, then, was "Bereitsamkeit", or "learned piety". By "learned" he meant the elements of humanism, and by "piety" he meant the evangelical elements. He believed that in this way he would be cultivating all of the powers of the human spirit. Beginning with the classical languages, he would make the benefits of religion his final goal. ¹

Students would in Melanchthon's mind become eloquent in a particular humanistic way. The eloquence Melanchthon wanted was not the type that might have been a God-given gift to certain individuals, who because of their positions, would be able to use their talents to influence their followers. This type of eloquence, which Melanchthon had assigned to the

¹ Manschreck, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-40 and 145.
ancients, he believed to be out of reach. No sixteenth century person could speak like them. Eloquence for Melanchthon was the same as it was for Agricola and Erasmus. It meant the person's understanding of the word and subject - grammatical insight and factual knowledge - which was then tied together with the person's ability to present something clearly. Melanchthon repeated this ideal many times in his writings.²

Melanchthon affirmed that for a student to fully understand a word, he must be able to understand examples of that word -- its definition and usage. He must then be able to transfer this knowledge to others. If he is able to teach someone the concept of the word, then he himself really understands the word. Any knowledge, Melanchthon claimed, that cannot be imparted to others is really not a knowledge. Melanchthon thus believed that one can give clear and distinct form to his thoughts from true knowledge. As abstract thoughts can only be crystallized through words, he continued, so also are understanding and speech inseparable. Speech,

therefore, is the proof of understanding. Since words denote objects, complete understanding of the word is possible only if the object itself is understood. Word and object therefore are inseparable. Both are so inwardly connected that one cannot be without the other. Just as speech makes the item understandable, so the item makes speech understandable. One therefore needs words to express one's understanding of a subject. Clear and distinct speech, then, is formed from an understanding of things. In this aspect of education, Melanchthon adhered to the last basis of Middle Age Scholasticism which in theology stressed the oneness of "thing" and "understanding."

Because of this accent on the knowledge of things, erudition was most important to Melanchthon. Obviously necessary to the understanding of words, the acquired knowledge of various subject matters was stressed by Melanchthon and humanists in general, who believed it to be an inseparable part of eloquence. Some of his opponents who felt eloquence

---


5 Ibid., p. 334.
really had nothing to do with gaining knowledge in other subject areas caused Melanchthon to believe they were avoiding the hard work necessary for gaining a goal. He believed not being able to master the art of speaking was the same as being dumb. It was not easy, he reflected, to organize one's thoughts for others. Furthermore, Melanchthon believed that everything found its basis in speech, including the brotherhood of man and the art and method of living correctly.  

Some contemporaries of Melanchthon differentiated between elegance in speaking with eloquence, of which it is part. Melanchthon believed them to be the same. He believed elegance to be so important that he felt it unthinkable that some felt it mattered not how one spoke.  

Eloquence for Melanchthon was necessary because it sharpened the spirit, allowing one to grasp human things better, and it led to prudence and diligence, sharpening one's competence to judge. Prudence can be acquired from eloquence in two ways: first, by studying authors who have in 

6 
7 
Ibid., pp. 335-6; cf. CR XI: 53.  
8 
such a way already acquired prudence, and, secondly, by the intellect's becoming more active in its pursuit of the correct expression.

How does one acquire this eloquence? Through practice, which to Melanchthon meant imitation in the best way—imitating good poets and authors. A more practical use, Melanchthon added, was the acquisition of facts which one can get through listening to the lectures and studying the classics (only the facts from the ancients were considered practical by the humanists). Lectures and studies thus were the paths to the humanities and language study and their results were the gates that opened to culture. For Melanchthon, as well as most humanists, eloquence and sagacity were inseparable.

Melanchthon believed that eloquence was important in all branches of education, including theology. Eloquence must serve theology. The cultivation of language, important for the acquisition of eloquence, was an indisposable basis for the pure teaching of the gospel. Just as the light of

---

9 Ibid., p. 337; cf. CR XI: 56-8, 60.

10 Ibid., pp. 338-9.
the languages lightens up, so the light of evangelical teaching lights up. If one extinguishes the first, the second is in the same trouble. 11

Religion and character education belonged together according to Melanchthon. 12 He was, like other humanists, attracted especially by the great classical moralists, finding in their ethical teaching inspiration and instruction of permanent worth. He was always controlled by the practical interest. He felt all study that did not improve character as well as the mind was needless. 13 In all his labors in education he never lost sight of the moral betterment which was to result from learning. 14

Melanchthon was influenced by the writings of St. John Chrysostom (344 or 347 to c. 407 A.D.), who emphasized the importance of home training of the child, showed a sympathetic understanding of child psychology, wrote about vocational guidance, and outlined a direct training for citizenship.

---


12 Meinhold, op. cit., p. 43.


Chrysostom urged the cultivation of the powers of observation, and stressed imitation and emulation as important incentives to better effort. Chrysostom was greatly concerned about bringing up "a philosopher, champion, and a citizen of heaven" through the development of a sound Christian character by means of good religious and moral training.¹⁵

Philip Melanchthon constantly warned against neglecting the youth of the church and state. "To neglect the youth in our school is just like taking the spring out of the year." Those who permit the schools to decline do indeed take the spring out of the year. Religion and society would indeed suffer if the study of the sciences were neglected.¹⁶

Utility was another key word in Melanchthon's educational philosophy. Knowledge had for him no purpose of its own. It existed exclusively for its service to moral and religious education.¹⁷ He constantly stressed the usefulness of a subject or of material discussed to the youth in his classes.¹⁸

---


¹⁷ Kirn, op. cit., p. 283.

¹⁸ Sell, op. cit., p. 21.
He gave Latin lectures on the Sunday sermons so that those who could not understand German could get some use from the sermons. 19

Melanchthon kept edging toward realism in his philosophy. He believed medicine and law should be practical. He worked feverishly in perfecting dialectic in order to improve law. 20 His realism was, however, verbal realism. Besides striving to obtain the universal knowledge which Erasmus claimed was needed to understand the classics, Melanchthon advocated the study of natural science. He believed that man should use the faculties that God gave him to contemplate nature. He felt that Adam himself could have taught Abel philosophy by pointing things out to him in nature. Melanchthon believed that science must be applied to life. As an example of his quest for realism, Melanchthon, in preparing his book on psychology, sought interviews with Nuremberg doctors and also asked the celebrated Leonard Fox to send him information on anatomy temperaments. In contrast to the standard procedure of reading the classics to glean phrases

19 Cohrs, op. cit., p. 27.
20 Sell, op. cit., p. 22.
for constructing Latin sentences and expressions without giving much thought to content, Melanchthon, following Erasmus's lead, stressed the reading of the classics for grammar and content. This study of content came to be called "reals" during the early seventeenth century. Making the content real, or getting "realism" from the ancients as the humanists did, through the means of ancient authority, not from experiments or observation, Raumer called "verbal" realism. Experience and observation were the basis for "real" realism. Experimental, analytical, and critical methods were not used at that time. 22

Melanchthon however was a realistic diagnostician. He shunned the scholastic deductive method and used instead induction to arrive at his conclusions. He honored exact knowledge successfully arrived at over all glittering hypotheses. 23

On Method

Melanchthon's success as an educator lay in his use of


22 Sell, op. cit., p. 21.

23 Ibid., p. 23.
method. But what was his method? Cox describes the method as a plan in which he extracted the good out of Aristotle, illustrated it by the aids of literature and genuine criticism, and adapted it to the principles of true religion. Melanchthon did not follow Aristotle implicitly, but used also what was good from the Stoic and Platonic systems. Cox states that this plan, eventually used throughout Germany and sanctioned by both state and church authorities, was called the "Philippic Method".  

Gilbert, however, states that Melanchthon took his definition of method from Lucian's Dialog on the Parasitic Art. He claims that Melanchthon especially stressed the criterion of usefulness which Lucian's definition set up for any art. Melanchthon himself says: "The Greeks thus define this term: Method is an acquired habit establishing a way by means of reason. That is to say, method is a habit, that is, a science (scientia) or an art (ars), which makes a pathway (via) by means of a certain consideration (certa ratione); that is, which finds and opens a way through impenetrable and overgrown

---

24 Cox, op. cit., pp. 50-1.

places (loci), through the confusion of things (res) pertaining to the matter proposed." 26

Ong claims that Melanchthon's definition of dialectic sounds like his definition of method. It too is an "art" (ars) or a way (via). Dialectic is the art or way of teaching clearly and in proper order. The interior organization of a science, and therefore deduction itself - defining, dividing, and reasoning - is nothing but a pure and simple teaching process, Ong continues, since it is the product of dialectic. Ong further believes that Melanchthon adhered to Agricola's teaching which favored topical logic over a logic of prediction, since the former was easier to teach than the latter. 27 Agricola had used the same setting for his explanation of the places or loci. He used the same description of "abode" or domiciles or receptacles, the same confusion of things, and the same way or road cut through them as through a woods. Melanchthon even retained the same indecision of Agricola's concerning the connection, if any, between the cutting-out process and the road metaphor: Is one to regard the "things"


27 Ibid., p. 159.
as obstacles in a road-building project, or as valuable objects to be harvested and used? 28

Agricola was concerned with the places or loci themselves and to the orderly arrangement of items (augumenta) within those places, while Melanchthon was more concerned with the orderly arrangement of items which were professed to belong to the predicaments or categories. Melanchthon obviated this intention by placing his method in a book devoted to the categories. Melanchthon also was more concerned about getting arguments out of these receptacles, while Agricola was more interested in placing them into the receptacles. Melanchthon believed method was what one did with the arguments once one got them out of Agricola's places. Melanchthon placed method with the predicables and predicaments (which can be affirmed or declared true), rather than with propositions and argumentations (which must be proved or reasoned to be true), with which it generally is placed. 29 In other words, Melanchthon stressed utility. It was more important for him to be able to use the arguments once he had located them. Agricola was

28 Ibid., p. 237.

29 Ibid.
more interested in listing the arguments in correct, convenient categories.

Melanchthon likened "habit" to a science or an art, which to him and other post-medieval scholars meant a curriculum subject, which in turn is likened to Agricola's topical apparatus. Gilbert traces Melanchthon's belief in common places back to Galen and still further back to Stoic beliefs, which were commonly held by Melanchthon's contemporary humanists. Also noticed in Melanchthon's ideas of method were the influences of Aristotle and Plato.

Aristotelian commentators accentuated the idea that method is a short cut to knowledge - a short art or compendium. Gilbert claims that method did not become a common philosophical term until Melanchthon observed that the dialecticians adapted it for the most correct order of explanation. The Stoics had originally equated art and method. Agricola used this definition to prove that humanist dialectic was an art while medieval dialectic, or terminist logic, was not. Melanchthon accepted

30 Ibid.
his interpretation of Lucian's definition. Method was thought of as both an art and a science. That it was considered an art can be traced to Socrates who labeled as art the teaching of the arts and communication in general. That it was considered scientific is traceable to Aristotle who developed explicit criteria of demonstrative procedure that surpassed Socrates and who carried out the mathematical program proposed by Plato.

Melanchthon thought of method as proceeding by means of questions. When one is considering a single word, one can usually attack it with ten questions:

1) What does the word mean?
2) Does the thing exist?
3) What is it?
4) What are its parts?
5) What are its various species?
6) What are its causes?
7) Its effects?
8) Its associations?
9) What things are related to it?
10) What is contrary to it?

---

32 Ibid., pp. 59-60 and 70.
33 Ibid., pp. xxiv-xxv.
34 Ong, op. cit., p. 238; cf. Gilbert, op. cit., p. 126.
According to Melanchthon these are derived from the four which Aristotle had outlined in his *Posterior Analytics*, with six more added in the topical tradition. Ong claims, however, that Aristotle's questions do not have to do exactly with single terms, or "simple themes", as Melanchthon's treatment of method does, but with demonstration, involving questions and proceeding by the process of exact thinking from first principles. Melanchthon did not attack this problem at all, but treated propositions and syllogisms in general in his second and third volumes on logic, giving no separate discussion of method for them. Later logicians stated that Melanchthon treated method very lightly, referring casually to Galen's three "ways of teaching", that is, three methods of the arts - analysis, synthesis, and definition. Melanchthon, they claim, used synthesis most, without making any issue of the matter.

Although "method" as described above seems a part of logic, dialectic, and rhetoric, Melanchthon applied it to


36 Ong, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

practically every field he was interested in. Melanchthon however never wrote a complete systematic presentation of the method of teaching. His Ratio discendi (Wittenberg, 1522) was an attempt to do so. It harmonized with Erasmus's thoughts on the subject, found in his Commentariolus de ratione discendi. Melanchthon's main thoughts on education are found in his Lectures on the Tenth Book of Quintillian (CR XVII: 653) which emphasized 1) lecture, 2) exercises in style, and 3) Latin speeches or declamations. These Melanchthon felt would be useful if done correctly and in the right order. Melanchthon was against all unmethodical learning. He denounced the fact that many Germans in their studies did not follow a method, wandering around without a goal, without use of any one knowledge or another. 38 Young people, Melanchthon claimed, followed a certain author, not because he was next in a series, but because he momentarily caught their fancy. Scarcely had they opened his book, and they already felt nauseous. So they took out another book helter-skelter from a book case - today a poet, tomorrow a historian, next day an orator. All have the same fate - scarcely begun, they

are put aside; not one book is read to the end. The person seeks just entertainment, shying away from serious work. Who works this way, Melanchthon believed, comes to nought. 39

The first step in Melanchthon's course of study is the lecture on the classics. He believed a knowledge of grammar is basic, but he also believed that lectures should begin as soon as possible near the beginning of his study instead of waiting sometimes for years while mastering grammar. 40

Next comes the Exercitio styli, or imitation of Latin prose and poetry. In several of his writings, such as Elementa Rhetorices (CR XIII: 492-504), the Scholien zu Ciceros De oratore (CR XVI: 722-727), his remarks to his Commentary to Cicero's Partitiones oratoriae (CR XVI: 858-59), and in his explanation to the Tenth Book of Quintilian's Institute of Oratory (CR XVIII: 670-675 in the section Commonefactio de imitatione; also in his important remarks in the Preface to Hesiod, CR XVIII: 172ff and in identical form in CR XI: 239), which Stephanus Riccius had published, Melanchthon devoted much space to the worth of imitation. Because the Latin

40 Ibid., pp. 340-1; cf. CR XII: 483.
language was already regarded as a dead language during Melanchthon's time, it seemed to humanists that the imitation of authors was about the only way to reach the desired goal. Melanchthon compared the imitation of authors to pictorial artists who modeled their own schools in imitation of masterpieces. Even the preparation of speeches seemed to Melanchthon related to the composition of poetry, with imitation the key idea.

Basic to imitation was knowledge of grammatical and rhetorical rules, which showed the way. Furnished with them, one could attempt to imitate the good models. In discussing the characteristics of imitation, Melanchthon distinguished between *Imitatio generalis* and *specialis*. The first concerned the places from which the author to be imitated received his original ideas, how and where the thoughts had been enlarged, and in which manner he handled the universal propositions. How could the author stimulate the passions, win or enrage the hearts and minds of the listeners, through placing the items in the correct places? Are the aphorisms used sparingly? Are the parts of the "causae" placed properly? Are the nar-

---

ratio, Refutatio, and the like in the correct places? This imitation could be a real borrowing or complete take over from the ancients. If Cicero could take over completely from Isocrates or Plato without feeling blameworthy, then one studying Latin composition could too, just as a painter not only borrows the mechanics, but creatively imitates the form and movement of the painting which is his model.

*Imitation generalis* reaches also to the "grammaticus sermo", the grammatically correct expression, which not only embraces the Latin word, but also the phraseology. When one borrows a Latin word from an author, one must be certain it fits the phraseology. Melanchthon advocated the stock-piling of probable good words and phrases. Where should one find these? Not from the medieval scholastics, but rather from Cicero, Caesar, Terence, Livius, Plautus, and Quintilian. However, they should not be imitated mechanically and outwardly. One cannot just take verses and places from here and there and join them together. Just as a sculptor could not take the head of Pallus from Phydia, the chest of Doryphoros


from Polyklet, and the feet of Hercules from Euthycrates, and try to put them together into a new figure, so a writer cannot do this with the writings of the ancients. Individually they make an atrocious work. The same would hold true for writing. This would not be called "imitating", it would be labeled "plundering".

Imitatio specialis concerns itself with the imitation of the composition style or sentence construction of Cicero. Melanchthon believed the arrangement of the parts of a sentence to be important because it made the presentation distinct and clear. Non-observance of the rule, however, made the lectures unclear. To make the job of imitating Cicero easier, Melanchthon put together some rules for the young people. First, one must get the correct order of thoughts. He believed this to be easy with narrations or explanations. Second, one must get the correct classifications of the phrases in Cicero's writings. If the proper sequence of thoughts made the items clear and distinct, so a knowledge of sentence structure helps tie in the thoughts and helps the speech sound true. Melanchthon cautioned against unreservedly re-

commending the imitation of Cicero, since he had a different religion and had lived in a different country. However, one need not scorn Cicero merely because one had to add words Cicero never used for the sake of theological arguments. Melanchthon advocated using newer words rather than using older philosophical terms for religious purposes. Even Cicero, Melanchthon claimed, was not on the same plane in all his writings. Melanchthon even admitted that his style was far removed from pure Ciceronian. 45

Melanchthon, like Quintilian, stressed the production of Latin verses as an essential tool. Melanchthon's thoughts on verbal and written imitation as well as the imitation generalis echo Quintilian. But Melanchthon was critical of Quintilian too, censoring his vagueness on verbal imitation.

The third step in Melanchthon's method was the production of a Latin speech or poem, and its presentation in the form of a declamation, a device carried over from the Middle Ages and idolized by the humanists. Eloquence was of highest importance. For its perfection one practiced the year long in Latin expression, read various authors, made observations, and then tried to produce such a work after the

model of Cicero or another orator. Less worth was given to the speech's contents. Since the knowledge of the sixteenth century embraced that of ancient times, no new content was required. Hartfelder pointed out that there was certainly a cleft between the ideal and reality. Many, even after finishing the Arts course of study, were incapable of finishing a declamation without outside help. Melanchthon himself wrote many declamations for others while at Wittenberg. Melanchthon and other humanists stayed in the tradition of the ancients. Quintilian, who differentiated between the oration and the declamation, was an influence on the humanists in general and Melanchthon specifically, who thought of himself as extending Quintilian's clear use of language.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 349-51; cf. CR XVII: 680.}

Philip Melanchthon believed in several pedagogical aids to make teaching more meaningful to the students. He believed in the use of examples. Because rules were too abstract, examples were necessary. The proper method for learning was through lectures, practice, and declamations. In connection with these Melanchthon advocated the use of fables. As he stated in his Latin oration, De utilitate fabularum, fa-
Fables have vividness and character. They arouse first curiosity and then a thirst for knowledge through which the slumbering spirit of a child is awakened. He who uses fables in teaching is like the one who captures the love of children through sweetness.  

Melanchthon believed in rules. Students should be able to quote rules and give examples from classical authors. One who does not know the rules and does not practice the language vocally will not try to use the language. One should not have rules without examples. However, the rule should not become lost in examples, for then no teaching could take place.

Repetition makes for retention, Melanchthon claimed. Students also should concentrate deeply on a few authors rather than be exposed to many in a shallow manner. He warned the pupils not to listen to too many too often. Practice in Latin style and verse is more practical, he believed. However, one should not concentrate on too little too much since this also makes for boredom. Variety is needed while one still

48 Ibid., p. 351-2; cf. CR XI: 118.
49 Ibid., cf. CR III: 532; II: 482.
has the zest for learning. Melanchthon believed the work of studying should be made as easy for the child as the subject matter allowed. He advocated brevity and the use of questions in lectures.

Melanchthon believed there should be a charm in the study of sources itself. The call to the sources in itself should be fruitful. Melanchthon believed strongly in order in the learning experience, with clearly established goals. He hated "durcheinander" learning which had no goals. Knowledges (different subject areas) were intertwined, he believed, and it is to the credit of the scholar to observe this. He felt that one should be able to distinguish between main and subordinate subjects. He further believed that one must get and retain the most important points and viewpoints from the other subject areas. These are the loci one should retain.

Important in Melanchthon's day was the acquisition of the Latin language. Melanchthon advocated the following techniques in his preface to the edition of *Cicero's epistlae*


familiares:

1) During Latin lectures on phrases mark the Latin phrases.
2) Learn them, so that one can at any time write or speak them.
3) Mark especially the metaphors which can be used as "little lights" in the presentations.
4) From phrases one steps up to the observance and production of the "Consecutio". One can learn this best from Cicero. From these one learns the ways of the sentences.
5) The highest point of the imitation is the reproduction of the rhetorical parts - the exordium, narratio, contentio, exemplas epilogus, etc.

Melanchthon realized that even here there was a cleft between the ideal and the real. One should be happy if one could build passable sentences which may never be considered correct Latin. More imitation would, however, help. But one had to be careful not to stay too long with one sentence. One should rather pick out a word or phrase of a sentence to study it. Like an artist uses just possibly a single line to portray an eye, so a teacher may concentrate on one aspect of a sentence. 53

We have reviewed Melanchthon's views on education from the standpoint of method and pedagogical aids. We have looked at method from three points of view 1) as an all embracing.

52Ibid., p. 354; cf. CR XVII: 15.
53Ibid., pp. 354-5; cf. CR II: 23.
system of education based on Aristotelian thought, 2) as a specific method for acquiring a new concept, be it a word, phrase, or piece of logic, and 3) as a program for acquiring a well-rounded humanist education based on the acquisition of form and content. We have scanned the various pedagogical aids that Melanchthon advocated. We will now look at which authors Melanchthon felt necessary for the typical humanist student to read in order to receive an education combining eloquence, utility, and piety.

**Classical Authors as an Aid to his Method**

In order to carry out his program based on lecture, imitation, and declamation, Melanchthon utilized certain authors whom he felt had the general characteristics and the contents worth imitating. His choices were typical of the humanists of his time and reflected his adherence specifically to the ideas of Agricola and Erasmus.

Among the Greek writers, Melanchthon especially liked Homer for his elegance, poetry, good examples, and moral worth. Melanchthon believed that no other work outside of the Scriptures reflected the spirit of the people as much as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. He liked the fact that Homer allowed his heroes to cry; they were not Stoics. Melanchthon believed that Homer's Hades was in line with the Christian teachings of
a life hereafter. Homer was the subject of many of Melanchthon's lectures. Melanchthon erroneously believed some works (e.g. The Batrachomyomachia) to be Homer's that proved later not to be his. 54

Next to Homer, Melanchthon liked Plato. He called Plato the wisest person after Homer. Melanchthon sought to see what opinions Plato and Homer held in common. He believed that except for Homer's undying gods and goddesses, the two had much the same views. 55

Melanchthon also liked Hesiod. He believed Hesiod's works to have two intimately interwoven characteristics - a knowledge of things and an intensity of expression. He did not just give dry rules, but wrote interestingly. He showed that the gods are never men and saw their evil deeds. Melanchthon liked especially Hesiod's writings on the nature of things, or physics. He was one of the first to write on astronomy. Melanchthon admired Hesiod's style of writing. He liked his exquisite words which gave both dignity to presentation and weight to knowledge. Hesiod's writings also con-

54 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 356-60; cf. XI:397-413.

55 Ibid., pp. 358-9.
tained good illustrations and good examples of sentence construction. Hesiod's fables are also good, according to Melanchthon; sometimes they are mistaken for Aesop's. 56

Among other Greek authors, Melanchthon liked Pindar for his lyrics, history, and rules for justice and moderation. Melanchthon translated Pindar's writings. Among the dramatists he admired Euripides. He translated eighteen of his plays into Latin and made some the subjects of his lectures. He called Euripides a distinguished rhetorician who used more figures of speech than Sophocles, whose plays Melanchthon also liked. He lectured on Sophocles's Antigone (contents of which are found in CR II, 792-793) and made up translation problems based on Antigone. In 1534 Melanchthon wrote Camerarius that the lectures of Sophocles brought him unbelievable happiness, especially in his hours of sorrow. Melanchthon did not care for Aeschylus. 57

Melanchthon believed the tragedies were worth advocating because of the importance of their contents, including warnings, concerning many things in life. Students could also

56 Ibid., pp. 360-3; cf. CR XI: 111-5.

57 Ibid., pp. 364-5.
use the tragedies for examples of interesting figures of speech. Tragedy was closely related to comedy, which Melanchthon also termed ethical. He liked especially Aristophanes, whose plays showed how rulers were to act. Melanchthon also lectured on Aristophanes.

Among the didactic, or instructive, poets of ancient times, Melanchthon liked Aratus, whose poetry he published and some of whose verses he translated into Latin. He felt Aratus had both a knowledge of physiology and a feeling for elegance. Melanchthon also liked Thucydides, some of whose poetry he translated (found in CR XVII: 1019 and CR X:656; 353); and Xenophon, whose writings Melanchthon felt youth should read not only for eloquence, purity, and gracefulness, but also because Quintilian advocated it.

Among orators, Melanchthon liked Demosthenes, whose work containing good examples, ethics, and sayings, students should read for insight, erudition, and eloquence; and Aeschines, Demosthenes's opponent. Melanchthon believed that both presented the relationships of both civic and political life more clearly than any existing book of philosophy. Me-

58

Ibid., pp. 365-6.
lanchthon liked especially the might and beauty of the form of Demosthenes's speeches; he felt that they could not be translated effectively into Latin. He admired Demosthenes's eloquence, but whose entirety must also be admired. Melanchthon also advocated the orator Lykurg for his patriotism and Isocrates for his eloquence, truths, and good examples. Melanchthon published Lykurg's poetry several times, sometimes with a Latin translation. 59

Among the philosophical writers Melanchthon held Plato in high esteem. Through Plato, according to a Melanchthon written Latin oration delivered by Konrad Lagus in 1538 at Wittenberg, one can get a proper love for scholarship and inspiration to help one endure in all the struggles which the culture of that time required. Melanchthon declared Plato's eloquence far greater than that of any Greek or Latin orators. Even though some other orators may have individual presentations or examples better than Plato's, yet Plato is better over all. If Jupiter spoke Greek, Melanchthon stated, he would have used Plato's language. Plato only declared those

59 Ibid., pp. 369-71; cf. CR I: 669, 837; X: 89, XI: 104 (all concern Demosthenes); XVII: 939ff. (Lykurg); X: 83, 89; VII: 879 (Isocrates).
presentations good which conformed to the desired subjects; other presentations, though equally eloquent, would be unnecessarily silly, like the oratory of the sophists. Plato's writings also contained worth and warmth. Melanchthon claimed that Cicero borrowed from Plato, a fact Cicero admitted in his writings. Plato's conversational technique, however, made his writings less satisfactory for school use than Aristotle's topical format. Melanchthon felt Aristotle's method of presentation more simple and clear than Plato's, which was obscured through his choice of examples. Melanchthon advocated studying Plato after having studied Aristotle, who also had borrowed much from Plato. Melanchthon, in his belief that Plato in his treatment of the eternity of the soul spoke of the same god as the Christian God, confused — according to Hartfelder — Platonic philosophy with the gospel. Melanchthon, however, did not agree with Rhenanus who, in identifying Platonism with Christianity, called Plato one of the greatest prophets. 60

Aristotle, of course, was first in Melanchthon's heart. Already at Tübingen Melanchthon idolized him, and, except for a short period of time after he came under Luther's influence at Wittenberg, continued to idolize him throughout his life. In lectures and declamations Melanchthon acknowledged Aristotle's utility, method of inquiry, simplicity, and clarity. Melanchthon felt that Aristotle's medieval commentators had obscured his thoughts and had, through their ignorance of Aristotelian Greek, engaged themselves into a needless battle of words. Furthermore, Melanchthon believed that Aristotle's dialectics was necessary for the Church whose purpose it was to teach the correct method, define skillfully, and instruct in opinions. He felt that Aristotelian philosophy did all this. 61

Other Greek writers whom Melanchthon advocated included Ptolemy, Galen, Lucian, and Plutarch. Melanchthon's personal interest in astronomy and astrology, which will be discussed elsewhere, drew him to Ptolemy. Melanchthon believed Galen to

be the only and most important authority of medicinal knowledge, surpassing Hippocrates because of his (Galen's) development of that body of knowledge into a system, based on observation. Melanchthon felt that Galen had completed the ideas Aristotle had begun in his own *Physics*. He admired Galen's clearness and ingeniousness, avoiding all sophistry and hair-splitting. Melanchthon admired Lucian for his elegance and originality of presentation in addition to his gracefulness. Through his fables Aesop, of course, was an excellent source for teaching virtues and righteousness through analogies and examples. Plutarch's biographies were to be read for lessons in morals and style. Melanchthon had translated Plutarch's writings partially into Latin during his stay at Tübingen. He used Plutarch in his lectures at Wittenberg. In general, Melanchthon recommended only those Greek writers who could be used for language purposes as well as for ethics and style, a trait common to all German humanist educators. 62

Latin writers were more important in Melanchthon's time because of the practical need for a knowledge of Latin.

Cicero was to Melanchthon, as well as all Northern European humanists, most important. Cicero was hailed as being a master of eloquence, clarity, exactness, and utility. His writings were useful to humanists as their source for ideas, words, expressions, figures of speech, analogies, and moral lessons. Quintilian was Melanchthon's second choice, especially because of his eloquence.

Melanchthon's choice of Latin historians has already been mentioned in the section concerning his philosophy of history. Among the Latin poets, Melanchthon places Vergil first because of his *Aenied*, which Melanchthon felt contained good examples of moral life and an excellent knowledge of physiology, or natural knowledge. In this poem, Melanchthon observed, Vergil showed how a man through certain experiences overcame odds through his understanding and insight. One must read Vergil with the idea in mind of finding certain truths and utilizing the author as a model to be imitated. Since Vergil himself imitated Homer, one should imitate Vergil.

63

Melanchthon, however, did not agree with the medieval idea that Vergil's Aenied was an allegory for Christian prophecies.

Although Melanchthon in his writings and lectures placed Horace next to Vergil, he does not say much about him. He does, however, place Ovid next to the two. He admired especially the *Metamorphoses* as examples of godly benevolence and scorn. He believed that Ovid showed, through a series of fables beginning with creation and continuing to his time, that things do not happen through fate or chance, but through the leadership of God from whom everything is made and put in order. Because of the many references to astronomy, physics, lands, places, hills, and rivers, one can learn geography, cosmography, and other knowledges from it. Ovid is also good for character building and as a source for eloquent phrases. Ovid was so good, that his writings were translated into Greek, the highest possible compliment in Melanchthon's eyes. Since Ovid often repeated himself, Melanchthon believed him better for content than style.

Among the dramatists, Melanchthon favored Terence above Plautus, because of the impropriety of the latter. Melanchthon...

---


lanchthon, who did like Plautus's humor, used only those plays of his which were clean; others he probably edited. Melanchthon, as well as Luther, liked Terence's plays. Besides their elegant style, beautiful sentence construction, and good figures of speech, they are filled with excellent moral values. Much about life can be learned through Terence. Melanchthon believed that one could understand Terence best through lectures. Moral values, examples from life, and style were what Melanchthon and German humanists in general sought in the writers of comedy.

In his choice of authors Melanchthon, generally speaking, emphasized the language need. Servants of both the state and the church should read both Latin and Greek because the languages were important to each area. For Melanchthon content—both facts in general and moral examples specifically—was important. In other words, the knowledge of the subject matter was as important to Melanchthon as the words used. Not only was one during Melanchthon's time expected to speak Latin, but the language used was expected to be beautiful, ornamented, and filled with good sentences.

67 Ibid., pp. 393-4.
In Melanchthon's mind only those authors are worthy that help to ennoble moral values, and with whom one could defend or demonstrate evangelism. However, Melanchthon was not so set on moral values that he would stay with Christian authors like Prudentius or Baptista Mantuanus in preference to the classical authors, as the older generation of German humanists such as Wimpfeling had done.

German humanists, including Melanchthon, according to Hartfelder, had no respect for the aesthetic value of the ancient writers. Though Melanchthon spoke of the beauty of the writing's contents, he never stated clearly what "beautiful" meant to him. Hartfelder questions whether Melanchthon viewed the beauty of a writing's contents in the same way he admired a painting of Dürer's. Hartfelder reminds us, however, that we cannot really say Melanchthon and other humanists had no aesthetic knowledge because they never really commented on it. Utility was what was stressed.

Melanchthon and Luther both loved the classics. Both praised Cicero and Terence equally. Luther, however, emphasized the religious aspects. Luther was not well acquainted with the Greek authors, whom he learned to know through Me-

68 Ibid., p. 395.
lanchthon. Melanchthon believed Greek and Latin inseparable in worth. Luther, however, placed Greek after Hebrew. Luther believed the Greeks' goal of knowledge to be merely virtue. The Greeks had good words, but not good phrases, he continued. Their language is friendly and gracious, but not rich for speaking. Hartfelder believes Luther's comments shows the difference between the religious and the humanist elements in the two reformers.

Melanchthon's choice of authors reflected his Christian humanism. Authors selected were those typically favored by sixteenth century humanists. Like other Christian humanists, Melanchthon screened the contents, removing all undesirable subject matter. Because of both his accent on verbal realism and his humanist belief in the authority of the ancients, Melanchthon selected these authors to help expedite his method.

69 Ibid., pp. 396-7.
Chapter VIII

HIS CONCEPTS OF TEACHER, SCHOOL, AND CURRICULUM

The Role of Teacher

Philip Melanchthon had no radical thoughts concerning the basic subject matter of the gymnasia and universities. He engaged in no wholesale purging of existing subjects. He came up with no radically different replacements. He was interested mostly in using in the best manner the best of what had been till then commonly taught. Lutheranism influenced his ideas to the extent that he sought always to teach that which would serve the church best. He saw as one of higher education's faults its lack of organization and method in its traditional curriculum. Melanchthon believed the remedy of this situation lay in greater awareness of the end or purpose of each art. Other humanists of the time, like Johann Sturm, echoed Melanchthon's beliefs.  

Two principles had made mass education a must during the Reformation era. First was the appeal of the Lutherans to use scripture as final authority. People therefore had to be able to read the Bible to know that which pertained to eternal welfare and to be able to participate intelligently in

1 Gilbert, op. cit., p. 72.
church services. Secondly, the principle of the "priesthood of all believers through justification by faith" took the responsibility for education out of the domain of the priestly hierarchy and gave it first to the area rulers, and ultimately to the people.

By the time Melanchthon arrived on the scene many universities were in decay. The institutions, church affiliated throughout the middle ages, were now state affiliated in the Lutheran states. Luther looked to the princes for help with this problem. Melanchthon himself also felt that solving the problems of the Church and school were the highest duty of the area ruler. It was his responsibility to provide the universities with teachers who were distinguished in talent, scholarship, virtue, and knowledge, and who not only had a serviceable method of teaching and learning, but who would perform their duties faithfully. He further believed that the princes should provide teachers with a decent salary. Financial insecurity of the teachers had been the cause of many of the schools' problems. Melanchthon and

---

2 Manschreck, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

3 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, pp. 401-2.
also Luther tried to get raises for the teachers and have them supported with money from the public treasury. They were not always too successful. The need for money often caused teachers to resort to questionable practices. Manschreck states that money-making schemes, like making and selling alcoholic beverages on the school premises (a practice engaged in by some ministers, too), were common. Salaries also were often paid in goods and in money from many varied sources.

Paying teachers' salaries from the public treasury was a practice that developed slowly. The sons of professors and pastors, as well as poor children, were usually given school training without any fee. Melanchthon believed that teachers should have salaries large enough to make outside work unnecessary, but not large enough to encourage idleness or extravagant living. He further complained that common laborers were usually better paid, that schoolmasters often had scarcely enough to eat, and that teachers often went to book fairs in rags while the booksellers dressed themselves like maharajahs.

---


Melanchthon believed it to be God's will to provide churches and schools which were necessary for the spreading and cultivation of knowledge. No skill or trade was as important as the knowledge of scholarship, for without it one can neither keep or govern either state or church effectively. Since not everyone was strong enough to learn all, God has given some to set out, instruct others, and maintain skills. Without scholarship one ends up with barbarity and vulgarity, in danger of sinking back into a life like that of wild animals.  

The cultivation of knowledge was necessary to the church. When schools sunk into decay, so did the church. To be religious-wise, one must learn to understand the nature and manner of prophetic and apostolic speech. Because of this, ancient languages, the whole development of speech, lectures on the ancient literary texts, and practices in writing were to be studied. Also, because of the Church strifes, one needed both the skill of a dialectician and the knowledge of the stories of the classical writers. One could learn these only in the schools.  

---

6 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 403; cf. CR XI: 107, 214, 617.
7 Ibid., pp. 403-4; cf. CR XI: 445.
Melanchthon's views found opposition during his time from certain groups who believed that nothing should be taught that was not Biblical. Among these were the fore-runners of the Anabaptists who were against all formal religious training. Another problem of the time was the lack of money on the part of the princes. Melanchthon was angry at the fact that the little money available was spent on items other than what he considered important - the schools. He felt that the older people were to live for the well being of the younger people. He prized Nuremberg and Hamburg where money offerings were made for the schools. The goal of the schools was not schooling itself, according to Melanchthon, but the establishment of the realm of God on earth. The church and state both needed qualified, able servants, and the schools' job was to train them. Students were to be trained to be more than just men. They had to fulfill their jobs with expert knowledge and conscientiousness in the chancel, in the school room, in the law and government offices, and at the sick bed.  

Few in his time knew the job of teacher as well or defended it as well as Melanchthon did. In a letter of advice

8 Ibid., pp. 405-6.
to the citizens of Antwerp he wrote: "If you know a good man, one who can teach, speak, and act at the same time, get him at any price; for the matter involves the future of your children who receive the impress of good and bad example with the same susceptibility."  

In a tract, "de miseriis paedagogorum," Melanchthon expounded on the miseries of teaching. No one lives through as much sorrow as he who teaches children. To illustrate this truth Melanchthon cited an example he asserted typical. A boy, he begins, is given to a teacher to educate. In most cases he is already spoiled at home. Because the boy already knows that which is base and wicked, he lacks the love and appreciation for scholarship. To the contrary, he hates it, scorning his teacher and indulging in evil habits brought from home. With one of these misfits the teacher must now worry himself to death. During his classes the boy's mind wanders, causing the teacher to repeat himself six hundred times until finally the new concept is absorbed. If, however, the teacher pauses for a moment, all is again lost.

If the student is brought to task, the teacher's problem really begins, for the student takes pleasure in angering his teacher. It is easier, Melanchthon believed, to teach a

9Manschreck, op. cit., p. 32.
camel to dance or a donkey to play a harp. The student shows his unthankfulness in the form of derision of the teacher.

The teacher lectures himself to death while the students fall asleep. So the teacher repeats, but the student's mind is not on the things to be studied, but is in the local tavern, playing dice or doing something worse. If a teacher asks questions after the dictation, the student has forgotten -- all has gone in one ear and out the other. The teacher's plight continues, Melanchthon believes, for an unhappy situation like this works havoc on the health of the teacher's body and soul.

But this is only the beginning. It is the teacher's thankless task to teach the boy the Latin tongue. Only through practice in good speech will he learn its usage. For the student this is difficult. When the teacher calls upon him to answer, the student stands as quiet as a statue. Called upon once more to answer, he acts as if he had the falling sickness. When he finally does answer, he speaks quietly so that the teacher cannot hear his mistakes. Slyly he swallows word endings. If the master calls for a loud, distinct answer, he hears monstrosities of word formations. Though the sentences the student recites are grammatically wrong, they have the color of the well-read author, giving the teacher a hint as
to their origin.

Unsuccessful with his attempt at teaching Latin speech, the teacher turns to writing, also a difficult task. Getting students to write is almost impossible. One is lucky to get some to write one Latin letter in one semester. If the project is the construction of Latin verse, the teacher must give the contents and finally probably also give the words.

When the composition or verse is finally written, the teacher must correct it. A "criminal" teacher, according to Melanchthon, is one who is sluggish in this area. It takes much effort to point out the grammatical errors, to clarify the dark, equivocal phrases, to smoothen the student's rough style, and to point out proper figures of speech. Even for the diligent teacher it is a chore to read the work, often quite silly, and always to show its errors. Understandable punishment usually follows poor writing. Just like a field commander cannot succeed when his soldiers are cowardly and lazy, so it is also with the teacher, whose life is just as much a military service.

Melanchthon felt that the students' general attitude toward teachers was that no one does so little to earn money than teachers. Many who hardly had learned anything quickly passed themselves off as learned and looked down with disdain at the teachers. Their good deeds are not yet recognized by the students who are as yet too young to understand. When they do get older, the memories of their teachers' good deeds have vanished.

Parents are as bad as the children, Melanchthon believed. If the son did something good, the teacher deserves no credit. If he erred then the teacher is to blame. Besides his own personal experience, Melanchthon was influenced by Rudolph Agricola's description of a school - jail where beatings, tears, and lamentations had no end. 12

Melanchthon's view of the teaching profession was not all negative. The woes of a teacher according to the Praeceptor were never greater than the joys. Three days before he died Melanchthon told his friend Camerarius in a letter that he hoped before God that their work as schoolmasters would not be forgotten, but would bring forth much fruit. 13

11 Ibid., p. 410.
12 Ibid., pp. 410-11.
In several writings he stated that no one earned the esteem of the state more than those who taught youth in appropriate ways.

In the essay, *Laus vitae scholasticae*, Melanchthon described the illuminating sides of the job of teaching, a profession which was to him a very holy, beneficial way of life. Teachers foster truth and justice, which he believed were the best and most Godly features of mankind. Both are not practiced (as they should be) in the courts and forums, but in the schools. If they were not first presented there, they would never be found in the court and town hall. The diligence of the teachers is not only useful and noteworthy, it is holy. Men were created that they would teach each other about God and other good things. The teaching of youth, Melanchthon claimed, is better than living the life of a monk.

Nevertheless Melanchthon was irritated by the coarseness of the students, which reflected the coarseness of the times. In 1533 he complained in a letter concerning the stu-

---


dents equating contempt for discipline with true bravery. In 1537 he discussed the general misbehavior of youth - the gangs which roamed at night, yelling, assaulting, destroying, among other items, booths in market places, carriages, and anything else they could see. 16

Karl von Raumer believes that student behavior at Wittenberg was no better or worse than at any of the other contemporary institutions. Why could Luther and Melanchthon not exert a greater moral influence over the vicious students? Raumer gives four reasons: First, there were present a great number of them. Second, since they came from all over Europe, many were not natives and were therefore harder to manage. Third, the work of the Reformation demanded too much of Luther and Melanchthon themselves and of other teachers engaged in the Reformation work. Fourth, students in various ways misinterpreted for evil the newly rising intellectual freedom without religious adaptation. Many foolishly and wildly broke over all bounds. 17 One can see in the students' behavior an immediate effect of the disassociation of the

---

16 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 155.

university from the church, with its built-in disciplines.

In order to be an effective teacher, Melanchthon believed one had to know how to teach, speak, and act at the same time. A teacher should always include a personal touch in his work. He must further strive to make his lectures interesting. Teachers should also be well trained, both academically and morally. In general, Melanchthon and Luther agreed that there was nothing greater or more glorious than being a good educator - one who was both diligent and pious and who both truly trains and teaches. One could never reward him enough, even with money.

The Role of the School

Melanchthon's ideas concerning the state of the universities in his time were definitely influenced by Luther and the Reformation movement. His stay at Heidelberg and Tübingen seemed to him to have been fruitful because of his own independent studies. However he never condemned either place completely. In his 1521 essay, Oratio adversus Thomam Placentinum pro Martino Luthero Theologo, written under the pseudo-


19 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 413.
nym Didymus Farentinus, he condemned higher education. Universities, he asserted, quoting a speech of Wycliff's, originated not from the popes, but from the devil. Princes, he maintained, should pay attention to changing and bettering the universities, since spiritual and worldly officials were trained there.

Melanchthon charged that philosophy and jurisprudence stood in full contradiction to Christian teachings. The Jurisprudence courses, he maintained, produced only babblers and windmakers. What was called canonical law was but the tyranny of Rome. The theology taught at the universities was nothing but the glorification of nonsense, sewed together out of the philosophy of Aristotle and the silly laws which one called canonical. The sentences the theologians taught were a forest of countless opinions, which had really nothing to do with Christ. The universities were a swamp of vice and depravity, which through its sensuality causes the youth to sink to the bottom.

Faculty members also came under Melanchthon's censure. Speaking in generalities, he claimed one is driven to jurisprudence without polish or ambition and the other through hunger in theology. Covetousness, pride, and arrogance were cultivated more at a university than anywhere else. The Turks
(Melanchthon's and Luther's, as well as the Emperor's enemy) would not allow such schools, Melanchthon adds, but we do because they are the creation of the Popes, that is, the devil's. 20

Condemnation of the existing universities were but one phase of Luther's battles with Rome. He saw in the Church associated universities the Roman spirit in Germany. Melanchthon, however, remained convinced of the need for reform on the university level in both form and content. Scholastic theology prevalent at his time was unsuitable building material for Evangelical theology. Through Biblical theology, classical lectures, and Aristotelian philosophy created from translations of original texts, Melanchthon hoped to better the methodology of theology. 21

To facilitate the teaching of theology and combat impious opinions, Melanchthon believed in using the "Loci" method, an idea that led to his originating his *Loci communes* discussed earlier. As he told Henry VIII in his preface to one of the editions of the book, it is of great advantage to


"have at one's command the main points distributed by order and procedure and contracted into a method." He followed the mode of John the Damascene and Peter Lombard in using this method. Catholic writers, including Joachim Perionius (died c. 1559) and Melchior Cano (1523-60), followed Melanchthon's practice and brought out rival collections with the same purpose.

The Curriculum

With service to the church and state his main Reformation-influenced goal and eloquence his humanistic key word, Melanchthon looked at the existing body of knowledge and the methods used to transmit it in the vast, picked out what was good, and discarded that which was not. As he had stated in his Latin speech delivered at Tübingen (see Chapter One), he believed in the seven arts, the traditional curriculum of higher education. His philosophy followed basically the existing trinomial system which included first, the teaching of thinking and reading - the artes formales - dialectic and rhetoric, both of which issue from grammar; second, the teaching of reality - the artes reales - physic, cosmology, physiology, and psychology; and third, the teaching of the

practical problems of life - ethics and politics. 23

Melanchthon constantly stressed the inner connection of all the arts to each other. If one wanted to understand completely, one could not dispense with the other. With the passing of time, Melanchthon emphasized more and more the overall worth of all the subjects for theology. He constantly sought to spur on the theologians of the New Church to a diligent study of all knowledge. In judging the worth of any branch of knowledge, he took into consideration the extent to which it served theology. In both his writings and his lectures Melanchthon sought to show this organizational relationship of these bodies of knowledge to each other, to show unity of knowledge from one's early childhood till one's last years, in order to stress an over-all harmony of subject matter. He did not, of course, lecture in all of the branches of knowledge. 24 Melanchthon preferred this orderly advance through the arts to theology which had been established during the Middle Ages over the disorderly progression practiced by earlier and even contemporary humanists.

23 Paulsen, op. cit., p. 265.

The Trivium

Accenting utility, Melanchthon, echoing his fellow humanists, stressed the study of languages - Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Since humanists based all their knowledge on books rather than on empirical research and since they advocated going back to the original sources for their knowledge, language study was of highest importance. These writings of the ancients were to Melanchthon and his fellow humanists the fountainhead - the source of all knowledge. Like other humanists he did not trust many of the earlier translations of the Middle Ages. The originals had to be read! He felt that these medieval products were transformations, not translations, since they either made hazy or completely changed the original intent of the writer. Some translations, such as Luther's of the Bible, he felt worthwhile. But he felt there should always be someone who knew the language of the originals.

He, like other Reformers, considered the original languages the gold and silver vessels that contained the true Gospel. He considered Greek most important - most cul-

tured, ornamental, and most eloquent. He admired it especially because it is the language of the New Testament. Through it one can feel he is talking to the Son of God, to Paul, and to the other apostles and evangelists. Greek was also the source for the basic writings of all other important knowledges - medicine, law, physics, and history. 26

Second he placed Latin. Melanchthon did not praise Latin as much, since the utility of the language was obvious to those sixteenth century scholars who coped with it in order to advance in the work of the church, the government, law, medicine, and in the realm of international trade. Latin was the world language of the time, and the merchant, the cleric, and the scholar had to know it. Melanchthon felt that the Latin language was the best vehicle for clear understanding and logical thought. 27

After Greek and Latin, Melanchthon placed Hebrew. Since it was the language of the Old Testament, Melanchthon believed it to be the language of God himself. One needed a thorough knowledge of Hebrew to understand the writings of

26 Ibid., pp. 166-8; cf CR XI: 231-9; 862-3; 875.

27 Ibid., pp. 68-99; cf. CR VIII: 368, 383.
the prophets. Even New Testament Greek remained obscure without a knowledge of Hebrew, since even though the writings were in Greek, the expressions were Hebrew. Melanchthon felt, however, that a knowledge of Hebrew was not too important, because the Hebrew's knowledge of their own language did not save them from error in interpreting their Bible. Their error, however, Melanchthon believed, was due to both ignorance and bad will. Humanists generally were against Hebrew study because they felt the language was already lost as far as exact understandings were concerned. They felt that since Greek and Latin literature embraced all existing knowledge, one should not divert the students from their study. To a certain extent Melanchthon concurred with their opinions. But he felt also that the church must not lose Hebrew, since only that language disclosed the final understanding of the Scriptures. In the Hebrew controversy, Hartfelder comments, the theologian won out over the humanist. 28

Melanchthon stressed grammar because he felt it was absolutely necessary for a good understanding of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He felt that the correct meaning of words, a wide range of well chosen expressions, and proper sentence con-

structions were indispensible to a correct understanding of concepts. Weighty controversies, he believed, could be settled through the determination of exact meaning based on grammar. ²⁹

Melanchthon based his study of grammar on that found in the Middle Ages. He divorced grammar from dialectic with which it had been merged, simplified its rules, filled it with humanistic content, and accented syntax. The Praeceptor recognized the students' aversion to language. He felt it the teacher's task to show the students the importance of the subject. Those teachers who consciously instilled a complete hate to this difficult subject should be severely punished. One who does not learn any grammar wanders about goal-less and unsteadily in the fields of knowledge, plucking out the agreeable here and there. Such learning lacked organization and integrity, Melanchthon believed. Melanchthon did not agree with those contemporary educators who felt that one could learn grammar through practice in speaking and writing after only an introduction to a minimum set of rules. Rules should be learned thoroughly, but grammar should be used in practice, too. A good knowledge of grammar, Melanch-

²⁹ Manschreck, op. cit., p. 147.
thon insisted, was necessary in the study of all subject areas, especially theology. However, from the theological point of view, Melanchthon seemed to contradict himself, agreeing with Luther that one could learn the languages better through practice than through grammar.

In choosing the authors to be studied for examples of good grammar, Melanchthon sought to make school training a preparation for daily living. Therefore he chose writers like Terence who had produced products worthy to the human mind. Content was as important to him as example.

Philosophy in Melanchthon's time had a wider definition than today. Included in it were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and physic - the basis for the Arts curriculum. As Melanchthon thought of it, philosophy, which he called "simplex", could not assert anything without proof, in order that it would escape the danger of nonsensical beliefs which could not be proven. Philosophy also had to be ethical; it had to provide a check on the passions. Scholasticism was not a true philosophy for Melanchthon since it was filled

31 Manschreck, op. cit., pp. 147-8.
32 Ong, op. cit., p. 136.
with empty words and sophistry. A new German philosophy was not even remotely thought of by anyone during the sixteenth century. Humanists turned rather to the ancient Greeks. Melanchthon rejected the Epicurean philosophers because of their accent on lust and absence of pain as the highest good, and the Stoics, because of their dialectics which contained hair-splitting, confusing arguments, and their relegation of God's activity to a secondary role. He also did not agree with the basic teachings of Plato's academy, especially in the skeptical form evolved through Arkesilas. Melanchthon felt that all the Academy taught was so unsure, battling at times with God, the order of life, and with the understanding in general. 33

In Aristotle Melanchthon saw his ideal. He had the stronger method (as explained above). He had divided knowledge correctly into dialectic, physics, and ethics. Aristotle was more pure and truthful and less fantasizing than the other earlier philosophies. However, Melanchthon was a selective Aristotelian. Any part of Aristotle's philosophy which conflicted with the beliefs and moral teachings of the Evangelical Church he rejected, with the exception of his views on astrology. Melanchthon believed however that theo—

33 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 177-80.
logy must learn, and borrow, from philosophy, in order to combat obscurity. Philosophy, too, should borrow from theology -- especially in revealed teachings. The sources of philosophy -- experience, principles, results of intellectual processes -- are very worthwhile and could be considered a voice of God. However, to that must be added the voice of God.34

Melanchthon felt that philosophy should be studied for its utility to the state and church. Theology could not exist without it, since it could be only a muddled knowledge, causing endless irritation, endless arguments, resulting in confusion and uncertainty. The theologian must not know only grammar and dialectic. He must have knowledge of physics and ethics, too. Even without these philosophy is important, Melanchthon states, because it teaches method and presentation, helping theologians to unravel difficult problems and bring light to obscure meanings. Add to this the moral advantages gained through a knowledge of the philosophical schools, which do not look for arguments, but seek to further truth through sober propositions. A philosophical education makes for modesty, Melanchthon believed. Melanchthon, echoing fellow humanists in many of these thoughts, pushed philosophical studies

34 Ibid., p. 180-2.
especially because he felt they served both religion and morality.\(^{35}\)

Regarding the second and third subjects of the Trivium, Melanchthon sought to reestablish the distinction between the two, dialectic and rhetoric - a distinction which had become blurred during the Middle Ages. Though dialectics are used by rhetoricians, there was a difference. In Melanchthon's mind dialectics presented the items plainly and simply, while rhetoric endowed the presentation with raiments - a thought originally expressed by Valla. Rhetoric and dialectic both have the same thought content, but each gives it a different point of view, and each looks toward a different goal. Melanchthon pointed out that the ancient writers distinguished between the two, stating that rhetoric gave the material, but that dialectic answered all the other questions which men had to learn concerning method.\(^{36}\)

The true goal of dialectics is instruction, while the goal of rhetoric is the stimulation and impression of the mind and heart. Melanchthon cited as an example the topic "virtue". Dialectics would determine the concept of virtue - its

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p. 182-3.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., pp. 183-4.
origins, its divisions, its operations, and the like. The rhetorician, however, used the commonplace of his subject to move men to practice virtue. 37

Melanchthon believed that an understanding of logic would lead to a better understanding of Aristotle. He believed the teaching of logic was necessary because it taught men with moderate capacities and was a help to them, while on the other hand it could control and keep within bounds those more gifted with common sense, who would be led to seek after truth and to prize truth alone. He censured those who decry logic and its laws, comparing them to men of unbridled passions who hate the restraint of moral laws. He can forgive those who felt that the Scholastics had driven logic into disrepute. The logic he advocated, however, was the true, pure, and unsophisticated logic of Aristotle and his better commentators. 38

Those who spoke eloquently but without either learning or logic, Melanchthon called "self-conceited blockheads." To speak well, he states, one must have something to say, one must use logic to think it through, and one must have the

37 Ibid., pp. 184-5.
means of expressing it. He felt further that logic was a preface to all necessary art. Logic also could be used to determine correct doctrine in the church. He cautioned, however, that one should not be deterred from using it because it had been abused by heretical teachers.

Rhetoric had not been corrupted as dialectic had. Cicero and Quintilian were the superior models from which students could learn the eloquence needed for their work. To obtain this eloquence, however, involved extensive learning, great talent, long practice, and a keen judgement. Melanchthon warned that one should be on guard for blockheads who already conceitedly considered themselves rhetoricians after they had learned to write a letter.

Melanchthon believed that all in all rhetoric did not deserve the widespread scorn that had been associated with it. He protested against those who declared rhetoric's rules important and childish. Rhetorical instruction would not only help clear up obscurity in meaning, but would be of great use in handling the important business of both state and church, besides adding to one's education. To the most

---

40 Raumer, op. cit., p. 176.
41 Ibid.
difficult arts belonged the art of speaking. One acquired this art through rhetoric.

In his thoughts on dialectic and rhetoric Melanchthon followed the ideas originally fostered by the Italian humanists and brought to Germany by Rudolph Agricola who advocated them in his three books on logic, *De inventione dialectica*, in which he had organized them into an excellent system. Melanchthon, who considered this work authoritative, admired especially Agricola's ideas concerning the inner relationships between logic and rhetoric. Melanchthon regarded rhetoric also as an effective tool for the preparation of sermons. Indeed, rhetoric was a key thought in Melanchthon's ideas on homoletics. The utility of oratory to the theologian was one of the arguments easiest to prove in the Reformation era.  

The Quadrivium

At various times Melanchthon also expressed his ideas on the four subject composing the Quadrivium. Concerning arithmetic and geometry Melanchthon had similar thoughts. Many students did not elect mathematic lectures because they felt the subject too difficult, requiring too much of their

---


43 Ibid.
time which they felt could be put to better use in subjects worth while to both church and state. In other words, they could not find any practical need for mathematics, both arithmetic and geometry. Melanchthon in typical humanist fashion defended the two subject areas by quoting the ideas on mathematics of such classical writers as Plato, who claimed that a study of the knowledge of ciphering led to making the study of other knowledges easier, and Pythagorus, who placed the principles of all things in numbers. He refuted the claims of difficulty his students forwarded. If they would learn arithmetic (and geometry) using the established methods of Euclid, Ptolemy, and Procleus, the subject matter would be more easy for them. He advanced his belief that the beginning bases of arithmetic - addition and subtraction - which one used daily certainly were not difficult. The rules for these, inherent in the subject matter itself, were so obvious they could be grasped by boys. Multiplication and division, of course, were more difficult, but with attention, practice, and application, one should be able to quickly grasp those too.

\[^{144}\]

Utility Melanchthon also stressed. Traders, miners, those engaged in any work dealing with money, such as managers of the state treasury or bankers would need a knowledge of arithmetic. Builders and mechanical artisans especially needed a knowledge of geometry. In relation to religion Melanchthon found a use for geometry - to help understand the correct presentation of God in the minds of men. However, he could find no use for arithmetic in theology study. Both arithmetic and geometry he considered important as a basis for studying both astronomy and astrology.\(^{45}\)

Manschreck remarks that Melanchthon's advice was not always taken. Though he advocated those two subjects of the Quadrivium, he had a hard time keeping them at Wittenberg, his recommendations concerning them having been condemned.\(^{46}\) However, Gilbert states that the statutes at Wittenberg before Melanchthon taught there expressly emphasized the value of mathematics for a knowledge of Aristotle. Melanchthon's encouragement, according to Gilbert, meant much.\(^{47}\) Hartfelder is silent on this subject.


\(^{47}\) Gilbert, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-5.
During Melanchthon's time physics was regarded as that branch of knowledge dealing with the material world and its phenomena - in other words, natural philosophy. Astronomy was considered a sub-knowledge under it, while astrology, according to Melanchthon and other humanists was part of astronomy. Melanchthon used similar arguments to establish the worth of both astronomy and astrology.

In a preface to John Sacrobusto's book on the heavenly spheres, Melanchthon stated his belief that the harmony of the heavens revealed God. He believed that a knowledge of the heavens leads to knowledge of both chronology and the conduct of life. One is led to an understanding of the phenomena of the days and seasons. A knowledge of time is especially important religious-wise for an understanding of the origin of the world and the church. And of course a knowledge of chronology helps set in order both the history of the growth of the Empire and the expansion of the church.

48 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 190-1.

49 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 149.

50 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 191.
Melanchthon did not believe in Copernicus's heliocentric theory. Because Melanchthon had regarded himself an authority on natural science, he viewed the new theory with enmity. Since Melanchthon's teachings were based on the ancients' authority rather than empirical research, he judged Copernicus's theory in light of their writings. He was familiar with Archimedes' views on the conflict between the ideas of an immobile sun and a moving earth. He knew of Aristotle's comments on the same paradox.

But he also knew completely Ptolemy's contributions to astronomy. In his *Initia doctrinae physicae* (1549, found in CR XIII, 216 ff) he opposed the Copernican system on Biblical grounds, quoting Psalm 45 which stated that the sun moves, Psalm 78:69 and Ecclesiastes 1:4 which proved (in Melanchthon's mind) that the earth is stationary, and the account of the sun's standing still because of Joshua's command (Joshua 10:12-14). Melanchthon felt that these scriptural proofs should deter one from throwing the liberal arts into confusion. He followed the spiritual proofs with physical arguments, concluding that the earth is in the center and is immobile. 51 Hartfelder com-

ments that Melanchthon probably did not accept Coe­
pernicus's ideas because they were only hypotheses which were at his time not yet fully formulated.\(^\text{52}\) Paradoxically, Melanchthon was instrumental in getting Joachim Rhaeticus an appointment to a chair in Mathematics at Wittenberg. Rhaeticus, who visited Coe­
pernicus in 1539 and supervised the printing of his chief works in 1541, actively taught Coe­
pernicus's theories at Wittenberg without any apparent opposition from Melanchthon, though he was opposed by other Wittenberg reformers. By the end of 1541 Rhaeticus, however, was teaching at Leipzig. A 1542 letter to Veit Dietrich from Melanchthon is filled with praise for Rhaeticus. A later letter of Melanchthon to Camerarius reflects the idea that Rhaeticus left Wittenberg reluctantly, but that the Coe­
pernican problem did not cause any break in his friendship with Melanchthon.\(^\text{53}\)

But Melanchthon considered astrology one with astronomy. Like other humanists, he was influenced by a magical world picture in which the stars influenced both the character and temperament of men.\(^\text{54}\) At Melanchthon's time astrology was a

\[^{52}\text{Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 310.}\]

\[^{53}\text{Elert, op. cit., p. 420-1.}\]

\[^{54}\text{Ibid., p. 417.}\]
fairly well systematized subject that Melanchthon considered a science. In a Latin speech, on the *Dignity of Astrology*, he defended it as a true science with practical value. He rationalized errors in prediction by saying that science could not be held responsible for the mistakes of its representatives. Though the outcome of many predictions did not materialize, many had been accurate. He cited further astrology's past value to medicine, agriculture, statesmanship, and character. He concluded by calling the sun, moon, stars, and comets all God's oracles of fate. He argued that if the sun could affect the change of the seasons and the moon the humidity of the earth, then other bodies in the heavens could predict extraordinary happenings. To disdain the heaven's prediction, he warned, was to disdain God. 55

Melanchthon would not abandon astrology because he did not find enough evidence for doing so. He stated that he would accept astrology, however, even without enough evidence. In his 1549 edition of his book on *Physics*, he asserted that human temperaments were affected by environment, but were

55 Manschreck, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-5.
chiefly influenced by the stars, which caused human beings to be inclined in certain directions and even cause events to happen. God may interfere to punish the wicked, but man too is capable of doing this. The stars influenced some men to crime, but the fiendish impulses of men do too. The universal corruption of nature may even cause some men to die before their astrologically appointed time. Manschreck comments that these beliefs did not make Melanchthon a fatalist or a determinist.

Luther, however, was a sworn enemy of astrology who at times labeled it idolatry. He often made fun of Melanchthon and even at times scolded him. Manschreck reports Luther as saying that when Melanchthon spoke about his theories of astrology, he sounded like Luther under the influence of too many beers. Luther usually let Melanchthon have his own way since the Gospel itself was in no way influenced by it.

Melanchthon, as was usual for him, based his astrological proofs on the writings of the ancients - Galen, Hippo-

56 Ibid., p. 105.
57 Elert, op. cit., p. 417.
58 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 29.
59 Elert, op. cit., p. 417.
crates, and especially Ptolemy whose work he had translated into Latin and who was the subject of many of his lectures. Roman law condemned prophecies, but Melanchthon did not believe it applied to astrology, although he himself was against the prophecy of murder, thievery, and certain other items. Even Ptolemy had condemned these.

Philip Melanchthon believed in astrology so much that he regulated his life according to it, casting his own horoscopes. Though humanists such as Plutarch, Celtis, and other German and Italian humanists condemned astrology, Melanchthon, influenced by Stöffler during his stay at Tübingen, defended it. Melanchthon might have inherited his love of astrology from his father, who had Philip's horoscope cast by a local court astrologer at his birth. Hartfelder comments that it may have been Melanchthon's Schwabish inclination to brooding which led him to astrology, winning out over humanism.

Melanchthon was superstitious in other ways. Every eclipse of the sun or moon was to him a sign, usually of something tragic. Eclipses were so important to Melanchthon, that he dismissed his classes on those days. He also believed in

---

60 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 192 and 194.

61 Ibid., pp. 196-7.
dreams, which he classified into four types. The first included those which have a natural causation, dealing with things one has seen or heard. The second were prophetic dreams, which were affected by the stars. The third, divine dreams, were those inspired by God on the order of those which Jacob and Daniel experienced. The last were the satanic dreams conjured by the devil. 62

Melanchthon's thoughts concerning history have been discussed earlier. However, during the Renaissance, and also the Reformation Era, geography had been considered a sub-knowledge of history. Just as philosophy was a servant of theology, so geography or cosmography, was a help-meet to history. Melanchthon was also inclined to consider geography tied to astronomy. He felt astronomy to be the source of geography. 63

The utility of geography was self-evident to Melanchthon. It was, of course, necessary for travel. Without it, one would only be familiar with his own local area. From a theological point of view, geography was also important, since it helped one understand the times and places of Biblical

62 Manschreck, op. cit., pp. 104 and 106.

events. He advocated especially map study. 64

Although Melanchthon recognized music as a subject of the Quadrivium, he wrote little concerning it in his thoughts concerning subject matter. He did, however, write some conservative Latin hymns 65 and did allow time for it in his curriculum devised for the Visitation Articles, as we shall later see.

64 Ibid., p. 203.

Chapter IX

HIS PUBLISHED WORKS IN EDUCATION

Textbooks

During his lifetime and afterwards, Philip Melanchthon's fame spread widely through his textbooks, or manuals, most of which were perpetuated through many editions. These manuals were noted for their great clarity of expression. Melanchthon, as stated above, was always concerned with making himself as intelligible as possible. To do this, he strove to achieve concise and clear definitions which he placed in well-organized arrangements.

Though Melanchthon's poetic and narrative style ranked about the same as most other German humanists of his time, his expository writings are notably clear and eloquent. Hartfelder believed that many of Melanchthon's thoughts were poured out, hurriedly thrown onto paper, not formed in the proper or usual way. They were pushed out under the press of necessity and momentary conditions. Some of Melanchthon's opponents found his writings popular and light, not pungent and biting as their own tastes dictated. These criticisms probably fit the great-

1 Raumer, "Philipp Melanchthon", p. 172.
2 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 320-3; 317-8.
er bulk of his writings. Some, however, were written only after much time and thought had been spent on the topic under consideration. Besides, as we shall see, Melanchthon often revised his texts many times to bring it to what he felt was a state of perfection.

In general, Melanchthon organized all his textbooks along the following lines. Each book began with a preface and introductory remarks in which he stated the name of the personality to whom he dedicated the particular book, gave his reasons for writing the book, vouched for the utility of the subject, showed the relation of the subject treated in the textbook to other subjects, and described the method used in the manual. The rest of the book would be divided into chapters, each covering a phase of the topic studied according to the general method he described in his opening remarks.

Melanchthon's earliest textbooks dealt with rhetoric and logic. His text on rhetoric first appeared in 1519. Titled De Rhetorica Libritres, printed at Wittenberg by John Grunenberg, and dedicated to Bernard Maurus, it treated the relation of rhetoric to logic. His textbook was intended to be an elementary guide to the understanding of Cicero and Quintilian, who he claimed had written excellent treatises on rhetoric.

3Ibid., p. 176.
In his 1542 edition of *De Rhetorica*, following the format outlined above, Melanchthon explained the relationship of and differences between rhetoric and logic. He accented utility of the subject for both eloquence and practical use. He stated that he presented the rules so that his listeners could judge the speeches of others, treat relative arguments in letters, and make practical use of it in their church duties. Melanchthon was very much concerned with the proper setting up of propositions. Accompanying his rules were examples drawn from history and literature. Though Melanchthon accented utility rather than pompous speech, Hartfelder believes he was not completely free from what he calls the legitimate humanistic happiness concerning Latin pompous speech. Melanchthon felt, however, that after one grasped the subject matter of rhetoric, one would no longer be dependent on rhetoric texts, but would use the art properly with the help of common sense. Furthermore, he was very conscious of the greater danger of what happens when one takes only excerpts of good speeches and forgets the deeper meanings of the contents of the original sources. Because he felt this approach fostered false education, he stressed in his textbook that a good knowledge of speech depended in turn on a good knowledge of philosophy,
theology, law, and history.

The first division or "book" of his rhetoric dealt with the finding and proper arrangement of subject matter in the preparation of a speech. The second part treated elocution, or style of presentation. Again Melanchthon accented form and exact and clear speech, sprinkling his text generously with examples drawn from theology and law. Melanchthon, following Cicero's ideas, taught that elocution embraced three items—grammar, figures of speech, and amplification or enlargement of the thought. He stressed clarity, warning his readers to get rid of double meaning words, not to use words from the classical age to fit new contexts since new ideas require new words, and not to use unnecessary new words. Melanchthon also warned against the indiscriminate use of allegory, since some people just might pick up the wrong meaning. He advocated the reading of Erasmus as a source for examples of amplification. After learning the rules, Melanchthon advised his readers to imitate the style of classical writers in words, ideas, content, and form. Besides Cicero, Melanchthon recommended Caesar, Terence, Plautus, Sallust, and especially Quintillian as models. Melanchthon concluded his book with a chapter on the

---

art of presentation, using Erasmus and ancient authors as models.  

Melanchthon's book on rhetoric was published under three titles. Besides the first mentioned above, his second, printed in 1521 at Hagenau, was titled Institutiones Rhetoricae, while his third, published in Wittenberg in 1531, was called Elementorum rhetorices libri duo. The last mentioned was published in three separate editions until 1542. The second was published under Melanchthon's authority, but not by Melanchthon. Each of the editions was reprinted many times, often in pirated versions without Melanchthon's knowledge. Melanchthon's manual on rhetoric gained a wide reputation, creating an impact even as far away as England.

Philip Melanchthon's manuals on dialectic, the branch of logic which dealt with the arts of disputation and of discriminating truth from error, met with similar success. His first Compendiaria Dialectices, published by Melchior Lotther at Leipzig in 1520 was an immediate success. First published

---

5 Ibid., pp. 225-8.
6 Ibid., p. 220.
7 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 151.
8 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 211.
on September 1, by October 18th it had sold 18,000 copies, a tremendous number for that age. His second, *Dialectices Phil. Mel. libri quatuor ab auctore ipso de integro in lucem conscripti ac editi*, bound together with his volume on rhetoric, was printed by Secirius at Hagenau in 1528. A third, *Erotemata dialectices, continentia fere integram artem, ita scripta, ut inventuti utiliter proponi possint*, was published at Wittenberg in 1547. Three thousand copies of this edition were sold within the first few days.

In writing and teaching the subject, Melanchthon wished the end of logic to be not merely cognition, but also the ability to teach someone else in a capable manner that which one had already learned. His original objective for writing the text was to assist students in getting a better understanding of Aristotle. In order to judge its worth one has to take this into consideration. He claimed his manual to be a guide to the pure teachings of Aristotle. The contents of his book, he

---


10 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 and 216.


12 Raumer, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
maintained, had been handed down from the classical age. He relied on the works of Rudolph Agricola for guidance in organizing and writing his book. He recommended dialectic for its usefulness for every knowledge, since it added light to whatever knowledge is studied. Theologians especially should study dialectics to give them the tools to teach clearly and to compose simple argumentative questions. Melanchthon's manual on logic was better than any written previously because of these qualities -- accuracy, exactness, and clarity.\(^{13}\)

Melanchthon's text echoed Rudolph Agricola's book on logic. Both stressed its utility and also condemned the old scholastic logic because it had become an end for itself. Both praised Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero, though Melanchthon stressed Aristotle more. Both stressed the intimate connection of rhetoric and dialectic; Melanchthon, however, pointed out the differences too. Both Melanchthon and Agricola seemed to veer away from pure logic. One can defend Melanchthon on this point though, since he was writing a textbook, not a book, on logic. Because Melanchthon was a teacher, not a philosopher, pure logic -- which he identified with scho-

\(^{13}\) Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 216-7.
lasticism - was not useful to him. 14

Rudolph Agricola had been responsible for a major shift in emphasis in logic, replacing the suppositional logic of Peter of Spain's *Summulae logicales*, with place logic, which was more in line with Stoic and Ciceronian rather than Aristotelian tradition (as discussed above in section on Melanchthon's ideas on the Trivium). Ong likens medieval logic to modern formal, or mathematical logic, also called logistics. He claims that the scholastic logic (which Melanchthon abhored) was in reality a residual, quasi-scholastic, post-humanistic logic, unlike the scholastic logic of the central medieval tradition. Peter of Spain's *Summulae logicales*, which had continued the ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas, served as a medieval and early Renaissance introduction to Aristotle. It was Peter who equated dialectic and rhetoric. 16

Melanchthon's textbook on dialectic followed the same general scheme as his other text books. Following the dedication, he stated his reason for writing the manual. Since rhetoric and dialectic were so intimately connected, and since he


16 Ibid., pp. 42, 61, and 93.
had written a rhetoric book the previous year, some of his students asked him to produce a text. Those already on the market, Melanchthon observed, were so detailed that the meaning and use of dialectic was in general lost. He continued by showing the differences between it, which strives for correctness and exactness, and rhetoric, whose end was oratory. Next he stressed dialectics' utility. Melanchthon believed dialectics to be an aid to learning and teaching.\footnote{Hartfelder, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 212; cf. Paulsen, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 265-6; CR XIII: 507-751.}

The manual was divided into three chapters - Finitio, Divisio, and Argumentatio. The first two concerned simple words while the last dealt with orations. The first, Finitio, dealt with definition. According to Melanchthon, the student must use the ten question approach described under method, based on Aristotle's method as described in his \textit{Posterior Analytics} (see Melanchthon's ideas on "method"). To illustrate the four "praedicamenta" - substance, quantity, quality, and relation - Melanchthon used diagrams.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 21-3.}

The second chapter, Divisio, examined both the arrangement of the classes into divisions and the analysis of the
subject matter. Again Melanchthon stressed that one should in regard to name or object seek the cause, parts, and proper action of it. In this second chapter Melanchthon forwarded the idea that dialectics is a set of rules and guiding principles for oratory. In the mode of Cicero, Melanchthon designated the sentence as "pronuntiatum", while others labeled it either axiom, enunciation, or proposition. Melanchthon advanced the idea that the source of the sentence is nature itself. Next he treated the various forms of sentences -- antithesis, or contrasts, antitheticals, sub-antitheticals, and contradictory antitheses. Again he used diagrams to clarify his thoughts. 19

The third book, or chapter, dealt with arguments. In this section, which Melanchthon felt was most important, he covered the sequence of syllogistic forms as used in the universities at his time. He compared Ciceronian argumentation with that of Aristotle and Quintilian. He advised students to observe the form of arguments at the lectures covering poets and authors in order to sharpen their judgement. In a fourth and final book he listed the places where the students could locate the material. For each question, Melanchthon insisted,

19 Ibid., p. 214.
the procurement of the material is the most difficult. These "loci" or places are suitable to be used in both dialectic and rhetoric. He ended the text with a section on hypothetical propositions to be considered.  

The manual, as stated earlier, was well received. In 1522 Jacob Wimpfeling designated the book the official textbook in his regulations for the reorganization of the University of Heidelberg. Melanchthon's 1528 edition contained examples which he felt better than the original edition plus newer, better insights in the uses of dialectic. His third edition, published in 1547, was revised the following year. Melanchthon's thin volume of 1520 had grown into a hefty volume with the same organization and enriched content but with the ideas of rhetoric interwoven. After first accenting the difference between rhetoric and logic in his 1520 edition, Melanchthon had almost come full circle, stressing the interrelationships in his 1548 revision.

Like other humanists Melanchthon was very much interested in moral law. In the early days of the Reformation Me-

20 Ibid., pp. 214-5.

21 Ibid., pp. 215-6.
lanchthon was too busy to write any humanistic treatises on ethics. But as things became more organized and quiet, he returned to the study of Aristotle and the idea of freedom of the will first treated in his early version of his *Loci communes*. These new writings were the bases of Melanchthon's humanistic moral teachings, which were not entirely theological.

Among Melanchthon's manuals on ethics are:

1) *Philosophiae moralis epitome* (Strassburg, 1538)

2) *Ethicae doctrinae elementa* (Wittenberg, 1550)

3) *Questiones aliquot Ethicae de iuramentis, excommunicatione et aliis Casibus obscuris* (Wittenberg, 1552)

4) *Ethica Aristotelis commentarius* (Wittenberg, 1529)

5) *Prolegumena to Ciceros De Officiis* (No date)

Number three is partly and number four is wholly a commentary on Aristotle.

As with all his manuscripts, Melanchthon re-edited them over the years. The 1546 edition is organized as follows. Melanchthon began with a discussion of the relationship between moral philosophy and the gospel, the latter containing God's promise of the Holy Spirit and eternal life because of Christ and God's forgiveness of sins through His grace. Ethics,

---

Melanchthon maintained, were a part of God's rules consisting of exact and dependable norms. Christians, Melanchthon argued, must be allowed to learn these ethical teachings. As to utility, Melanchthon affirmed that it served both education and culture as God required. It supported completely all law and was therefore necessary for jurisprudence. Its greatest need, however, was in the field of theology, where it would assist in judging things concerning citizenship, political rules, governmental authority and administration, and the every day life of a citizen. Theology, Melanchthon asserted, gave the bare regulations in these areas while Ethics added the foundations of the rules. 23

Next Melanchthon discussed the purpose of mankind. Again rejecting the Epicurean and Stoic points of view, he viewed mankind's main purpose as the recognition of God, obedience to him, the duty to spread his honor and praise him, and to impart God's will to the rest of humanity. After discussing the divisions of virtue, he listed as a principle division the rules of nature which determine the actions against God and man. Melanchthon could find no better set of rules than the Decalog, the first table of which deals with

23 Ibid., pp. 232-3; cf. Paulsen, op. cit., p. 266.
our relationship with God. For these one should examine the Bible. Philosophy, however, deals with the virtues of the second table beginning with the fourth commandment. Melanchthon sided with Aristotle who felt that some of the statements, such as "Don't hurt anyone who has hurt no one else", are so basic that to change them would lead to a disruption of nature. These statements are unalterable. Also discussed are such questions as "should man judge according to written law or according to reason?", and "could ignorance of the rule be excused?". Melanchthon used proofs from the Bible and from history in discussing questions of ethics. \(^{24}\) Melanchthon's books on ethics grew out of his lectures. His *Ethica Aristotelis commentarius*, for instance, not only explained the original wording of Aristotle's *Ethics*, but discussed certain questions for which there was a special interest during Melanchthon's time. His *Ethicae doctrinae Elementa* of 1550 was a complete re-writing of his original book. This book reflected Melanchthon's giving up more and more the purely humanistic bases for his moral teachings in favor of the teachings of the church. Singularly each of the named books was not a definitive book on ethics. But by ad-

ding the mentioned books to his other religious works such as the *Loci*, the *Augsburg Confession*, the *Apology*, the *Visitation Articles*, the *Confession Saxonica*, the *Examen Ordinandorum*, and the *Catechesis puerilis*, Hartfelder believes one can arrive at a system of ethics with little difficulty. Luther recognized that ethics controlled Melanchthon's outlook on Christianity. Though Melanchthon remained true to his principle of making one of humanism and evangelism, the latter won out over the former, leading him into increased theological activity, which as time went on developed from a question of knowledge into a question of the heart. Although Melanchthon never took the final step to theological ethics, Hartfelder claims he was the head of a school of ethics which drove its offshoots into the Reformed church.²⁵

In the field of Renaissance Physic, or Natural Science, Melanchthon wrote textbooks, one of which was the *Commentarius de anima*, published first in 1540 and again in 1553 (found in CR XIII, 1-178). He never actually completed the book, covering only what he called "Psychology", but which was really anthropology, because it dealt with the body of people. In it he covered the distinctions between the three

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 234-7.
persons of the Trinity, the differences between individual people, the union of the eternal soul and the mortal body, the definition of the soul, the anatomy of the body and the functions of its parts, the nutrition of the body, the relation of dreams to humans, and a study of emotional disturbances. Melanchthon used as proofs for his statements both the Bible and classical writers such as Galen, Aristotle, Pliny, and Hippocrates. He also cited universal experiences of humans and the findings of medical colleagues of his, such as Jacob Milich, who lectured on Physics and Psychology at Wittenberg, and Leonard Fox. He advocated the book to professors for use in their lectures. He asked them for honest criticism, reporting any mistakes they may have found. 26

In 1549 Melanchthon's book, Physik, was published by Johannes Luft in Wittenberg. Two more editions during his lifetime and one after his death were also published. This book too grew out of his lectures. Paul Eber assisted him in gathering the material for it. After beginning with an historical definition of physics, he recommended the subject for its capability of leading one to a knowledge of God and as a tool for life. In this text Melanchthon began with God,
rather than Aristotle, as a basis, reflecting a more Christian-theological world outlook. After advancing proofs for the existence of God, he continued with a description of the universe and the earth from the Ptolemaic point of view. Next Melanchthon discussed the nature of dreams, astrology, and the temporarity of the world. In a following section Melanchthon discussed the elements of the earth, based naturally on his medieval-humanist understanding of the basic four and their compounds. The non-theological sections of the book were borrowed heavily from Aristotle.

Again, Melanchthon was a scholar who attempted to systematize Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Aristotelian thought and who sought to utilize Aristotle to supplement and support theological teachings through an orderly presentation of world matter usually neglected in Christian circles. As stated earlier, this method became known throughout the world of his time as the "Phillipic Method". By the mid-sixteenth century most academic centers of Germany taught this Melanchthon-modified Aristotelianism. He himself did not see any need for a new Greek version of Arito-
tote's works. Most of the teachers of Melanchthon's time and later were satisfied with Melanchthon's commentaries on Aristotle. Ironically, the man who fought the medieval Scholasticists who used glosses and compendia of Aristotle's works, saw his young students satisfied to reach Aristotle's thoughts through another newer, but yet secondary, source -- Melanchthon's own commentaries.29 Even his style was imitated, developing eventually into what became known as the "Philiopic" style.30

Melanchthon wrote two grammars, one for the Greek language and the other for Latin. His Greek grammar was written solely for his students. Taking the advice of a bookseller who persuaded him to revise it for publication, Melanchthon critically revised and altered the book, publishing it in 1519. The book was used in Germany for over one hundred years.31 By 1544 it had already run through nineteen editions. Melanchthon's book for centuries had been thought of as the original


31 Manschreck, op. cit., pp. 149-50.
Greek grammar of the time, but scholarship has turned up at least five others that have predated it. Melanchthon's was noted, however, for its clarity and methodical form. Because it made rules practical and short, and because it was in general simple and well organized, the book found immediate acceptance. However its lack of a section on syntax did not enhance its value.\(^\text{32}\)

After listing and classifying first the vowels and then the consonants, he treated etymology, syllabication, tone and accent, and the outer word forms which the accent rules covered. Next he covered the eight parts of a sentence, which he based on the Byzantine Grammar of Manuel Moschopulis. Next he surveyed contractions, the cardinal numbers, and a detailed section of the use of the verb. Sections on pronouns, adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions followed. Examples from ancient Greek writers such as Homer with parallel Latin translations are included. Melanchthon exhorted readers to build their Greek vocabulary of nouns and verbs through reading such authors as Theocritus, Ilias, and Plutarch. They were to observe their writing and use some of the words and phrases in their own presentations. Errors common to other

grammars of the time are found in Melanchthon's. It could be used only by students who already had a knowledge of Latin. Although the tone of the book could give one the impression that it could be used for self-study, it did not replace the teacher. Melanchthon did write a syntax meant to accompany his book for forms and models. He sent a manuscript to Count Nuenar, but it was never printed.

Melanchthon also wrote a Chrestomathie for boys who were first beginning to study Greek. This book, as well as a Latin Chrestomathie which he wrote, were intended for use in his private Latin school which he ran during his first ten years at Wittenberg. Published in 1525, the little book contains a listing of the Greek alphabet, short verses in hexameter, whose thoughts the boys were to translate into Latin, and selections from the Greek New Testament and from Greek classical writers. Melanchthon advised teachers to have the boys both read and write Greek, since the two are tied together. The book was not too popular, with only one extra edition appearing in 1536 published. Hartfelder believes that students, rather than using the Chrestomathie, went directly to the


original sources. 35

Latin grammars, of course, were in great demand because of its use in both government and school. Donatus's text and Alexander of Ville-Dieu's Doctrinale were much in use. Humanists such as Melanchthon who divorced grammar from rhetoric and dialectic needed a text book that treated grammar as a separate subject. Some teachers, dissatisfied with older texts, composed their own. Philipp Melanchthon did too. 36

Originally written for Erasmus Ebner of Nürnberg, a member of Melanchthon's Schola Privata, Melanchthon's Latin grammar was published in 1525 by Luther without Melanchthon's knowledge. Melanchthon, not satisfied with the product, allowed a former student of his, Jacob Micyllus, head of the Latin school in Frankfort-on-the-Main and later professor of Greek at Heidelberg, to revise it by adding pertinent material. It was published in 1550. Lucam Lossius rewrote Melanchthon's original text in question and answer form with his approval. It appeared in 1544. 37 The basic text was also revised by


Joachim Camerarius who lengthened the manual to 507 pages. Melanchthon did not want to discourage his students with an over-abundance of grammar, but he did want to be thorough. Melanchthon had given Camerarius permission in advance to revise the text, choosing the bookseller Panst of Leipzig as publisher. Schenk, a Latin teacher in Leipzig admired what he called the "now perfected book." Michael Neander shortened Melanchthon's text to 130 pages. His version proved more practical and popular. It was used even in the Catholic schools till 1734.38 Between 1525 and 1727 fifty-one editions, more or less changed from the original, appeared. The Mark Grammar of 1728, which superseded it, was similar in arrangement and treatment of parts, phraeseology, definition, and rules of syntax to Melanchthon's.39

In writing his Latin grammar Melanchthon observed the following guidelines: One, there should not be too many rules, since they would discourage the learner, and, two, it should follow a proper method of learning. Melanchthon's stress on the importance of grammar, stated in his book, has been discussed in the section on the Trivium. His text book

38 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 150.
followed the same general scheme of his Greek grammar. He divided the manual into four sections: orthography, prosody, etymology, and syntax. In his first section Melanchthon began with a short vocabulary, followed by a review of the vowels and consonants. In the etymology section Melanchthon reviewed the eight parts of the sentence. After defining the term "noun", he lists its various cases, including genus, number, and declination. He advised his readers to observe proper usage and authority when using grammar in one's speech or writing. He attempted to show Greek etymological derivations whenever possible. In the section on conjugation of verbs Melanchthon followed the ideas of Donatus.\textsuperscript{40}

The section on syntax was printed separately in 1526, again without Melanchthon's knowledge. It too was written for Erasmus Ebner. After defining syntax it treats the subject in relation to nouns, verbs, both transitive and intransitive. He again instructed his readers to study writers for examples, making a compilation of the better phrases. In another section he lists the differences between cardinal, ordinal, and distributive numbers, briefly discussing and explaining them with proofs. Short chapters on participles, adverbs, conjunc-

\textsuperscript{40} Hartfelder, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 260-5; cf. CR XX:193-336.
tions, prepositions, and interjections treat these subjects in their most concise forms, and also serve as a review of the etymology of the original Latin grammar. Finally, in a section titled "De Periodis", listed in many editions as a supplement, Melanchthon exhorted teachers to faithfully perfect their students' grammar. He stressed the students' need for a knowledge of proper Latin word order and for skill in construing. He further accentuated the necessity of learning the particular characteristics of sentences and phrases. This book, like the grammar, is noted for its simplicity of rules, its explanation of those rules, and its appeal to the reader's sense of utility.  

Melanchthon also published a small Prosody. Because it was meant to be tied in with etymology and syntax, the book began with a list of seven universal rules concerning the quantity of syllables in general, and continues by listing special rules concerning end syllables. Next Melanchthon revealed a scheme for metrical feet in poetry, listing the most frequent verse and strophe forms, including the hexameter, widely used at that time. He concluded with a section devoted to scansion. In his concluding remarks Melanchthon revealed

41 Ibid., pp. 266-9; cf. CR XX: 337-374.
the main purpose of this book - an aid to the perfection of Latin verse. Again he advocated practice, learning through lectures the techniques of the best poets and using them as models to be imitated. 42

Hartfelder believes the books should be judged by their original intent - they were to be outlines, or manuals, for the direction of the students, adapted to youthful understanding. They were not to be scholarly portrayals of the subject. Melanchthon himself stated that he did not attempt to further knowledge of Latin by discussing its questionable problems. Furthermore, as stated earlier, Melanchthon's was one of the many produced. Earlier texts by Wimpfeling and Bebel replaced the above mentioned Doctrinale of the Middle Ages. The grammar that influenced Melanchthon most was Brasicanus's, which had run through four editions between 1506 and 1516. Melanchthon's, as well as other German humanists', chief complaint against the Medieval Doctrinale was that it failed to help students obtain a speaking use of Latin language in its pure form. Wimpfeling attempted to do this with his text. Killian Goldstein, a contemporary of Melanchthon, praised Melanchthon's manual for its conciseness and comprehension.

Ibid., p. 269; cf. CA XX: 375-8.
Hartfelder labels it a good textbook which harmoniously united brevity with understanding. He notes especially the references to Greek etymology and to the various references to Donatus and Priscian in regard to usage. Again, Melanchthon was not original in this last point, but he did use references more extensively than his predecessors. 43

Melanchthon's grammar, like the other humanist grammars, was written with the idea in mind that Latin was the first language. It contained no translations or explanations in German. Raumer believes that one can understand Melanchthon's view of grammar by surveying the transition in point-of-view from Melanchthon's grammar to those of the nineteenth century. Melanchthon states: "Grammar (Latin grammar) is an exact method of speaking and writing." The Mark Grammar of 1728 which was the first to succeed Melanchthon's states: "Grammar is the art of speaking and writing correctly". Otto Schulz's Complete Latin Grammar, modeled after the Mark Grammar, which in turn had been modeled after Melanchthon's, carries this statement: "Latin grammar is a guide to the knowledge of the Latin tongue; it shows how the universal laws of a language should be applied in the special instance of Latin."

43 Ibid., pp. 270-2.
Finally, Kühner in the nineteenth century states: "Grammar is the guide to a correct understanding of a language, through its words and forms of speech." The trend therefore, from 1728 on is from a practical treatment of the ancient languages, according to the art of speaking and writing, to the theoretical, whose aim is by means of science to obtain a perfect understanding of the same.

Because Melanchthon advised the teachers not to keep students too long on the rudiments of grammar, but to begin the exercises as soon as possible, he wrote an accompanying manual, a Latin Chrestomathie, which he published at Wittenberg in 1524, and which contained a collection of models and examples. The book, titled Enchiridion elementorum puerilum, began with a list of the Latin vowels and diphthongs. Next are printed in Latin the Lord's Prayer, the greeting of Mary (Luke I: 28, 42), the Apostolic Confession of Faith, Psalm 66:2-8, the Ten Commandments, a prayer from the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 6-7), Psalm 127 and a paraphrase of it, a poem written in hexameter - "De vita Humana", sayings of the seven wise men of Greece in Erasmus's Latin translation, and more poems. The book concludes with selections from Ovid's Ars amatoria and

44 Raumer, op. cit., p. 175.
Plautus's *Mostellaria* and a table prayer written in Latin distichs. Melanchthon probably intended the book also for his *Schola Privata*. It reflects again his humanistic background by presenting a mixture of Biblical and classical writings. The manual went through only five editions, again reflecting a lack of popularity.

Melanchthon's Latin grammars contain errors that we today deem unexcusable. One must remember, however, that because of lack of over-all knowledge of the subject area, due only to the fact that certain things had not yet through scholarship been discovered, Melanchthon and other humanists did make honest mistakes. Many of these were due to an inexact knowledge of etymology. Most humanists, because they considered Hebrew the oldest language, attempted to trace the meaning of words of languages which later were proved to have no relation to Hebrew back to that language. Melanchthon, for example, tried to trace the word "German" back to the Hebrew "Gerim anim" which meant "those exiled to misery," an expression Melanchthon felt fit the German people who he believed had been exiled people saved long ago by missionaries the Lord had sent. Humanists made the mistake of relying on

---

syllables that sounded like those of the ancient languages, failing, of course, to take into account any radical change of sound over the years. However, in many cases Melanchthon and other humanists were either absolutely correct or at least on the right path. 46

**Editions of Classical Texts**

Another invaluable service Melanchthon performed was his editing of classical texts. He tried to get the oldest sources available for his editions. Among the authors Melanchthon published are Terence, Cicero, Tacitus, Sallust, Quintilian, Vergil, Ovid, Demosthenes, and Pindar. By modern standards Melanchthon's labors in preparing these texts for publications were primitive. He did not, for instance, exhaust every possible resource to find the oldest version, nor did he seriously attempt to designate variations or gaps in the various texts. But Melanchthon was no better or worse than any of his contemporaries, who worked in this early era of German philology. 47

Melanchthon also translated some works of classical Greek authors into Latin. In most cases these translations

---


grew out of a need fostered by his lectures, and only some were published during his life. Some were translations, others were Latin interpretations of the Greek texts. In many cases these were published as parallel translations to the Greek in Melanchthon's editions. Because many were never meant to be printed, they were not discovered until after his death. He usually did not care to translate, preferring that his students would read the text in the original language. At all times his translations were meant only to add clarity to hard-to-grasp concepts and to possibly lead the reader to the original text. He was constantly afraid that the translations would cause misunderstandings of the original, as the medieval translations of Aristotle had done. Among the writings he translated were the works by Xylander, Euripides, Theocrites, and Demosthenes. How good were the translations? Kaspar Peucer, his son-in-law, admired some but said little about the others. Melanchthon's students - Camerarius, Micyllus, and others followed Melanchthon's lead and turned out translations themselves, many of which remained in use until the late nineteenth century.48

Melanchthon wrote summaries to accompany his classical publications. A typical humanist, he constantly rewrote these summaries to better them for subsequent editions, for which he also wrote comments on the author's or poet's beauty of style, perfection of language, and utility of the writing for language and moral learning. Melanchthon's annotations explained points of grammar, figures of speech, and the organization of the writing. He often referred to other writers, both classical and Biblical. But, like his contemporaries, he did not cite exact locations of his references by book and page. Because of the heavy emphasis on logic in his day, Melanchthon interlaced his commentaries with various logical deductions. He also, whenever possible, included a theological point of view. Like other Christian humanists, he used certain heathen classical writers to explain Christian dogma. He was also careful in his selection of authors and their writings, picking only those who would be in harmony with Christian teachings. He sacrificed grammar and aesthetics for dogma and ethics. Though he believed in the expanded - or longer - lecture, he kept his expositions purposefully short. Brevity again was his watchword, his main purpose being not an interesting collection of details, but clarity and relation-
ships of the author's thoughts. In his time Melanchthon's contributions to classical studies served well. Compared to research and research techniques used now, however, his were simple and naive. Konrad Bursar, in his History of Classical Philology in Germany, states that Melanchthon's authorship and teaching activities alone would be enough to give him a secure place of honor in the history of the cultural development of Germany—a knowledge of classical activity was not for Melanchthon an end in itself. For him classical studies had the purpose of providing a beneficial tool for developing properly the youth of his country, for obtaining the knowledge of a pure Evangelical teaching from the Bible, and for studying grammar and style. As far as actually providing critical reviews of the classics, Bursar feels Melanchthon's contemporaries—Erasmus, Rhenanus, Grynacus, and others—far surpass him.

Textbooks of Others

Melanchthon also published books and textbooks of other writers in the Quadrivium subjects. To accompany his edition of Tacitus, Melanchthon wrote a commentary which des-

49 [Ibid., pp. 289-92.]

50 as quoted in Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 292-3.
cribed the geography and living conditions of early Germany. In mathematics he published the first text book in that subject - Liber Ioannis de Sacro Busto de Sphaera (1531). He also published Georg Peuerbach’s Elementa arithmeticae. He wrote prefaces to many other mathematical works. In the field of geometry he re-newed and translated old classical works. Astronomy, as already noted, was part of his work on physics, and his translation of Ptolemy has also been mentioned. Melanchthon did not further the cause of mathematics or astronomy with any new facts or methods. He did, however, see the utility in these areas and constantly advocated their study. He recommended chairs in these fields at Wittenberg (and at the other universities whose curriculums he revised). 51

Declamations, Letters, and Tracts

Besides writing and publishing manuals on various subjects, Melanchthon developed his thoughts in these areas through declamations. Besides those on rhetoric, logic, ethics, and grammar, Melanchthon wrote declamations which either he or someone else delivered in the fields of history, geography, mathematics, and astronomy. In these he usually discussed the his-

tory or utility of the subject. Those on history have already been described in another section. In the area of geography he wrote declarations describing the physical and political features of such countries as Schwabia, France, and Palestine. 52

Melanchthon also wrote several short, concise study plans. Among these is his Ratio discendae theologiae of 1530 which outlined a study plan for a thorough knowledge of religion. He also worked out a study plan for a prince, Duke John Frederick of Pomerania, and a general course of study which could be used for the education of a lawyer, prince, or theologian. 53

Like other humanists, Melanchthon constantly wrote letters to friends, associates, and in general, anyone who sought his advice. Many of these dealt with education in general. Some dealt with questions concerning the reorganization of a school's curriculum. Others sought judgement or advice on a specific educational problem. According to Camerarius, Melanchthon weighed his words of answer very carefully

52 Ibid.
53 Ibid., pp. 472-5, 468-70; cf. CR II: 455-61 (theology); CR VIII: 382 (Prince).
as if using a gold scale.\footnote{54}

The Visitation Papers

Finally, Philip Melanchthon wrote the famous Visitation Papers, which served as a basis for the reorganization of the schools in Saxony. These papers will be discussed in the section treating Melanchthon's work with the German schools.

In all of Philip Melanchthon's ideas on education one can see the stamp of humanism - his belief in the classics, his advocacy of Latin as the language of scholarly, religious, and state functions, his stress on clarity and eloquence. One can also see the influence of the Reformation in general and Martin Luther specifically in his accent on the service of education to the new Evangelical church and on moral learning. Though his books on logic, rhetoric, and grammar reflect his Aristotelianism, many of the examples he used in these texts plus his utilization of the subjects in the service of the church again betray his Christian bent. While his ideas on mathematics, astronomy, history, and geometry seem rather naive and limited to twentieth century man, they were very practical to Melanchthon's contemporaries. His refusal to accept the Copernican theory, felt by modern man to be a

\footnote{54} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 317.
weakness on Melanchthon's part, could be interpreted as a point in his favor - his refusal to accept a theory not conclusively proven. True, his reliance on ancient authority could also be called a weakness on his part. But he did inquire and he did -- in a small way, to be sure -- research, as shown by his investigations preparatory to his publication of his book on physics. He, like other humanists, had not as yet divested astronomy from astrology. In grammar he stressed Greek and Latin at the complete expense of German, relegating that language to the elementary, or Folk, schools. Melanchthon was surely not an innovator. He was rather a perfector of that which had been tried and found good. He was not a slave to the old, however, rejecting that which had no value or utility. Eloquence, clarity, and utility to education, the church, the state, and mankind were his watchwords. As a teacher and as a writer and publisher of manuals, books, and other educational materials, he influenced many during his life-time, and as we will see, long afterwards.

Philip Melanchthon was a Christian Humanist. His ideas - influenced by Aristotle, Erasmus, and Rudolph Agricola - were thoroughly humanist. Martin Luther, however, by recognizing Melanchthon's talent and by persuading him to use
his knowledge in the service of the new church, added the second dimension, Christianity, to Melanchthon's philosophy. In the process Melanchthon joined that peculiar group of sixteenth century educators who seemingly did the impossible—reconciling the pagan thought of Aristotle with the religious concepts of Christ. But Melanchthon did not divest himself of everything Scholastic, as we have seen and as we will see in the next section. Those items which were good, those authors which were excellent, and those methods which worked he kept. Whatever was good and useful he retained. Whatever was unsatisfactory was, after thorough examination, discarded. Melanchthon was convinced that the Reformation was necessary. He saw also, possibly more than Luther, the role that education must play in the battle of ideologies. Next we will examine how Melanchthon's philosophies of religion and education helped implement his work with the German schools.
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Chapter X

MELANCTHON THE TEACHER

Always the methodical, quiet, concerned educator, Melanchthon worked indefatigably for the causes of humanism and Christianity. We will see his concern as a teacher for eloquence and utility. We will note also his interest in the personal lives of his charges. In all his endeavors for both church and school Melanchthon placed the problems of others before his own. He strove always to do what he believed right.

In his work with the secondary schools and the universities he labored tirelessly to evolve the best possible curricula and to staff the schools with the best teachers. Though his work was thorough, yet his suggestions were not so restricted as to allow no leeway in their implementation. Let us now examine Melanchthon's work with the German schools.

When George Sabinus, Melanchthon's son-in-law, visited Italy with a letter of introduction to the celebrated Cardinal Bembo, the Cardinal invited him to dinner. At the dinner the Cardinal, according to Francis Cox, advanced three questions to Sabinus concerning his father-in-law: What was Melanchthon's salary? What were the number of his hearers? What was his opinion respecting the resurrection and a future state?
In answer to the first question, Sabinus said, "300 florins." Cardinal Bembo commented, "Ungrateful Germans! To estimate at no higher price so many and such labors of so great a man!" To the second question Sabinus replied, "Usually 1500 hearers." Bembo gasped, "I cannot believe it, because I do not know a university in Europe excepting that of Paris in which one professor has so many scholars." In regard to the third question, Sabinus replied, "Melanchthon's works are a sufficient proof of his belief in both these articles." The Cardinal declared, "I should think him a wiser man if he did not believe them." ¹

Passing over the last enigmatical remark, we can see that the first two comments of Bembo's reflect the respect shown Melanchthon and the esteem in which he was held during his lifetime. While some of Melanchthon's fame in education did rest on the textbooks and Latin essays he wrote and the schools he organized, much of it resulted from direct contact with both his own students and other educators.

**His Lecture Style**

Melanchthon worked hard to make his lectures both clear and interesting. He sprinkled them with anecdotes, short sto-

¹ Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 557.
ries, current expressions which the students would understand and enjoy, and questions, in the style of the Socratic method.²

He also enlivened his lectures with poems in various meters.³ Because he felt Wittenberg to be an international university and learning to be international, he lectured in Latin, the language of the learned. But he was also good in German. His Latin lectures bristled with outstanding expressions in German. He thought of his mother tongue as a comfortable house dress. He was as sentimental over German as Luther.⁴

Because of the many doctrinal battles in which he was involved, Melanchthon had little time or strength to improve his style. He turned more and more to extemporaneous speech in his lectures and speeches. Yet many of his contemporaries, including David Chyträus, Laurentius Ludovicus Leobergensis, and Victorin Strigel praised Melanchthon's speeches and lectures for their eloquence, power, grace, and charm. Others condemned him. Gruter blamed Melanchthon for his own poor

² Manschreck, op. cit., p. 152.
³ Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 81.
⁴ Sell, op. cit., p. 25.
Latin since Melanchthon himself spoke poor Latin. Cochläus stated that Luther ruined Melanchthon's style. Camerarius reported that Melanchthon's language was flat rather than exalted in style, containing no empty words or high phrases. Melanchthon adhered to his subject, scarcely ever going off on any tangents. Camerarius felt Melanchthon controlled his speech as one dams up a pond. His style is clear in explaining, flowery and rich in narrating, sharp in reasoning, and not soft and powerless. Neither was it bombastic and formless, just simple and correct. Melanchthon himself blamed his teachers who used Pliny and Politan as examples to be imitated for his own dry, powerless, though concise speech.5

Because the students who attended the university at that time were younger than now, Melanchthon tried to show the relevance or utility of the material he covered in each lecture. For example when discussing "virtue" in his lecture on Aristotle's Ethics, he tried to show its utility to everyday life. Theology students were to listen to his lectures with the goal in mind of understanding and being able to lead in the ques-

tions concerning church problems. 6

Ong believes that a general characteristic of universities during this period was that the intellectual heritage was constantly simplified through a systematic presentation and re-presentation to the youthful mind. In other words, the courses were constantly watered down to fit the youthful scholars. 7 Because his hearers were so young and lacking in intellectual experience, Melanchthon had to spend most of his time on vocabulary, morphology, and syntax. 8

Because of the scarcity of textbooks, Melanchthon would sometimes have to schedule his lectures in relation to their availability. Sometimes he would defer announcing his lecture schedule until the bundle of newly printed books arrived from either Frankfort or Leipzig. 9 Because Greek texts were especially scarce, Melanchthon's students had to either transcribe Melanchthon's dictation of the text word-for-word, or copy them at home from a borrowed manuscript. Melanchthon,

6 Ibid., p. 82.

7 Ong, op. cit., pp. 136-42.


however, believed as Reuchlin did -- that transcribing helped students memorize the work.

**His Personal Interest in Students**

Melanchthon took a personal interest in his students. He displayed fondness for his students individually, writing letters of recommendation to the deserving who asked, helping others revise their essays, listening to their humorous incidents or their complaints. Melchior Adams called him a teacher at heart, a friend of children by nature. Melanchthon, always available for personal conferences, was deeply concerned about anything that affected their welfare. Wolfgang Shirer, another student, was amazed that Melanchthon, whom he considered such an important man, would allow him, a "dung-beetle" to see him as often as was agreeable. Johannes Meier called it his greatest luck to be allowed to be a listener and scholar of Melanchthon's. Kilian Goldstein stressed Melanchthon's ability to pass on to his students the power of comprehension.

---


Heerbrand declared that the number of his thankful scholars was in the thousands, and that all the cathedrals and schools in Germany would echo and re-echo from his writings.  14

Many others, students and fellow educators, praised him in letters in both prose and verse. The Jurist Scheurl, who taught Roman Law at Wittenberg, in a letter to Melanchthon in 1519 said this of him: "As one earns his love, so you too love him." He stated further that all loyal students till the end wished him well and success. Luther himself praised Melanchthon's clarity of expression in his courses. Referring to the fact that Melanchthon never sought the doctorate, Luther attested: "He was a simple magister, but a doctor above all doctors." He further advised that all should observe Melanchthon. Whoever despises him, Luther believed, must himself be a man despised of God.  15

Melanchthon was a very popular professor. Often hundreds of students attended his classes. In 1520 Spalatin reported five to six hundred listeners. Luther reported four hundred listeners per class. Heerbrand's report of two thou-

14 Ibid., p. 101.

15 Ibid., pp. 100-01.
sand is dismissed as a total amount by Hartfelder. Since Melanchthon held four or five lectures, each on a different day of the week and each lasting two hours, four to five hundred per class in good times could be correct. 16

Occasionally a subject would be unpopular to Melanchthon's students and class attendance would drop. After finishing his lectures on the First Book of Ptolemy, he introduced his next series on the Second Book by stating that he was pained to see that some of his hearers had taken a dislike to such an excellent author. He contrasted the life of a student to a soldier weary of warfare. He chided them, declaring it unbecoming of a soldier to grow weary and faint-hearted when things do not go according to his wishes. He exhorted all who had begun the lecture series with him to return. To those who had not deserted him, he offered his tribute of thanks. 17

He had a similar experience while lecturing on Homer in 1531, causing him to comment, "Homer was a beggar in his lifetime, the fate follows him now that he is dead." Melanchthon in 1533 made a similar statement because of poor attend-

16 Ibid., p. 98.

17 Raumer, op. cit., p. 284.
ance at his Demosthenes lectures:

...I perceive that this generation has no ear for such authors. For there remain to me but few hearers, and these have not forsaken me lest I should be wholly discouraged; for this courtesy, I thank them. But I shall, nevertheless, continue to discharge the duties of my office. I shall commence these lectures tomorrow. 18

Melanchthon felt that graduation from one level to the next was important. He stressed the importance of the Baccalaureate Examination, which many of the students considered child's play. He considered the Magister examinations more important, inviting all the students to what he considered the solemn promotion. He reminded especially the younger students of the necessity of diligent language study required for the attainment of that goal. He also held in high esteem the disputationsthat accompanied both Baccalaureate and Magister examinations. He encouraged the students to earn the prizes which the Elector had set up for the disputations. Of course, Melanchthon invited all to seek the degree considered highest at the sixteenth century universities - the Doctorate in Theology. 19

Philip Melanchthon served as Rector of the university twice, in 1524 and again in 1538. As was the custom at that

18 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 152.
time, he held the position each time for one school year.20

In 1524 he was Wittenberg's first married rector, a major event of his time, as letters of his contemporaries attest. He probably could not have been rector more often, Hartfelder states, because of his numerous absences from the university on Church business. It was a compliment to Melanchthon that his son-in-law, Peucer, was elected rector a few days after Melanchthon's death.21

Melanchthon's position as rector brought him into intimate contact with the students' personal life. He had to perform such acts as declaring the Elbe River off limits for swimming and bathing because of the danger of drowning; enforcing a dress code which students tried to violate in insignificant ways; and warning the students concerning their own chastity and purity, especially in dancing. Melanchthon was in favor of dancing, however, because he believed students should learn how to behave in the presence of the opposite sex. He believed the students should realize that school is a workshop of virtue.22

20 Ibid., p. 98.
21 Ibid., pp. 98-9.
22 Ibid., pp. 93-4.
As both rector and professor, Melanchthon was involved in students' affairs. He hated the Karnival season, which preceded Lent, likening it to a Bacchanalian orgy conducted by the devil. Melanchthon also tried to weed out those people who would live in the university town among the students with no intent or purpose to study or engage in scholarly affairs. Hartfelder also reports an incident which almost seems too dramatic, filled with "Hollywood" cliches! In an incident in 1545 three students had killed a peasant during an argument in a neighboring town. The local sheriff kept the three caught boys in jail. Wittenberger students, some masked, marched toward the jail armed with stones. About two hundred citizens stood before the jail ready to stop the youths from freeing the captives. Dramatically the rector and some teachers from the university appeared armed with swords and lances. At the front was Melanchthon. Because no one dared oppose him, the mob soon broke up. After calm again set in, Melanchthon became instrumental in freeing the three students. Melanchthon could be strong and firm if he wanted to! 23

Melanchthon tried to help his students in many ways.

23 Ibid., pp. 94 and 97.
When a plague in 1535 forced the university to move to Jena, Melanchthon informed them that the move was more out of concern for the students' health rather than the professors'. He warned them to pay all their debts to the local Wittenbergians and not act boisterous in the final days. He advised them, however, that they would be well provided for at Jena. The city was even providing them with cheaper beer.  

The Praeceptor also asked the students' help in various charitable endeavors. At one time he sought help for a father whose nineteen year old son died. At another time, when a large section of the city of Gotha burned down, he appealed to the students' generosity for help.  

Melanchthon had a sense of humor, too. He as well as Luther allowed the tradition of hazing the new students -- the "Beani" or "Foxes" -- to continue at Wittenberg. The ceremony, which ridiculed the new students in ways ranging from humorous to vile, was officially sanctioned at many sixteenth century universities, having evolved over the past centuries.  

24 Ibid., p. 95.  
25 Ibid., pp. 95-6.
Melanchthon believed it helped the students prepare for later life.

**Relations With Colleagues**

Philip Melanchthon had another goal in his university career -- to be in communion with the other teachers of the university, representing all the other branches of knowledge. He was always a friendly and self-sacrificing colleague. At Wittenberg the rule was that teachers studied speeches, orations, and declamations together; but the products were then presented as the instructor's individual work. According to Camerarius, the largest portion of public lectures held at Wittenberg came from Melanchthon's pen. At one time a professor had begun his public speech while Melanchthon was still at his desk writing the speech's conclusion. Melanchthon helped many with their declamations, recommended students to listen to his colleagues' lectures, and wrote college texts or commentaries for other colleagues.

---


After Melanchthon died, four teachers took over the work Melanchthon had done. Veil Oertel, Doctor of Medicine and for forty years teacher of the Artes dicendi and the study of Greek at Wittenberg, took over the lectures in Dialectic (Mondays and Tuesdays - 9 a.m.), Euripides (on two additional weekdays at 8 a.m.), a course in Greek grammar for beginners (Wednesday - 9 a.m.), and for the advanced, the interpretation of the Gospels. Paul Eber, who officially was the head priest of the town church, took over the lectures in Romans (Thursday and Friday at 9 a.m.). He also took over the lectio matutina Melanchthon held on Sundays for students who could not understand the vernacular German service. M. Petrus Vincentius took over the lecture on Ethics (Wednesdays at 2 p.m.), while Kaspar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, took over Melanchthon's lectures on the history of the world from creation to Charles the Great (Saturdays - 9 a.m.).

Popularity and Influence

After 1550 Wittenberg was the most largely frequented university in Germany. Young people from all over

---

29 Ibid., p. 99.
Germany and Europe flocked to hear him. At the time of Me­
lanchthon's death, there were few German cities which did not
have at some time a pupil of Melanchthon's in it. 30

Among Melanchthon's more famous students are Joachim
Camerarius, Valentine Trotzendorf, and Michael Neander all of
whom became renowned schoolmasters. All three, Raumer re­
ports, loved him till their dying day, holding his doctrines
sacred and worthy of long rememberance. 31 Other educators,
including Wolf and Johann Sturm, were friends who, Sell states,
were influenced by the Praeceptor. 32 Sturm, according to Paul
Monroe, depended on Melanchthon for advice. 33 Melanchthon
certainly influenced many people throughout his years of ac­
tive teaching.

Hartfelder credits Melanchthon's success as a teacher

30 Friedrich Paulsen, The German Universities: Their
Character and Historical Development, tr. by E. O. Perry,


32 Sell, op. cit., p. 20.

33 Paul Monroe, A Text Book in the History of Education
to three things. The first he calls a "seldom born gift of teaching." In other words, Melanchthon was born with the gift of teaching. The second he claims is Melanchthon's positive manipulated, maintained, and administered method (spoken of earlier), backed with a diligent organization of grammar. Melanchthon's astonishing versatility of knowledge is the third reason. Melanchthon had an extremely well-rounded, thorough education for his time. Because he had it, he could impart so much of it to his hearers. R. Stintzing, according to Hartfelder, praised Melanchthon, as an educator who, using the didactical method, structured the learning disciplines, both lecture and textbooks, so clearly that he himself showed and taught his students how to teach; and who solidified knowledge to such an extent that he made liberal higher education effectively live.34

34 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 102.
Chapter XI

MELANCHTHON THE ORGANIZER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS

When Martin Luther asked Philip Melanchthon to assist with the educational phase of the Reformation movement, the secondary school was already well established in Germany. The evolution of higher education into two levels, the secondary and university, had taken place over the preceding decades. Distinctions between the two, however, were in the sixteenth century still vague.

Evolution of Secondary Education

Historians trace German higher education back to Charlemagne (742? - 814 A.D.) who induced Alcuin of England (735 - 804) to come to the continent to establish a school, and Rabanus Maurus (775 - 856) who founded the first convent school in Germany at Fulda in 818, and who was called by his contemporaries the "Primus Praeceptor Germaniae". With the decline of the convents, their associated schools also declined. When new orders like the Franciscan and Dominican started convent schools for their novices and chapter schools for the masses, education was again on the incline. Magistrates of cities also started schools, angering the bishops who felt only they had the right to found schools. Two were started at Breslau, Silesia, in 1267 and 1293, using the con-
vent schools as models. Teachers were appointed by the city magistrates for a one year period, being reappointed at the end of each year. The town's head tried to hold influence over the school. If he was a landed knight, he was assumed to be the school's head. If he was not, he sought to get under the landed knight's influence. During the fourteenth century regulations were passed in various areas of Germany which stipulated that the head of the town was in fact the head of the school.

Gerald Groote and the movement he founded, the Brethren of the Common Life, gave new impetus to the Secondary school movement. Shortly after 1374 Groote's pupil, John Cele, brought about a reform of the city school at Zwolle, north of Deventer, in the Netherlands. His school, according to Albert Hyma, became the model for those started by Dringenberg, Hegius, Murmellius, Sturm, Calvin, the Jesuits, and Melanchthon, plus all their followers.


2 Paulsen, Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts, pp. 18-2.

Cele fitted his curriculum to the needs of his students. He retained only those subjects which could be used as a means of reaching a certain end. Since a priest would have little need for geometry, he need not take that subject. Because a merchant had no need for medicine and astronomy, he did not have to study those subjects. However, Cele did stress the sacred writings, good manners, and Christian life. He believed also that one should be able to read the Bible in one's own language. He believed further that if a teacher avoided the formal side of things, a student could retain anything. With this in mind, Cele retained exercises in scholastic grammar, logic, ethics, and philosophy. But he did include the Quadrivium subjects in his curriculum. Since he had 1200 boys in his school, he divided the group into eight classes, an innovation in his time. He believed that teachers should take a personal interest in their students, using sympathy and love first in punishment and resorting to physical punishment only if the first two did not work. He believed in the "Rudarium" method, in which the students collected excerpts of good writing. From the New Testament, for instance, they would collect the plainest and most helpful sayings, which were later to be memorized. Cele's curriculum also influenced the curriculums of most of the other schools operated by the Brethren of the
Common Life. The purpose of most of their schools was to improve the intellectual standards of the clergy, to offer preparatory courses for the university, and to provide teachers for other cities.  

In 1453 Maurice of Saxony started three territorial schools under civil administration, known as Land or Fürsten-schulen (Schools of the country or of the court). Pupils who had mastered the rudiments of Latin grammar were accepted in the schools for preparation for entrance into the university. Pupils, 230 in number, were nominated for the schools by the cities, the nobility, and the elector. State schools were also started at Stelle and Joachimstad in what later became Prussia.  

The Prince or Land schools were also called "Classical" schools since they were erected for service to the state. The Cloister schools kept their name because they continued to meet in the cloisters which were endowed to them. The rest of the schools kept the name Schola particularis, Particular schools, or Trivial schools (from "Trivium"). Those under

4 Ibid., pp. 92-5 and 130.

town supervision were also called "Town" or "Council" schools. Because these schools did not fit the needs of all the people, private schools were also founded throughout North Germany. They taught reading and writing in the vernacular. Some also taught French and Spanish, while others taught mathematics in answer to the needs of those engaged in business. Many schools of all types were started throughout Germany. 7

The language of the secondary school and the university was Latin. In the elementary schools, or Volkschulen, vernacular German had already begun to displace Latin during the Middle Ages. By the sixteenth century, elementary schools were already developed in practically all the towns because of the existing social - not religious - needs. Usually a sexton or other minor official was designated as teacher, but sometimes a tailor, shoemaker, or disabled man served as school master, with the town pastor in charge of the school. The Reformation with its stress on Bible reading caused schools to be started even in the smallest villages. The elementary school curriculum generally included reading the catechism,


7 Ibid., pp. 19-21.
church hymns, and selections of the Bible in German. 8

The new Lutheran church was slow in organizing any system of elementary schools. Its leaders were mainly interested in the secondary, or Latin schools, which catered to the middle and upper classes, and from which would come those who would prepare themselves for church and civil careers. According to Reisner, one of the results of the Peasant Uprisings of 1525 was the triumph of the middle and upper classes and the retrogression of the lower classes. The Reformation, according to Reisner, was doctrinal and political, not humanitarian. The Church's leaders concerned themselves little with the education of the common people. Reisner claims that as a result elementary education remained in a miserable state of neglect and inefficiency into the seventeenth century. 9 Because of Martin Luther's stress on Bible reading in the vernacular, there was, however, some concern about teaching the masses. Adolph Meyer credits Johannes Bugenhagen with starting many elementary schools. 10

8  Reisner, op. cit., pp. 431-4.

9  Ibid., p. 434.

By the time Melanchthon worked out his formula for the Saxon secondary schools, the schools which had already begun to take on the name "gymnasium" had already taken on a humanistic flavor, and had become a much more exactly graded school than the earlier medieval grammar schools. Because the elementary schools no longer stressed Latin, entering students needed only to recognize the Latin alphabet and be able to read. In many schools the work of the entire course was distributed into a specified number of classes or forms. Work of each class had to be completed satisfactorily before the student could go to the next higher class. If the school was large enough, work of each form was placed under a single teacher. The aims of sixteenth century humanist secondary schools were about the same as those Melanchthon advocated. Sound studies, filled with noble personal examples taken from the classics or from history, developed the students' moral judgement. Generally speaking, school masters believed that mental exercise developed power, that reading enlarged one's experience, developing better points of view, and that increasing a pupil's literary appreciation, his literary skill, and his intellectual vigor were desirable. They further believed that students possessing the items mentioned could be used in service of humanity. Of course, the classics were the
beginning and end of all studies, and Latin was the vehicle to obtain these goals. The teachers were servants of the town. They were given their job by the town council and were paid by them. Only the teachers of the land schools were directly supervised by the state government. The only influence on the town schools was the examination needed for entrance into the land schools (including the universities).

However, the average secondary school masters of the sixteenth century were men of less than ordinary ability. They were sons of either the lesser nobility, merchants, country squires, or professional men. The pupils who attended their classes ranged in quality from good to mediocre. The rules of learning Latin were difficult. Classes spent most of their time learning grammar and syntax in dreary exacting drills. Usually the schools did not successfully achieve the goal of opening up the riches of classical culture and applying this culture to the education of the younger generation. Since form rather than content was usually stressed, instruction degenerated into mechanical exercises.

---


12 Paulsen, op. cit., p. 331.

Luther's Ideas On Secondary Education

Luther and Melanchthon were conscious of the shortcomings of the schools of their time. Luther in his "Letter to the German Nobility" stressed the reorganization of the grammar schools along Protestant, humanistic lines. In his 1524 letter to the "Burgomasters and Councillors of the German Cities", he stressed the importance of the learned languages for a true comprehension of the scriptures. He further pointed out the duty of Christian magistrates to provide schools so that in all the cities there might be a "great store of citizens who were learned, wise, honorable and of a goodly nature." In his 1530 "Sermon on the Duty of Keeping Children at School," Luther showed the great necessity of having competent ministers of the gospel, judges, magistrates, and other public officials for the good of society. He gave the magistrates the right to force parents to send their children to school. He compared this right to the power they had to compel their subjects to take up arms for defense. Luther's arguments influenced the princes to institute the needed educational reforms. Since the head of each German Lutheran state was now titular head of the church in his area, he assumed the role of head of education in his state, wresting that power from the Pope who, as head of the Church, had
traditionally been the head of all educational institutions.

Melanchthon's Ideas--The Visitation Papers

In his position as head of the Church, Elector John the Constant of Saxony divided the Ernestine territory into five regions, each of which was to be visited by a survey team made up of representatives from the clergy, law, and the faculty of the University of Wittenberg. Luther and Melanchthon helped prepare the instructions for these visiting committees. The purpose of the visitation was to inspect the existing schools and churches, settle any disputes, study the qualifications of the ministers, and make any resulting recommendations. The general aims, then, were the reorganization and reconstruction of the existing churches. Frederick Myconius, a pastor at Gotha, Justus Menius, a pastor of Erfurt, together with Jerome Schurf, John von Planitz, Erasmus von Haugwitz, and Melanchthon, left for Thuringia on July 5, 1527. The group inspected the churches near Jena, Neustadt, Kahla, Aema, and Weida, where they noted such deplorable conditions as ignorant priests and widespread adultery. After about a month, Melanchthon returned to Jena, where the Wittenberg University relocated during the plague of that year. In order to help guide future commissions and also set a goal for the ministers

Ibid., pp. 427 and 429.
and teachers of Saxony, Melanchthon formulated a set of articles, now known as the Visitation Papers, Instruction to Visitors, or Book of Visitation.\textsuperscript{15}

The guide, published in 1528, had two parts. The first contained a statement of the Lutheran faith, while the second part detailed a school plan. Because they were to serve only as a guide, the Visitation Papers were not intended to be rigid. Melanchthon said they were to serve only "until God the Holy Ghost begins through it or through us something better". Two principles ran throughout the document - Sola scriptura (Scripture alone) and Sola fide (justification by faith alone). Because Melanchthon believed that churches and schools were complementary parts in the Christian formula, the church and school guides were printed together.\textsuperscript{16}

Through these Visitation Papers, an evangelical church system was established for the first time, independent of the Pope. It had its own authority both in matters of doctrine and church government. Other states soon followed Saxony's example. Bugenhagen actually had conducted a visitation in Hamburg much earlier in 1520. Brunswick conducted a visitation in 1528, while Zuebeck in 1533, and Pomerania in 1535 did also.

\textsuperscript{15} Manschreck, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 136-7.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., pp. 137-8.
Denmark and Norway set up church orders in 1537. The Diet of Rendsburg in 1542 extended these and also recognized the Hamburg schools set up in 1520 with the University of Copenhagen at its head. The Brunswick-Wolfbütta church orders of 1528 and 1542 called for the establishment of elementary schools for girls as well as boys in the country parishes, where the organist was to serve as schoolmaster, giving special attention to singing and the memorizing of Bible texts. Raumer called Melanchthon's plan a crude beginning of a high school system, without any thorough organization or well-regulated activity. He claimed that it remained for Trotzendorf and Sturm to develop Melanchthon's plan. 17

In formulating these Instructions to Visitors, Melanchthon took into account all his ideas on education, all he knew of secondary education - its history, its goals, and his practical experiences with his own private school, which he ran from 1520 to 1530 at Wittenberg, and with schools at Eisleben and Nuremberg. After exhorting the people to send their children to school to be educated to serve well the church or state, he laid down the qualifications for the teachers. They must be better qualified than laymen because they must be able

17
to teach others. They are to teach Latin only— not German, Greek, or Hebrew. Troubling children with too many languages Melanchthon believed was not only useless, but also injurious. Teachers taught more than one language, Melanchthon continued, because they felt they were enhancing their own reputations. Neither should they burden their children with too many books. Multiplicity was to be avoided in every possible way. 18

Melanchthon believed that the children of the schools should be divided into groups and if possible taught in different rooms. Because his Saxon plan was intended mainly for schools which were to be set up in the smaller towns and villages, he chose three divisions, giving rise to the name "Trivial School". Though he is silent on the subject, Melanchthon knew of secondary schools of more than three divisions. He was friends with both Sturm, whose Strassburg academy had eight forms, and his former student Plateanus, whose school at Zwickau also had more than three sections. Both of these schools had been modeled after those run by the Bretheren of the Common Life. Correspondence between Melanchthon and Plateanus indicates that he inquired about the workings of the

Zwickau school. Another school at Torgau had four sections. Melanchthon did not insist it be cut down to three. If schools were larger, more sections were desirable. If schools were smaller, three forms were the minimum. A school at Herzberg which had only two teachers still was required by Melanchthon to have three classes.

The first form, or level, was to be composed of those students beginning to read Latin. Books to be used included a primer which featured the alphabet, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and prayers; Donatus (to be read) and Cato (to be expounded). The school master was to expound two verses at a time. Students were to repeat these at a later time in order to build up a Latin vocabulary necessary for speaking. They were to practice this till they learned to read well. Students who proved weak had to repeat Cato and Donatus. Students were to be taught to write and were to show their work to their school master. As was common practice at that time, the teacher was to assign a few Latin words each evening for memorization. Music and choral singing were also scheduled.

---


20 "Instructions to Visitors," p. 315.
Those who had learned to read and were ready for grammar were placed on the second level. Etymology, syntax, and prosody were to be taught in sequence in the hour before noon. After finishing the series once, Melanchthon advised repeating it so that grammar would become a part of them. Children were to be able to say all the rules of grammar. If, by chance, the teacher should find this grammatical work tedious, the teacher should be replaced, because the students had to stay with grammar. The accompanying lectures had the same purpose—the grasping of grammatical knowledge. Nouns should be declined and verbs conjugated, many or few, easy or hard, depending on the pupils' varying abilities. Students were always to give the rule or explanation of the forms. After learning the rules of sentence construction, students were to learn how to construe sentences and to know the parts of speech. Aesop's Fables in a Latin translation was to be used as a "help book" in grammar, providing material to decline, conjugate, or construe. The fables were also to be studied for content, the master explaining the text word for word. The children were to review the day's fable the next morning.21

21 Ibid., pp. 316-7.
After vespers, the school master was to explain Petrus Mosellanus's *Paedagogia*, a collection of dialogs, mostly between students and scholars, discussing the objects of education, plans of study, the benefits of vacation, and other varied items. After this book was completed, the students were to study those colloquies of Erasmus that were useful and edifying. Students were to repeat them to the school master the following evening. After Aesop followed Terence, whom Melanchthon recommended learning by heart, and selected fables of Plautus which were not objectionable, such as "Aulularia", "Trinummus", and "Pseudolus". Music was to be instructed daily during the first hour in the afternoon.

Grammatical instruction was to take place daily, except for either Wednesday or Saturday, during which time Christian instruction would be given. In teaching religion school masters were to avoid two extremes - one, some learn nothing out of Holy Scriptures, and, two, some learn nothing but the Holy Scriptures. Besides the books with religious content, students were to read humanist books and books on how to speak in order to be exposed to eloquence. On these first two levels


23 "Instructions to Visitors", op. 316-7.
everyone had to have memorized the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Decalogue. If these had already been memorized, the school master would proceed to those items necessary to life—fear of God, belief, and good works. School masters were not to discuss religious items under dispute or teach children that it were proper to slander people, as some unscrupulous school masters had done. Furthermore, students were to memorize psalms like the thirty-fourth or the 133rd which Melanchthon felt were easy and clear. Melanchthon also advocated using the Book of Matthew, the Letters of Paul to Timothy, the First Epistle of John, and the Proverbs of Solomon for expounding in Latin. Melanchthon warned teachers not to belabor the students with more difficult material like the books of Isaiah, Paul's Letter to the Romans, and the Gospel of St. John just because of their fame. 24

The more proficient in grammar would advance to the third form. In the morning hours students were to review the grammar principles already learned. After finishing the basic work in etymology and syntax, students were to be exposed to meter in order to learn to compose verses. Melanchthon felt the exercises were fruitful because they helped one understand

other writings and enrich one's vocabulary. He believed the principles learned could be adopted to other things. All in all it made for eloquence. Besides declinations and conjugations, Melanchthon felt a study of figures of speech to be necessary. Writings to be studied were Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, either Cicero's *De officiis* or his *Epistles* and *familiares*, and selections from Vergil. Each week an exercise in the writing of a Latin letter or verse was required. Those who succeeded in grammar could advance to dialectic and rhetoric. The third section would study music together with the first two during the first afternoon hour. Pupils were to speak only Latin. School masters were to speak Latin as much as possible with the students. 25

In general, subjects included reading, writing, singing, Latin - both grammar and lectures on an author, religion, logic, and rhetoric. Other subjects - math, history, geography, nature study - are missing. Mathematics was to be taught only on the university level. Each class or form did not equal one year's work. Those who covered the subject matter and reached the desired goals advanced to the next level regardless of time. Because the whole school time between the elementary school and

25 "Instructions to Visitors", pp. 319-20.
the university was to be taken up by the trivial school, each form was to last several years.

Nothing in Melanchthon's plan was original. As stated above, Latin secondary schools had been evolving for centuries, using similar class divisions, curricula, and even some of the same textbooks. Even such practices as music study and the explanation of Sunday sermons had been in existence for some time. Melanchthon threw nothing out that was worth saving. His contribution to education, according to Hartfelder, is that he took the Latin School format developed in the Late Middle Ages and adapted it for the classical schools of the Lutheran States of the Holy Roman Empire. Also, he re-introduced Latin vocabulary learning according to the method in use during the ancient classical times.

The originality of Melanchthon's school plan lay in its modifications of that which was in existence. He changed the amount of time allocated from the various studies. For instance, the amount of time the students studied the songs to be sung in the Sunday Mass lessened considerably. Another

26 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 424 and 427.

27 Ibid., pp. 427-8.
change concerned the textbooks to be studied. As discussed above in the section dealing with his philosophy of education, Melanchthon followed humanistic trends, dropping the medieval grammar textbook of Alexander de Villa, but allowing Donatus's text to remain. He dropped other medieval texts (e.g. Facetus, moralitates Antogamerati, Alanus episcopus), while adding Mosellanus's Paedologia and Erasmus's Colloquies. Hartfelder labels Melanchthon's school plan a compromise between the old and the new methods, keeping the tried forms of the Middle Ages, but adding the new learning of humanism. New, of course, was religious instruction, which the schools of the Middle Ages did not have and did not need, according to Hartfelder, because of the Confessional Box.  

Implementation of His Ideas

Reforms recommended by the Visitors were only gradually put into effect. Most city councils first introduced Luther's Small Catechism and German hymns. Later they carried out Melanchthon's plans. Nevertheless, the 1528 plan of Melanchthon's became a model for other visitations. By 1555 over 135

28 Ibid., pp. 428-30.

of these plans had been evolved, with some still being used in the seventeenth century. All followed the principles of organization and regulation set up by Melanchthon. Starting before the Visitation Papers were written and continuing till his death, at least fifty-six cities sought Melanchthon's advice for founding their schools. Since the Visitation Papers were intended to be only a guide, much variation can be found in the systems of the other states and even in certain specific schools, as the 1538 school ordinance for the town of Herzberg in Kreis Schweinitz can attest. In the lowest form the children learned the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Decalog in German. Plautus' plays and any reference to rhetoric are missing. It suggested, however, that the teacher of the upper form could begin with dialectic. In religion, the two upper classes were to use Luther's Small Catechism. On Saturdays the teacher was to interpret the grammar of the next day's sermon. Regular visitation of the school by the priest, preacher, and some of the councilmen was ordered.

30 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 143.
The schoolmaster or organist could not make any changes by themselves.31

In general, instruction each day lasted for five to six hours, from 5 or 6 a.m. till 9 a.m. and from 12 noon to 3 p.m. The most important subjects, including grammar were taught during the morning hours while the less important were relegated to the afternoon. Scholars were to attend church on Sundays and twice during the week.32 The school year usually began in Easter and lasted till the following Easter. Where local circumstances made it necessary, the school year ran from Michaelmas (September 29) to Michaelmas.33

Melanchthon also originated plans for Obere Schulen, or upper schools, which were to be an intermediate step between the Trivial School and the university. Plans for schools at Eisleben and Nuremberg are examples. The school at Nuremberg was originally founded in 1496 when the city council engaged Heinrich Grüninger, a humanist, to teach. Unfortunately


he did not attract many pupils. In 1509 the council merged the school with two existing lower grammar schools connected with the parishes of St. Sebold and St. Lorenz. Grammar and poetry from a humanistic point of view were added to the curriculum. By 1511 the study of literary Latin was seriously begun, with Vergil and Sallust as required reading.34

In 1524 the mayor of Nuremberg sought Melanchthon's help. Lazarus Spengler, a friend of the Reformation movement, and Hieronymus Baumgartner, who had studied under Melanchthon, together with the mayor, wanted Melanchthon to personally supervise the reorganization of the school. Melanchthon, feeling he owed his service to his prince, Duke Frederick, told them he could not leave Wittenberg. He did send, however, his best friend and scholar, Joachim Camerarius, to take over the position of Master. Melanchthon was instrumental in getting Michael Roting from Sulzfeld, France, Eobanus Hessus, a well known Latin poet who had wanted to leave Erfurt where he had been reluctantly staying, Johann Schoner of Karlstadt, an ex-

pert in mathematics and mathematical instruments, as teachers. Camerarius and Hessus were to be paid 150 gulden a year, while Ruting and Schoner were to receive 100 gulden per year. The school was actually started in the spring of 1526.35

Since the new school was to receive its pupils from the lower existing feeder schools, the lower class consisted of the boys who came from these schools. A master, who was titled "professor", of rhetoric and logic was in charge. Erasmus's De Copia and Cicero's Orations were the standard text books. Portions of Quintilian were also studied. In order to apply the rules of logical argument, exercises in disputation were held. In the second class a Latin master was in charge. This class was chiefly concerned with the reading of poetical authors and the teaching of verse composition, subjects which the students had to master. A third class was devoted entirely to mathematics, while the fourth was devoted mainly to Greek, although Latin composition was also to be studied. Cicero's De Officiis as well as Livy and other Latin historians were to be studied. Exercises were to be prepared weekly.36 The school,


however, did not prosper as expected. Eventually it became the University of Altdorf. 37

The same pattern had been employed by Melanchthon for an upper school at Eisleben. In 1525 Count Mansfeld founded a trivial school. The Peasants' Revolt, however, delayed its opening. Luther originally accompanied Melanchthon and Johann Agricola to Eisleben, the place of Luther's birth, to help start this school. Agricola remained to become the master of the school. He and his colleague wrote the school plan, based on Melanchthon's ideas. This curriculum served as a pattern for Melanchthon's 1528 plan. 38 The court wanted Melanchthon to plan an upper school for Eisleben. Students were to be picked from the better students of the third class of the Trivial school. Since Eisleben was smaller than Nuremberg, the school could not hope to attract as many qualified students. Yet it offered Hebrew in its highest section. 39

37 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 506.

38 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 132, cf. CR I: 739, 674; Suppl. CR I: 258.

Problems Confronting New Schools

Everything did not run smoothly in the newly established trivial and upper schools. Melanchthon well knew the problems facing these schools through his own experience with the little private school, the Schola Privata, he had set up in his early days at Wittenberg to both make up for the poor Latin instruction incoming university students had received in the existing Latin schools and also to earn him some sorely needed money. To make up for lacking text books he created his own. To encourage student effort he offered prizes, like a special seat at the table. He presented plays to help practice using the Latin language and to create entertainment. 40

So when a town pastor felt slighted in his rights in relation to the school's master, Melanchthon, Luther, Burgenhagen, and Spalatin discussed it and eventually settled the dispute. When a school for some reason did not fare too well, and the school master sent to Melanchthon for help, Melanchthon answered him with advice on how to correct the situation. Since most schools had basically the same problems, Melanchthon had a set of answers printed. Whenever someone wrote, he

40 Ibid., pp. 491-4.
would answer with a personal letter plus the printed answer sheet. Melanchthon's correspondence concerning school problems fill ten quarto volumes. Besides these, Melanchthon also wrote many letters of recommendations for people seeking vacant positions.

Melanchthon's contribution to the advancement of secondary education in Germany lay in his advocacy of the Latin school as a vehicle for the preparatory education of those students who would later attend the university in order to prepare themselves for service to the church or to the state. His influence on both Luther and the German princes led to the adoption of his humanistic program at a time when those in position to do so could well have adopted some other educational plan. Melanchthon allowed only what he believed good to remain. Yet his plan, as laid down in the Visitation Papers, was not inflexible. It could be changed to fit the requirements of the schools of particular areas. Utility and flexibility, the two key words of his secondary school plan, also apply to his university plans, as we will see next.

41 Ibid., pp. 498-500.
Chapter XII

MELANCHTHON THE ORGANIZER OF UNIVERSITIES

Evolution Of Higher Education

At the time of the Reformation, universities were already fairly well developed. How the universities grew out of the "Studium generale" of the Middle Ages into the academies, gymnasiums, and finally universities or high schools in the sixteenth century has been chronicled many times. That they were established from a religious point of view to serve "God, to love Him, to spread His holy evangelical and Godly word, and to broaden all honest and good skills" has also been well documented. Here God's teachings were to be studied, His Word be preserved, and -- through influence of the Holy Ghost -- the continuous, harmonized teachings of the Catholic Church be presented. Any religious disputes would also be solved in this institution.

Universities were called "Studium generale" because they were regarded as schools for all Christendom, regardless of national or geographic lines, in contrast to the "Studium particulare", or school for the town or province, which -- as mentioned in the last chapter -- evolved into the Latin secon-

---

1 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 436-7.
It did not take much money to run a university. A thousand guilders or thalers was enough for salaries for ten or fifteen professors. Some, especially in the theology and law schools, were holders of ecclesiastical benefices which had been incorporated into the university. Lecturers, especially on the Arts faculty, received no pay, only the fees from tuition and the examination fees. Building expenses were minimal since old monastary buildings were usually used.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, universities in general consisted of four faculties - religion, law, medicine, and the arts. The theological faculty consisted of four professors, three of whom held doctorate degrees and the fourth, who was pastor of the town church, was also to hold a doctor's degree or at least a licentiate in religion. They would be under the rector of the university (who was usually chosen on a yearly basis from among the four faculties). The


3 Ibid., pp. 19, 36.
theology department was to guard the harmony of the church's teachings. Anyone who had received his doctorate from another university had to be examined on his knowledge and understanding of the church's teachings. All who held the Doctor of Theology degree had to know and pledge themselves to the one harmonious teaching. The theology faculty was considered to be the continuation of the Old Testament priestly, Levitical, and prophetical school. Like John the Baptist, Christ, and the Apostles, it was to spread the gospel. At the head of the theological faculty was the dean, elected to that position by his colleagues. The other three faculties each also elected its own dean. He was responsible for the proper assignments of classes, regular meetings of his staff, and the keeping of the university's regulations. If any dispute concerning doctrine arose, the dean was to bring it to the attention of the rector and the university councils who had to decide if the argument was important enough to bring to the Prince's attention. If it was not, the council would arbitrate it. If it was, the prince and the council would appoint a judge to hear the dispute and render an opinion. If the professor were found guilty and he claimed innocence, he would be imprisoned so that he could not continue to preach his wrong concepts. If a professor on another faculty of the
university held a Doctorate in Theology, he was to join the theology faculty to help with hearing the disputation and examinations and preserving the correct teachings. The theology department also had the job of judging any civil marriage problems. Professors were warned not to give explanations containing double meanings, not to slander their colleagues, and not to schedule their lectures to clash with those of their colleagues. During and after the Reformation era, since all theological facts were grouped in loci, or common places, according to humanistic influences, no systematic theology and history was taught. Instead they were taught in connection with the explanation of the books of the Bible. A 1546 regulation instructed the teachers to teach Greek and Hebrew in connection with the language of the Bible, since God had given the Church the gift of tongues to serve the spreading of the Gospel.

The Jurisprudence or Law faculty was considered the second faculty. It too had four members, three doctors and one licentiate. Each had to lecture on four week days, Wednesday being the off day. Again the dean was responsible for

---

4 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 437-41.
the assignment of duties according to seniority. This faculty had other duties too. The first three professors were to volunteer as judges in the high court of justice while the fourth was to act as lawyer to the poor. Each professor was to be well-versed in civil and penal law and was to work at the Wittenberg court of law.

The third faculty, medical, was, at least at Wittenberg, small. At first it had only one professor, and later two. In the 1536 reorganization a third was added. The first two professors were doctors, while the third again was a licentiate. These professors only lectured, since modern research was unknown and unthought of at the time. The subject matter of the lectures? Hippocrates, Galen, and other of the classical writers on medicine. Any research that was undertaken was really demonstrations by the professor to show the established truths of such ancient authorities as Galen.

The greatest change on the university level was the evolution of the fourth faculty - the arts, or philosophy

---


faculty, which began to offer the course of study all students had to take preliminary to their entrance into the specialized areas. Ten lecturers were needed for this department - one each for Hebrew, Greek, Poetry, grammar, physics, moral philosophy, and Terence; two for mathematics, and one to teach both dialectic and rhetoric. One of the mathematics teachers and the logic professor were held responsible for holding two declamations weekly. They also had the job of renting out the space in the college, gathering the fees, and bringing them to the state treasury. Lectures were to be held four days a week with Wednesdays and Saturdays reserved exclusively for declamations and disputations. By 1546 these assignments changed almost completely at Wittenberg. Two professors were assigned to teach Latin, with a pedagog appointed to review Latin grammar with the students, using Terence, Plautus, and Aesop as texts. The Greek teacher was also assigned moral philosophy or ethics to prevent someone with an insufficient background from teaching it. Melanchthon advocated the teaching of moral philosophy from Aristotle's Ethics, instead of from the Bible. By doing this Melanchthon unconsciously set a pattern of separating religious instruction from philosophy of civil ethics. 8

8Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 441-3.

9Ibid., p. 443.
This left him open to the charge of fostering an ethical attitude in the German people which tended to confine religious impulses to the sphere of the church and heaven, away from participation in civil life. 10

That Melanchthon did not want this to happen can be seen by Wittenberg's statutes concerning the Arts faculty which were in effect while Melanchthon was a member. Though the goal of the department was still facility in speech and philosophy, teachers were to bear in mind the greater goals of service to the state and to the church. The Arts faculty was looked upon as part of the Church of God. All of its members had to know and believe the pure word of God as handed down to both the Lutheran Church and the Catholic Church. All had to believe in Jesus Christ as Son of God and Lord. However, because the university provided no test of one's belief, a Catholic as well as a Lutheran could teach there. In practice this never happened. In general philosophy was to be taught in such a way as not to endanger the Gospel. Teachers were warned against epicureanism and frivolity. Those who deviated were to be reported to the rec-

10 Luecker, op. cit., p. 666.
The Arts faculty dean, besides regulating the courses and the schedule, and the quality of instruction, nominated those wishing to graduate to the rector, and supervised with the help of his colleagues the examinations which the rector arranged. Furthermore the dean had to arrange for the regular disputations of the masters, checking their theses to see that no silly, false, or meaningless topics would be treated. The dean had to also keep a bibliography of worth-while books for the university and keep a faculty year book in which he would list the most important and meaningful items and events. 12

Influence of the Reformation

In form the university did not change much as a result of the Reformation, except for the stature of the Arts Faculty. Other elements of the university, developed gradually during and since the Middle Ages, continued to be in practice. Because Melanchthon believed in them, declamations and disputations continued. Examinations, described above in the section on Melanchthon's university education, also continued in the same format embracing the examination itself, the accompanying


12 Ibid., pp. 444-5.
disputation, and the concluding public ceremony with its Latin speech or declamation. The degrees -- bachalaureate, master's or licentiate, and doctor's -- also were continued. The Doctor of Theology degree continued to be the degree with the highest worth. 13

Most students, however, did not complete their university training. Many left before obtaining even the lowest degree because they did not need it to get a job. Even those aspiring to join the lower clergy did not especially seek a degree. The higher clergy, however, needed university training. 14

In content the universities did change, and Luther and Melanchthon were responsible. The turmoil caused by the Reformation movement had brought about a near halt in education. Many Catholic centers of learning closed and many humanists forsook the cause of reform. 15 Some Protestant humanists who hated the Catholic roots of the university associated the degree system as a remnant of the old Scholasticism. At the op-

13 Ibid., pp. 449-66.

14 Paulsen, German Universities and University Study, pp. 21-2.

15 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 132.
positive end of the spectrum, the Anabaptists, who believed in the knowledge received through an inner light, did not believe in education, examinations, and degrees. Why should someone take an examination and get an academic title if the Holy Spirit from above at the right time tells one what to say? Karlstadt even maintained that academic titles were forbidden in the Bible. Did not Christ say, "Let no one call you master, for there is only one master, Christ" (Matthew 23: v. 10)? Furthermore, the Anabaptists, because they were against all oaths, especially opposed the Doctorate degree with its accompanying oaths.

Implementation of Melanchthon's Ideas: Reorganization of Wittenberg

Melanchthon, however, believed in education as a servant to the church. He felt the universities to be the fountainheads of the new school system since the teachers from these schools would be drawn from them. He considered Wittenberg to be the center of the education movement since it was the heart of the religious changes.

16 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 455 and 468.
17 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 144.
Wittenberg was reorganized by both Luther and Melanchothn. The university had been founded by Elector Frederick of Saxony in 1502. Opened under humanist auspices and stocked with humanist teachers, the school originally had no anti-Roman Catholic character. Theology, humanism, and scholasticism lived together under friendly terms. Melanchothn, who originally came to teach only Greek, found himself teaching also Hebrew when his friend Büschenstein left. Melanchothn's first change at the university involved his desire to replace Pierre Tartnuet's scholastic traditionalist philosophy course with one sympathetic to a humanistic interpretation. He was successful in this endeavor. The court, however, wanted Melanchothn to lecture on Aristotelian Physics, while Melanchothn felt an accent on dialectic and rhetoric to be more useful. He also wanted to introduce lectures on Quintilian, a project he felt would be a great step towards a completely humanistic faculty. He instituted other humanistic ventures, like starting lectures on Plinius, calling a humanist teacher of mathematics, and adding to the faculty a


19 Ong, op. cit., p. 141.
proven medical specialist, Stagmannus, who eliminated scholastic and Aristotelian physic from the medical college. 20

Martin Luther was responsible for the more sweeping changes in the Theological faculty. He decreed that the lectures on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, the customary religious text book of the Middle Ages would be terminated. Instead faculty members were to lecture on the Bible and the Church Fathers. Writings of the Old and New Testaments were now to be studied as well as those from St. Augustine. Explanations were to be based on the original texts rather than from derived translations or commentaries. Scholastic books like Sententiarius and Biblicus were banned. Melanchthon, of course, pushed the study of languages in the Philosophy faculty as a prerequisite to theology study. The requirements for the doctorate in theology were tightened. No one with a point of view different from the new Protestant church could get it. The requirements were to be as strict as those which Paul prescribed for the bishops in I Timothy 3, v. 2 and Titus 1, v. 7. Married men, as well as widowers who remarried were now, however, able to receive this degree. The

celibacy requirement of the Roman Catholic Church was eliminated also. 21

No major changes were made in the Law faculty. The only major change in the Medical faculty concerning the elimination of Aristotelian Physic has already been mentioned. Other changes took place in the Philosophy faculty, following Melanchthon's humanist ideas. Scotus and St. Thomas Aquinas were eliminated, replaced by authors reflecting humanist ideas. As far as language requirements were concerned, Melanchthon followed the guideline of not allowing anyone to enter the university unless he had a satisfactory knowledge of Latin grammar and was proficient in speaking it. In a 1523 outline for University statutes, Melanchthon stated that new arrivals had to report to the rector who assigned a pedagogue to them. This teacher made sure the new fledglings signed up for the proper lectures. He himself also taught them the preparatory courses. 22

That members of the theology and arts faculties had to take an oath, specifically to the ecumenical symbols of

21 Ibid., pp. 508-9, 446, and 467.

the Augsburg Confession, has already been mentioned. Many objected to these oaths. Melanchthon defended them, especially the one required by the Arts faculty. Most of the students of the Arts faculty moved later to either the theology or law departments, since the arts course was preparatory to them as well as to medicine. If the theology and law faculties were to serve the evangelical states, then nothing taught in the Arts department should create hostility toward the teachings of the Evangelical Church. Before the Reformation when only one church and one doctrine existed, the pledge was not necessary. Now there existed several. Hartfelder states that although the Lutheran theology faculty took on the form of the medieval Catholic faculty in respect to doctrinal adherence, history shows that the universities of Protestant Germany had the most unrestrained scholarly development, sprinkled with names like Kant, Schiller, Fichte, and Hegel. During the same era the Catholic universities, withered and shackled through faith, produced no brilliant scholars. The changes mentioned in the various faculties were placed in statutes Melanchthon wrote in 1533 for the reorganization of

23 Ibid., pp. 448-9.
Wittenberg. In 1545 Melanchthon composed another set of statutes that set forth clearly each professor's responsibilities and established a balance between the humanities and theology.

**Founding a New University**

Melanchthon helped found universities at Königsberg, Jena, and Marburg. He revised the curricula of Cologne, Tübingen, Leipzig, and Heidelberg along Christian humanistic lines. He helped reform the universities at Rostock and Frankfort-on-the-Oder.

Whenever a prince or a group of interested people wanted to found a university, Melanchthon was consulted. Marburg, the first Protestant university to be started, was the brainchild of Philipp of Hesse who had been converted to Lutheranism as a result of accidentally meeting Melanchthon in 1524 on his return to Wittenberg from Brettan. Though Melanchthon mentions nothing concerning his part in the founding of the university in May, 1527, Paulsen notes the similarity between the Marburg ordinance and Melanchthon's Wittenberg ordinances. Also, the first teachers were all Wittenbergians, probably re-

---


commended by Melanchthon. Eobanus Hessus, whom Melanchthon had installed in the Nuremberg Obere Schule, was among these, again recommended by Melanchthon. 26

The University of Königsberg was founded entirely under Melanchthon's auspices. Margrave Albert was ruler of the Teutonic Lands in which Königsberg is located. This area had just been transformed from a Catholic bishopric into a Lutheran state. Albert, who had kept an active correspondence with the Protestant leaders, was concerned about the religious life of his country. He at first encouraged his subjects to study at Wittenberg by offering stipends. After discussing a newschool with some of his subjects who were educators and friends of Melanchthon, he wrote Melanchthon and Camerarius. After much exchange of letters, the Margrave began to assemble teachers, based on recommendations of Melanchthon. The school, however, still needed a person to unify the institution. Although Albert wanted Camerarius for the position, he settled for George Sabinus, Melanchthon's son-in-law and teacher at Frankfort, who had asked Melanchthon for a recommendation for the position. Melanchthon, fearing charges of nepotism, hesitantly recom-

26 Hartfelder, _op. cit._, pp. 531-2; cf. Paulsen, _Geschichte_, p. 235.
mended him. 27

The university was started in 1542 by separating the upper class of a Latin school. Sabinus sought recognition of granted degrees and promotions from the Pope (who till that time had sanctioned all schools and promotions) through the Papal legate, Bembo. When this plan failed, Sabinus turned for advice to Melanchthon and Camerarius who stated that it was the state's right, not the Emperor's or the Pope's. Melanchthon cited as examples the ancient Christian churches who had no Pope or Emperor as head. Melanchthon had great influence in this school. Most of the teachers were Wittenberg graduates and many of these had been his students. Later the school, which had become known as a satellite of Wittenberg, became racked with religious controversies involving Melanchthon. 28

When Elector John Frederick, as a result of losing the battle at Lochaner Heath on April 24, 1547, lost the electorate crown and the area around Wittenberg to Moritz, he tried to establish a new university at Jena, with Melanchthon

27 Ibid., op. 533-4; cf. Paulsen, Geschichte, pp. 242-3.
as its head. Because Melanchthon felt that if Wittenberg, the symbol of Lutheranism would collapse, people would lose faith in the new religion, he remained, helping Moritz re-establish the university. However, he did help John Frederick by recommending teachers, many of whom were his former students, for the university. In later years Jena became the headquarters for those who opposed Melanchthon. The last university to be founded under Melanchthon's direction was located in Helmstadt. In 1560, Melanchthon's former student, David Chyträus, who had earlier helped reorganize the University of Heidelberg, carried out the details of the organization.

Reorganization of Existing Universities

Melanchthon helped reorganize the Catholic University of Tübingen after the area in which it was located came under Lutheran influence. Since the university was in Melanchthon's native land, Duke Ulrich, who had reconquered his own country with the help of Philipp of Hesse, believed that he could persuade Melanchthon in 1534 to come to Tübingen to help reorganize the university. Because his prince, Elector Frederick,

29 Ibid., pp. 536-7; cf. Paulsen, Geschichte, pp. 252-3.
30 Paulsen, Geschichte, pp. 253-4.
did not want him to leave Wittenberg, he instead sent his friend Camerarius, who had been stationed at the Obere Schule in Nuremberg. Problems, such as the influence of the newer, more liberal religions, vexed Camerarius, who sought Melanchthon's advice in 1538. In both 1537 and 1545 the Duke tried to get Melanchthon to come to Tübingen, but he settled for the advice Melanchthon sent him. Again, Melanchthon's students were among the teachers of the school. 31

Melanchthon served on a committee formed to help reorganize the university at Leipzig, founded at the beginning of the sixteenth century by Duke George of Saxony, who was both a humanist, patron of education, and friend of such learned men as Erasmus. In 1519 the Duke had already reorganized the university along humanist lines, having called many humanist professors. However, because of his ties with Erasmus, he never embraced Protestantism. Leipzig and Wittenberg soon became two enemy camps, exchanging many letters on religious subjects.

When Duke George died, his brother and successor, Henry, converted the land to Lutheranism. It was he who in 1539 cal-

led the commission for reorganizing the university along Protestant-humanist lines. The situation at Leipzig was difficult. In order to reform the theological faculty, a strong Catholic party had to first be ousted. The faculty, composed of monks and scholastics were told to conform to Lutheranism or leave. Because the rich no longer cared to be priests or preachers, the sons of the poor had to be induced through stipends to enter the ministry. Melanchthon advocated the use of money received from the sale of confiscated and now unused cloisters for this purpose. Since cloisters were originally founded to produce pastors and teachers, Melanchthon reasoned, the money received from their sale should naturally be used for funding pastors and teachers.

As usual Melanchthon recommended people to replace the ousted professors. In both the 1539 and 1540 sets of recommendations, the other three faculties were found good. In the 1540 recommendation, Melanchthon stated that the subject matter should be upgraded, and that all monies received should go into one common treasury. Only the good professors, not the lazy ones, should be paid. He also expressed sorrow concerning the fact that disputations had not been introduced. One whom Melanchthon recommended, his friend Joachim Camerarius, gladly accepted because of the poor conditions at Tübingen.
Duke Henry was happy with the selection, since over the succeeding years the University flourished. Melanchthon continued to serve on various committees, offering advice, reviewing qualifications of those applying for stipends, and giving recommendations of candidates for vacant professorships. 32

Melanchthon's alma mater, the University of Heidelberg, had come across bad times, dropping in enrollment to only thirty-four students by 1524. When Frederick II replaced his brother Ludwig V as elector at the Palatinate in 1544, he wrote the elector of Saxony seeking Melanchthon's help. Because of Luther's recent death and its resulting problems, Melanchthon felt he could not leave Wittenberg. He was also afraid that Lutherans would view his move to Heidelberg as an attempt to start a new religion. By 1553 when the Palatinate elector again called Melanchthon, he almost accepted. The Smalcald wars, the battles of the Interim, and his disputations with the Gnesio-Lutherans caused him to look at the call to Heidelberg as a call to heaven. However, because his colleagues persuaded him to stay, he remained at Wittenberg, send-

ing his friend and countryman, David Chyträus of Rostock in his stead.

In 1556 the successor to Frederick II, Otto-Henry, again asked for Melanchthon's service. Although the Flacian controversy tempted him to accept the position, Melanchthon's increasing depressions and thoughts on his death caused him to decline the call. However in the fall of 1557 he did travel to the university, where he was met with fanfare and celebrations. He did oversee some of the changes he prescribed, lent his advice in general matters, and sent some of his more pious students to teach there. In the five years from 1555 to 1560 the school prospered according to sixteenth century standards, increasing from thirty-eight to one hundred forty-three students. 33

Melanchthon also helped to reform the universities at Rostock and Frankfort-on-the Oder. When Joachim II, who was secretly in favor of the Reformation, succeeded his father, Joachim I, an anti-Lutheran, in 1535, he decided to reorganize the university at Frankfort in Brandenburg along Protestant-humanistic lines before he declared his region Lutheran. In

---

1537 he wrote Melanchthon seeking his help. The Praeceptor recommended his son-in-law, George Sabinus, for the position of leadership. Sabinus, who was doubly recommended as both a native of Brandenburg and a student at Wittenberg, carried out Melanchthon's plans, until he left the university for Königsberg in 1542. Other students of Melanchthon also served as professors there. Melanchthon served as intermediator in various theological disputations at the university. The Smalcald wars also almost tempted Melanchthon to seek the sanctuary of positions offered him at the university by both the elector and the professors. 34

The University of Rostock had been racked with both political and religious battles. The mayor of the town, jealous of the privileges granted the university, attempted to restrict some of its freedom. One of Melanchthon's students, Arnold Burenius, was called to Rostock to reorganize the university. Burenius carried out the reorganization, following Melanchthon's plans concerning subject matter and method. Though by this time his influence in theological matters had lessened, yet Melanchthon's influence in the realm of the

philosophical faculties was as strong as ever. Most of Melanchthon's suggestions were conveyed to Burenius through correspondence. Again, students of Melanchthon staffed the university. 35

A major problem of the time concerned the funding of the universities. Since medieval universities supported their professors through benefices, money was not a problem. This arrangement was dropped, of course, in the new Protestant lands. Protestant heads of state were quick to seize the now empty monasteries for their own use. Luther and Melanchthon, however, wanted the property to be used for churches and schools. The Smalcald League of Protestant theologians in 1537 decided that the Catholic churches would become Lutheran churches, and that the secular authorities would become the patrons and protectors of the property, some of whose income was to be allocated for church and school use, while others were to be used for projects intended to better the conditions of the state, like the building of better roads. As a result of this decree, the precedent of the secular authority be-

coming the head of the church in his area was established. 

Through Luther's and Melanchthon's influence, professors' salaries were increased. However, they were still low when compared to other occupations of the time. Those who provided the prince's food received twice the pay of those who taught in the philosophical faculty.

Melanchthon contributed much to the reorganization of the universities in the Protestant areas. He was instrumental in bringing about change in subject matter and in teaching methods. He bolstered Luther's accent on Bible reading by stressing the necessity of studying the languages needed to read and understand the original languages of the Old and New Testament. His influence was perpetuated by his many students, trained in his method and philosophy, who staffed these various universities. As Rothe emphasized, "It is not too much to say that the university in all its departments, throughout Protestant Germany, is his creation."

---


37 Ibid., pp. 485-6.

Philip Melanchthon's work on both the secondary and university levels and his own personal endeavors as both teacher and author reflect his Christian humanism. His reorganization of the universities along Protestant humanistic lines is especially important because these same universities, staffed by teachers well versed in Melanchthon's philosophy and method perpetuated his ideas throughout succeeding generations. Next we will investigate the extent of his influence, both in Germany and other countries, and both the immediate and the subsequent influences.
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MELANCTHON'S INFLUENCE: IMMEDIATE AND EXTENSIVE

Personal Influence

Melanchthon's influence on his contemporaries, colleagues, students, and others who worked in education has already been described. Since he taught at Wittenberg for over forty years, many students were exposed to his beliefs and methods. These were then perpetuated through exposure to other generations by his students who served as teachers throughout Protestant Germany. However, the depth and breadth of his influence depended on the interpretation these students gave his ideas. Nevertheless, all over Germany schools -- both gymnasiums and universities -- had been founded or reorganized along the guide lines he formulated, staffed by his former students, like Neander and Trotzendorf, using textbooks he either wrote or recommended. Secondary school systems, too, had been founded or reorganized, following the pattern suggested in his Visitation Book.

Influence of Textbooks

His textbooks too found wide circulation. As mentioned earlier, his manuals were not only popular throughout Protestant Germany, but were well received as far away as England and accepted even in Catholic countries. Many were in use for de-
cades; his Latin grammar was used for centuries. Michael Neander's version of Melanchthon's Latin Grammar, for instance, was used in schools in the German Catholic States until 1734.\footnote{Manschreck, op. cit., p. 150.}

John Seton (1498-1567), a Roman Catholic who taught philosophy at St. John's College in England and who had to flee the country because of his faith, became familiar with Melanchthon's book on logic. Seton later published a book on dialectics which utilized Melanchthon's ideas. Thomas Wilson (c1525-1581) of Cambridge University adopted Melanchthon's concept of method, introducing it in his own book, Rule of Reason, one of the first philosophical works in English.

Everard Digby (c1550-1592), a teacher of Logic at St. John's until 1587 and opponent of Peter Ramus and his method, used Aristotle's basic four question method. Digby's writings reflect his knowledge of Melanchthon's ten question method.\footnote{Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 198, 201, 205.}

Catholic writers followed the technique used by Melanchthon in his Loci communes, producing books to rival it. Joachim Perjonius (died c. 1559) was one who did. His Toporum Theologicorum libri duo listed topics intended to refute heresies the Lutherans and others perpetuated. Melchior Cano
(1523-60) produced a *Loci*, or *Topics*, published at Salamanca in 1562. Other Catholics, like Cardinal Sadolet, who was prominent in educational circles of the day, praised Melanchthon.

Not all Catholics accepted Melanchthon, however. In 1519 Melanchthon's writings were condemned by Rome. Francesco Calvi, a friend of Erasmus's, was the Italian bookseller who initially had made available Luther's and Melanchthon's writings in Italy. In 1522 the Sorbonne of the University of Paris also condemned Melanchthon's works. Until that denunciation, such writings of Melanchthon like his *De anima* enjoyed a healthy distribution in France.

**Influence on German Lutheran States**

As stated earlier, Melanchthon's plan for a secondary school system was widely copied. Besides those which were put into effect within the decade following the release of his suggestions, school codes throughout the rest of the century were modeled after his. Most notable was the school code of

---

3 Ibid., p. 109.

4 Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, p. 552.

Württemberg, drawn up by order of Duke Christopher in 1559, and sanctioned by the state diet in 1565. The code was modeled after the schools of Trotzendorf, Neander, and Sturm.

The Württemberg code was the first in Germany to outline a sequence embracing all three levels of education -- elementary, secondary, and the university. The first level, the "Teutsch" schools, consisted of the lowest grades. Girls and boys in separate classes were to learn reading, writing, religion, and sacred music, but no arithmetic. All work was to be done in the vernacular. The next rung consisted of what was known as "Partikular" schools, Lower Cloister schools, or Latin schools. In larger cities these would consist of five or six classes. In villages the students would meet in one class. In general the schools were to prepare the male students for the Upper Cloister, or Latin schools. At the ages twelve to fourteen, the most promising from the Lower schools would be chosen for these schools. These in turn prepared the boys for the University of Tübingen. Later the lower and upper Latin schools would be incorporated into what is now known as

---


7 Reisner, *op. cit.*, p. 430.
"Gymnasiums". For more than two hundred seventy years, until 1832, the organization outlined in this code remained in force.\footnote{Barnard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 292.} The Saxon School Code of 1560 (improved in 1580) is almost an exact duplicate of the Württemberg plan.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 293-5.} The states of Hesse in 1565 and Brandenberg at an earlier date adopted similar school laws. All recognized and provided for the classification, inspection, and support of public schools, according to plans that remained in effect into the nineteenth century.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 511-2.}

\textbf{Influence on Sturm's Strasbourg School}

Did Melanchthon influence Johann Sturm (1506-1589) whose academy at Strasbourg won world-wide acclaim? Sturm, like Melanchthon, believed that the purpose of education was to train the young in a wise and eloquent piety. But he did not share Melanchton's radically new concept concerning factual knowledge; he thought of Latin only as a means of communicating, not as a tool for creative writing.\footnote{Bolgar, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 350-1.} However, he, like Me-

\footnote{Monroe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 433.}
lanchthon, believed that to master a subject, one had to know its nature and its accompanying rules. One had to perfect oneself through exercise and imitation.\textsuperscript{13} Manschreck claims that Sturm and Melanchthon corresponded.\textsuperscript{14} Monroe writes that Sturm corresponded with both Ascham and Melanchthon.\textsuperscript{15} Hartfelder states that Melanchthon began corresponding with Sturm in 1534 while Sturm was still in Paris. Sturm had asked him to accept Francis I's invitation to come to Paris to discuss the Reformation movement. In 1535 Melanchthon recommended Sturm for a position at either Augsburg or Tübingen. Later in 1556, Sturm asked Melanchthon to come to Strasbourg as a Lecturer in Theology.\textsuperscript{16} The letters imply that both admired each other's work. Surely they must have exchanged ideas.

\textbf{Influence on the Jesuit Schools}

Did Melanchthon influence the Jesuits? Hay claims that he taught much to the Jesuits, especially that conscious system

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Gilbert, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 78.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Interview with Dr. Clyde Manschreck, March 14, 1972.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Monroe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 392.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Hartfelder, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 149-50.
\end{itemize}
was essential to an efficient school. One can conjecture, also, that indirectly through Sturm Melanchthon did influence the Jesuit school system. Farrington, Mertz, and Monroe all claim that the Jesuits were influenced by Sturm and his academy. Raumer states that the Jesuits used emulation like Sturm did in his school and that their organization, books, and regulations were similar to Sturm's. To be sure, Sturm himself thought the Jesuit system similar to his. The Jesuits, Sturm, and Melanchthon all had in fact such common predecessors as the Brethren of the Common Life whose principles they copied. As revealed in the section treating Melanchthon's work in religion, the Jesuits knew Melanchthon fairly well and respected him. They must surely have known of his work with the secondary schools and with the universities.

17 Hay, op. cit., p. 424.


After seeing the effects of his labors, they must probably have studied his educational programs, since -- as many historians testify -- humanism knew no religious bonds. It is safe to conclude that Melanchthon did influence the Jesuit school movement.

**Influence on the Development of Classical Studies on the Secondary and University Levels**

Though Philip Melanchthon died in 1560, his ideas concerning eloquence, the classics, and the use of Latin are felt to this present day in the German schools. His method of instruction was continued by Trotzendorf, Sturm, and Neander. Their successors, Wolfgang Ratich, Christopher Helwig, and Amos Comenius built on their ideas, basing their own writings and courses of instruction partly on their predecessors' philosophies.21

Other states continued to imitate Melanchthon's school plan. In the early seventeenth century Weimar, Hesse-Darmstadt, Mecklenberg, Holstein, and other German states adopted similar ordinances. In 1619 the city of Weimar adopted a similar plan, with one important difference -- girls were allowed to remain in school from their sixth through twelfth year. In 1642 Duke

Ernst of Gotha adopted a plan similar to the Württemberg ordinance of 1559, with again, one addition -- arithmetic was required. The ordinance stipulated that children from five years old and older had to attend, under penalty of a fine, every day of the ten month long school year. 22

The Thirty Years War caused some set backs, however. The Prussian school system, first begun in 1648, was more political than religious. Not until the eighteenth century was any real progress made. In 1724 girls as well as boys were allowed to attend the secondary schools in Saxony and Württemberg. By 1733 all children five to fourteen years of age had to attend school. 23

The classical gymnasium remained the sole secondary school until 1747, when Hecker, a pupil of Francke, established the first "Real Schule" or non-classical secondary school at Berlin. 24 In 1874 the gymnasium was still going strong. It was also known as the Pro-gymnasia and Lyceum in Württemberg and Baden, the Latin School in Bavaria and Württemberg, and either

22 Monroe, op. cit., pp. 434-5.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., p. 498.
Paedogogia or Seminary in Baden. The Real schools, now known also as "Higher Burgher Schools", were gaining popularity. In some cases the Real Schools and the Gymnasiums were combined, sharing the two or three lower classes in common, but branching off after that into two distinct courses.  

By 1900 the gymnasium had still not deviated much from the course of study advocated by Melanchthon and the sixteenth century humanists. Of the 252 total hours of instruction per week, sixty-two were devoted to Latin, thirty-six to Greek, and nineteen to religion. However, the gymnasium's goal by 1900 was the formation of the mind and taste through the reading of the ancients. It no longer stressed imitation for the sake of communication, piety, and eloquence. In 1900 Paulsen was highly critical of the amount of time spent on reading the classics. He felt that if all the writings of the ancients would suddenly disappear, mathematics, natural science, law, philosophy, and theology would not suffer in any way. Still, in 1900 the gymnasium was the only path to the university, a situation which would not be remedied until the twentieth century.  


Professor Nathaniel T. Allen, a principal of a school at West Newton, Massachusetts, in 1874 condemned the German school system. He claimed its main aim was to perpetuate a despotic government by making students into faithful, contented subjects of a sovereign in whom was invested all power and liberty to express thought. Furthermore, he claimed the system's purpose was to perpetuate the status quo. Though it did foster a class system in which there was no way for a common burgher or farmer to move up, the gymnasium system did have the advantage that its qualifications were the same throughout Germany. A gymnasium graduate was qualified to enter any university in Germany. After the Real schools were begun, authorities kept them in separate buildings (except in smaller towns, as stated earlier) in order to allow better concentration on subject matter.

Early development of German, as well as French, secondary schools forecast the later development in those particular countries of taking all the undergraduate work away from the universities and placing it in the secondary schools. The


The English did not copy this continental trend. There undergraduate work remained on the university level. The American colonies, of course, followed the English precedent. Melanchthon's division of subject matter and texts to be used in the sixteenth century created waves still felt in the nineteenth century.

Melanchthon and the humanists gave Latin a tremendous push, too. However, already in 1654 Latin slipped a little when the Frankfort ordinance declared that Latin should no longer be treated as a second mother tongue. It was from then on to be learned through German. The Mark Grammar mentioned earlier featured Latin being learned through German. After this Latin began to slip ever so slightly. It began to be needed less and less for study or for diplomacy. One result of the seventeenth century scientific revolution was that the ancients' Latin texts were no longer authoritative in many areas. Since the ancients' ideas that still held water were firmly incorporated in the medical, mathematical and scientific systems, they could add no new light to even today's knowledge. Only in

29 Reisner, op. cit., p. 474.

30 Barnard, op. cit., p. 301.
philosophy and law have the ancients not been superceded. 31
By the mid-seventeenth century, because of the increasing in-
fluence of the French court circles, French language and lit-
erature forced Latin from its throne. The only complaints
heard came from the professors of rhetoric. 32

In 1912 classicists sought to restore the classical
curriculum to what they believed was its proper position. They
advocated it for pure scholarship. One could study the ancient
writers in order to get an understanding of their civilization,
or one could get knowledge simply for the sake of knowledge.
One could study the classics for the sake of literature, or art,
but not just for the sake of the classical language itself. 33
Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the emphasis on the
classics was still reflected in the Arbitur, or graduate, ex-


32 Paulsen, The German Universities: Their Character and
Historical Development, p. 54.

33 John Adams, "Humanism and the Growing Dominance of
Classical Studies in 'Modern' Education," B. Representative
Catholic Statements, Wm. J. McGucken, ed. Readings in the Foun-
dation of Education, Vol. II. Harold Rugg, general editor (New
York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941), p. 65.
Classical education was not a panacea even in Melanchthon's day. The need for some other type of education other than that offered by the gymnasium - university system was noticeable even then. The Obere Schule at Nuremberg, for instance, was never too successful because it did not fulfill a need. Melanchthon relied on the wealth of the German merchants of the southwest for support. But these same merchants sent their sons after only one or two years of training at the Obere Schule to Switzerland, England, Venice, or Bruges to learn the great commercial languages. Their aim was commerce and wealth -- not a classical education. For most middle class people a humanist education required ten years of schooling to be effective. Most businessmen wanted their sons in a trade by the time they were fourteen. Only exceptional children, capable of entering one of the professions, were allowed a longer education. Because Western Europe outside of Italy just did not have enough rich who could afford this type of education, only larger schools, organized in the more important larger cities like Vienna, Strasbourg, or Bordeaux lasted. The burghers

---

34 Barnard, op. cit., p. 656.

instead sent their children to the writing and counting schools which had sprung up throughout the larger German cities to learn this knowledge more practical for them.  

Doctrinal struggles did not help the educational situation either. The disputes of the last half of the sixteenth century tended to accent more and more the uniformity and conduct stressed in the school codes. The Thirty Years War which accompanied the beginning of the seventeenth century spelled more disaster for education. In general, schools were in the decline. Manschreck claims that both the Catholic and Calvinist influences caused the German universities to suffer greatly, as they went from Biblical theology to a new kind of scholastic dogmatics, perpetuated on the most part by the ultra-Lutherans, as a reaction to the anti-Melanchthon feeling of the time. By the seventeenth century, Manschreck believes, the schools were out of touch with reality.

Paulsen labels Melanchthon's work with the universities as part of the first of three great periods in German university history. The first period Paulsen labels the "Period of


Denominational Universities". During this era the universities were controlled by the established churches and characterized by the predominance of theological and denominational interests. The theological faculty was the most important one. This period lasted until the end of the seventeenth century. The second period he calls the "Period of Invasion of Modern Philosophy and Culture". The philosophy and law faculties were now most important, with Halle and Goettingen the new centers of thought. This period embraced the eighteenth century. The third Paulsen labels the "Period of Greatest Influence of German Universities". Lasting throughout the nineteenth century, first philosophy, then science were accented. Most influential were first the philosophy faculty, and afterwards the medical faculty. After the set-backs of the early seventeenth century, the German universities regained their former greatness by the end of the nineteenth century.

In modern Germany Melanchthon's influence is felt only indirectly through the gymnasiums of West Germany that have been restored after near extermination by the Nazis. Today there are three types of gymnasia -- the humanistic,

38 Paulsen, The German Universities: Their Character and Historical Development., pp. 43-4.
the scientific, and the modern language. The Humanistic or Classical Gymnasium is the one surviving from Melanchthon's time. Latin, Greek, and one modern language are required to be taken by all. The Modern Language Gymnasium faintly echoes Melanchthon, still stressing Latin, but requiring two modern languages too. The Scientific Gymnasium requires two modern languages plus mathematics and science. A fourth type, the Wirtschaftsgymnasium, comprises the last three years of the gymnasium, stresses economics and business administration, and offers two modern languages. This gymnasium opens the pathway to higher studies in economics and social sciences. West Germany offers a host of other vocational schools, both full time and part time. Since World War II a new institution, the Kolleg, which is roughly equivalent to the American Junior College, has offered three year courses enabling students to pass the Arbitur examinations, the key to higher education. Most schools are public and therefore free. Most are also not co-educational. In the 1959-60 school year 861,166 students were enrolled in the various gymnasia, or about twelve percent of those who age-wise would had been eligible to enroll. The rest of the

children who graduated from the fourth grade of the Grundschule section of the Volkschule either continued in the upper section, or Hauptschule, or went into the Real-schule which would have given them passage into either the upper grades of the gymnasium, the Kolleg, the college of Engineering, the technical schools, or the professional schools immediately below the university level. In Communist controlled East Germany the classical Gymnasium has been eliminated, having been replaced by the Ten and Twelve Year Polytechnical Schools, on the order of those of the Soviet system. The only segment of Melanchthon's educational philosophy that one could argue still remains in East Germany might be his stress on utility of subject matter, a principle the Russians would agree with.

Did Melanchthon influence education in any other European countries? In general all the western and northern European countries had similar classical secondary school-university systems, evolved from the Medieval - Humanist eras. Many of these were derivations from the type of school Groote and


Cele founded. In other words, Melanchthon in Germany and the various schools of France, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, and even England had common ancestors. Melanchthon's textbooks undoubtedly found their way into many of these schools, especially during his time when Latin was treated as a first language. Educators in the Lutheran Scandinavian countries and Lutheran areas of the Netherlands probably studied Melanchthon's *Visititation articles*. As an example, Buigenhagen's school code for the North German states, as related earlier, placed the University of Copenhagen at the top.

Painter states that the Trivial School plan as presented by Melanchthon became the mode of education also in England and America. English secondary schools developed independently throughout the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Again, outside of the possibility of an interchange of ideas among sixteenth century humanist educators, one has no evidence of any direct influence on the part of Melanchthon on the English school system. It has been established that

---


Henry VIII knew of Melanchthon. It is possible that he may have taken Melanchthon's principles into account when he removed the English schools from Roman Catholic influence during the English reformation.

According to Graves, John Milton while in his thirties conducted an academy or boarding school in which he tried to establish a course of study with broad humanistic contents. His was mostly an education of books with a heavy work load for his pupils. Though we have no proof of any direct Melanchthon influence, Milton's stress on a strong training in Latin and Greek, teaching agriculture through Latin and natural history and geography through Greek, echoes generally Melanchthon's ideas. Other English educators of the seventeenth century started academies, following Milton's ideas.

Among nineteenth century educators, John Henry Cardinal Newman stressed the importance of the university as a place for a universal, not specialized education. He defended the study of the classics because they had helped found a common culture in Europe. Though he was attacked by those who could not see the utility of classical learning, labeling his educa-

---

tion one for gentlemen, Newman adhered to his beliefs, feeling education was basically for mental formation, not for fact dispensing. Again, though we have no proof that Newman studied Melanchthon's writings, he did foster ideas similar to his and so did perpetuate humanist and Melanchthonian influence in England. That Melanchthon's writings, especially those concerning logic and religion, were known in England has already been established.

Melanchthon influenced American education only indirectly. The original American grammar school was really the English public school transplanted into Colonial soil. It brought with it all the principles of education of its English predecessors. The Saxon Lutherans who settled in Missouri in 1839 founded a college whose curriculum was patterned after that of the German gymnasium. In 1869 the members of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, which had been founded by the Saxon Lutherans in 1847, founded a Protestant gymnasium

---


46 Monroe, op. cit., p. 395.
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in Milwaukee. It, as well as the Synod's early preparatory schools were modeled after German gymnasiaums, because its founders had received their education in similar schools.

The Lutherans were only representative of what other denominations of the other nationalities were doing. During the early nineteenth century various denominations founded colleges throughout the United States east of the Mississippi River. Like the earlier Calvinist New England colleges, most of these maintained classical curriculums, a pattern which lasted throughout most of the early two-thirds of the century, bolstered by the Yale Report of 1828 which strengthened the cause of the traditional curriculum. Like the Missouri Lutheran experiment, other denominations and universities also started academies, or college connected preparatory departments, which again emphasized the classical curriculum.


50 Ibid., pp. 24-5, 110-35.
Under the nineteenth century influence of the German Universities, American universities like Syracuse looked to the existing preparatory academies as gymnasia to feed students into the university. Jesuit education in nineteenth century America perpetuated the classical curriculum too. The story of American education, both on the secondary and university level, in private as well as public schools, is the story of the eventual decline of the humanist classical curriculum. In all of this Melanchthon is only indirectly responsible. Through his advocation of a classics-centered curriculum at a time when education was at one of its historic crossroads, his influence helped determine the curriculum to be adopted for the immediate needs. That this curriculum or variations of it lasted for so many centuries reflects not only the worth of the curriculum itself, but the faith of succeeding generations in Melanchthon's judgement.

The Continuing Debate on the Value of a Classical Education

Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries edu-

51 Ibid., pp. 272, 281-3.
52 Ibid., pp. 296-7.
cutors have debated the value of a classical curriculum. In 1856, David Cole, principal of a Trenton, New Jersey, high school declared the classical education of languages to be good. It helped the student to think for himself, he claimed. Latin gave one power, he continued. The study of languages is the study of the mind. Language is a storehouse for thought, he believed. In answer to the question, "Are classical scholars good for anything else?", he answered "Yes," citing Webster and Everett as examples.

In 1867 England's Henry Sedgwick felt that classical education was not that important since other branches of learning could impart the knowledges or disciplines that the classics were to give. Natural Science, for instance, could satisfy one's curiosity, while history and literature both could give one knowledge of the ancient world. E. E. Bowen did not go along with Melanchthon's idea that abstract grammar rules should be taught first. He believed that one learned

---


language by reading. Grammar, he admitted was a good practicing ground for logic, but it was not the only one. Some logic exercise books did the job better, he claimed. One should teach through good teaching, he continued. Guidance, tone, manner, and versatile oral teaching produce better results than the required memorizing of textbooks.\(^5\)\(^5\)

Lord Houghton, though he stated that classical studies should be maintained, found little practical use for it except by a learned class, which he felt could do little harm to the country. Latin no longer helped one remember, he claimed. Lawyers and clergy had no longer any need for classical studies in their daily lives. French should be studied today, he claimed, because it is the language of European society. The newly discovered Eastern cultures should replace Latin and Greek, he concluded, because they are just as important.\(^5\)\(^6\) J. W. Hales felt that English should be given precedence over the classical languages. English, which was


not in the curriculum of England's secondary schools at the time, should be taught, he maintained.

In 1917 R. W. Livingstone defended classical education. He cited the greatness of modern Germany, which had come to prominence through leaders whose education had a Latin and Greek classical background. He quoted professors of a technical high school at Karlsruhe who declared that the systematic study of Latin as a school discipline was of the highest value for engineers, botanists, zoologists, chemists, and physicists. He cited Germany's paradox -- the highest attainment in science was accomplished by a nation whose secondary education physical science was in a subordinate position to the classics. He maintained that the humanities trained flexible, sympathetic minds. Physical sciences, on the other hand, left the mind inflexible, unsympathetic, unimaginative, and undeveloped. Furthermore, he advocated Greek study because its thoughts were excellent, enduring, and influential. Greek literature is superior to English, he continued. Though English has more quality and range, Greek is more eloquent.

---

57

He advocated Latin as a medium for well expressed thoughts and sentences. The classics in general would allow students to study the problems of contemporary life without using contemporary authors. It would give students independent standards to judge themselves. One could even study the parallels between modern and ancient thought. One should not drop the classics, Livingstone stated. One should rather get good, intelligent teachers who would be more methodical and interesting and who would regard the classics as living -- not dead -- things.

As late as 1964 Maurice Bowra stated that schools dealing in specialized subjects could not succeed without paying attention to subjects which are usually in the domain of the liberal arts college, the successor of the classical college. One still needed fully educated men who could take an active part in a civilized society and who still would be reasonably complete human beings. Renaissance educators and modern educators have the same goal -- to make the most of a man's natural capacities. That is what is owed him as a human

---

being, Bowra believed. 59

The liberal arts college should teach communication through the correct use of words, Bowra continued. Man should learn to think and to be curious. The humanities can satisfy both of these requirements. Bowra believed that subjects looked upon now as purely theoretical could become useful; that subjects remote in their nature could, because of their remoteness, help us to take a fresh look at our own world; and that the humanities could prepare our inner life, irrespective of our activities as a citizen or of our jobs. Bowra too cited the dangers of modern specialization.

William De Vane believed the American equivalent to the gymnasium to be a two year extension of the high school or the junior college. The latter at present is not equipped to stimulate the liberal mind as much as it should. DeVane would change this, making the junior college the feeder to the uni-


60 Ibid., pp. 188-194.
versity where specialization would first take place. Schuster seconded De Vane's suggestions, adding that the liberal arts colleges should busy themselves with the problem of "being" in both its wider and narrower senses.

In the background of this continuous debate concerning languages, classical studies, the humanities, and the liberal arts college, one hears the voice of Rousseau reciting passages from his *Emile*, and the echoes of Basedau and Pestalozzi, all of whom did their share to point out the evils of traditional education, stimulating reaction against classical education. Usually forgotten in these discussions is the fact that Melanchthon designed a curriculum which was the most practical for the needs of his time. Never taken into consideration is the idea that perhaps Melanchthon would have designed a different curriculum had the requirements of the time proved different. In our final section we will speculate on this point.


63 Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

As stated in the introduction, this dissertation investigated the life and writings of Philip Melanchthon to isolate the aspects of his life that show the evolution of his educational thoughts and his distinctive contributions to education. The aim of this writer, therefore, is to show that Melanchthon, a humanist whose career in education led him into the service of the Lutheran reformers, advanced the cause of education through his own brilliant teachings, through the text books he wrote, through the schools and school systems he either organized or reorganized, and through the advice and assistance he gave to other educators.

Part I surveyed Philip Melanchthon's life, education, and career. Chapter One revealed Melanchthon's family background, his career at Wittenberg, and his work as a Lutheran reformer. Melanchthon's parents were pious, honest, and deeply religious. His grand uncle was the famous humanist Hebrew scholar, Johann Reuchlin. Melanchthon received his secondary education at a humanistic Latin school at Pforzheim. He attended the University of Heidelberg, where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree, and the University of Tübingen, where he earned his Masters of Arts degree. At all three
schools he was exposed to humanistic influences. By the time he accepted the call to Wittenberg, Melanchthon was a thorough humanist. At Wittenberg Philip Melanchthon came under the influence of Dr. Martin Luther. In addition to his teaching chores, Melanchthon worked for the Lutheran Reformation movement.

In surveying Melanchthon's private life in Chapter Two, the author of this paper found Melanchthon to be a sincere, dedicated, quiet scholar who -- though plagued by personal problems and public theological disputes -- continued faithfully with his tasks. In Chapter Three, Melanchthon's work as a reformer was reviewed. Besides writing various religious documents stating the Lutheran position in theology, Melanchthon participated in many of the doctrinal disputations and inter-faith meetings called by the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Any problems concerning education usually were handled by Melanchthon. After Luther died, Philip Melanchthon, who became the titular head of Lutheranism, found himself the center of many doctrinal disputes. Nevertheless, he continued to carry on Luther's work until he too died.

Melanchthon's philosophies concerning religion, history, and education were surveyed in Part Two. All three were influenced by scholasticism, humanism, and the new Lutheran
theology. Especially in religion and education was the influence of both Luther and Erasmus felt. In Chapter Four Melanchthon's distrust of the Scholastics and the obscure mistranslations of Aristotle is traced. Luther's influence specifically and the Reformation influence generally are also examined. As an Erasmian humanist already dissatisfied with many of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, Melanchthon saw in Luther's teachings the correct religion. Melanchthon and Luther's personalities complemented each other. Together the two made an unbeatable team for the cause of the new religion. Melanchthon did not agree completely with all that Luther believed. Toward the end of his life, Melanchthon differed more and more with Luther on the concepts of "predestination" and "free will." Melanchthon wrote many religious speeches, tracts, and statements of faith. His most famous book on theology is his *Loci communes*. His most famous religious writings are the *Augsburg Confession* and the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*.

In Chapter Five Melanchthon's ideas on history are analyzed. Though typically humanist in content, they reflect Melanchthon's belief in divine intervention. Besides writing many declamations on history, Melanchthon wrote one book, the *Chronik Carions*. Originally written by a Professor Carion,
Melanchthon revised and rewrote this history of the world up to and including the time of Charles V. Philip Melanchthon not only generally advocated the study of history but also recommended the reading of several specific books on history.

Chapters Six through Eight survey Melanchthon's views on education. Philip Melanchthon was a Christian Humanist who developed a method of teaching based on Aristotle's method as interpreted and developed by Rudolf Agricola, the first influential German humanist. Seeking to alleviate education from errors he believed the Scholastics had made, Melanchthon devised a method of learning based on Aristotle's, which was applicable to logic specifically and learning generally. He believed, like other humanists of the time, that an exact knowledge of grammar was a necessary pre-requisite to any other knowledge. Since Latin was the language of the schools at his time, a good knowledge of Latin was a necessity. Like other humanists, he turned to the classical writers of antiquity for examples of good writing and speech.

Melanchthon differed from his contemporaries in that he wanted his students to read the classics for acquisition of both knowledge and style. Besides eloquence he stressed utility. He believed in rules, repetition, and examples as teaching aids. Subject matter, he felt, should be made as
clear as possible for the students. Furthermore, he believed that students should follow a certain order in the selection of subject matter, keeping goals firmly in mind. The influence of religion on Melanchthon can be seen in his stress on piety as a third end of education and in his choice of and editing of the classical authors.

Melanchthon believed that good, conscientious, Christian teachers were necessary for effective teaching. Since adequate salaries were necessary for the mental as well as physical health of the teachers, he felt it was the duty of the state officials to provide them. Because education was necessary for the perpetuation of Christ's church on earth, both church and state must see that good schools are maintained and good teachers kept. Melanchthon, generally speaking, was disenchanted with the secondary schools and the universities at the time of the Reformation.

Though he was dissatisfied with conditions in education, he did not feel that all should be tossed aside. In general, he kept what he considered good and replaced the bad. The elements of the traditional university course of study, the Trivium and the Quadrivium, he kept.

Chapter Nine concludes the section with a review of the various books in education which Melanchthon either wrote or
published. Because of their clarity and good organization, many of his text books, especially those covering Latin grammar and logic, remained popular for centuries. Important too are the Visitation Papers which outlined the basic requirements for the Latin secondary schools to be organized or reorganized in Lutheran Saxony.

In Part Three Melanchthon's work with the German schools is detailed. After reviewing in Chapter Ten Melanchthon's qualities as a teacher and rector who at all times kept his students' interests first in mind, and as a professor who was always of assistance to his colleagues, the study traces in Chapter Eleven Melanchthon's endeavors in organizing the Latin Schools first in Protestant Saxony and later in other Lutheran lands according to the Christian humanist principles inherent in his own philosophy of education. Next Melanchthon's labors in organizing and reorganizing the universities in Lutheran lands according to Protestant - Humanistic principles which both he and Luther advocated is recorded in Chapter Twelve. In all his work -- as teacher, organizer, and adviser -- his Christianity and Aristotelian humanism is reflected.

Part Four treated Melanchthon's place in the history of western education. After reviewing Melanchthon's influence
on his contemporaries and immediate successors, the author showed in Chapter Thirteen how Melanchthon's project, the Latin school, slowly declined in popularity as the centuries passed, being replaced more and more by the Real school in Germany and by specialized instruction in non-classical areas in America. The writer concluded by showing that even today Melanchthon's ideas still find favor among the proponents of the liberal arts.

Conclusions

We have come now to that final task -- the judgement of Melanchthon's work. Dare we in the twentieth century look back toward him and pass judgement? And if we do, what will be our standards? Will we judge him as a Christian educator or as a humanistic innovator of new ideas? Let us begin with humanism.

Over the succeeding centuries since humanism had reached its zenith in popularity, critics of the classical curriculum have chipped away at the monument of honor once dedicated to it. In our modern day we sometimes forget that at its inception humanism was a vital force which helped lift learning and scholarship out of what many considered to be the chaos of medieval Scholasticism. As Kristeller had pointed out, humanists performed a vital function in restoring original sources, creating better Latin translations, and editing older
manuscripts in order to produce the best possible texts. Humanists in various European countries from England to Germany and Italy continued in these endeavors even after the flames of the Reformation had died down. Humanists, of course, have been chastised for placing all their faith in the ancient authorities as their medieval predecessors had done. What most forget, however, is that the scholarship they fostered help set the conditions which made the scientific study of the succeeding generations so successful.

Also forgotten is that for its time the humanistic curriculum was the most practical course of study. Since Latin was the language of education, it was vitally important that those engaged in scholarship should have a good practical knowledge of its contents and use. Just as French later became the language of literature, German still later became the language of science and engineering, and English still much later became the language of business and diplomacy, so Latin was at that time the indispensable tool of the theologian, lawyer, and statesman.

As time passed and Latin no longer was as greatly needed except in the fields of medicine and other highly specialized studies, the classical writings of the ancients still maintained their position, especially in the fields of theology
and philosophy. For Melanchthon the classics were important for they were the keys to logic, rhetoric, and moral teaching. Even in his time, however, many could not see this need, including at first Martin Luther. It was he who removed the classics from the throne on which the Scholastics and humanists had placed them, replacing them with theology. Melanchthon feared this trend, especially as typified by the extreme Anabaptists. He feared a return to the barbarity of the Dark Ages. A theology without knowledge was to him blind, no better than that of the Scholastics, whose theology Luther had cast out.\(^1\) It was fortunate for Melanchthon and the humanists that Luther respected Melanchthon's opinions and went along with his ideas, thereby superimposing humanism on Protestantism, setting a precedent followed by Calvin and succeeding generations of both Protestants and Catholics.

By the time of Melanchthon's death, German humanism as an active force had about run its course. It was Melanchthon and his students who kept the classics alive by stressing their utility as an ideal building material for the youth. As time passed, the classics more and more became objects to be studied

---

1 Hartfelder, op. cit., pp. 543 and 546.
in the school rooms and in intellectual circles. And as the centuries passed, the argument as to their practicability became louder and louder.

Bolgar forwards classical studies today for three reasons: one, to study man through sociology or anthropology, using an ancient civilization rather than a remote contemporary civilization as subject matter; two, for aesthetic interest; and three, for cultural interest, in which one studies the culture of the writer who had interpreted the past. Bolgar feels that modern classical scholars never get as far as the humanists did. Because they usually do not get past the tedious beginnings of grammar, scholars never do get to the research stage.

Bolgar argues that the classics have a place in education today. Modern specialization by factories and organizations have de-emphasized man by making him a subordinate part of the organization. Because men are now part of huge organizations turning out minute items covering only a small part of a consumer's life, they have been de-humanized. Bolgar calls this the "ethics of fragmentation." The traditional arts cur-

---


riculum, which evolved from the humanist classical curriculum, instills a view of life which respects individual responsibility and the individual bringing together of the various facets of human experience. This traditional arts curriculum is therefore in competition with those curriculums accenting specialization. While modern technology does not concern itself with ethical postulations, and science, in its disinterested search for truth, does not care about the personal needs of those involved in the searching, remaining neutral in the battles which the older disciplines such as philosophy, law, and theology cannot avoid, humanism, Bolgar maintains, stands in the closest association with the newer needs and impulses begotten by these newer trends which sought to destroy it. 

Melanchthon in his day recognized the students' rush to their specialized, narrow goals, which in his day was the world of commerce, law, government, medicine, and theology. Just as in today's world parents feel the extra time spent on liberal arts subjects to be a burden which they would like to eliminate in order to shorten the course of study by several semesters without hurting their children's development in

---

their vocational goals, so in Melanchthon's time, students tried to enter their specialized area of study with a minimum amount of study in the philosophical faculty. The same had held true for Melanchthon's predecessors, Agricola and Wimpffeling. 5 Melanchthon's own background gave him the answer to this problem. Already at Tübingen, and later at Wittenberg, he furthered himself in all areas of study, working toward a universal education. Though he served on two faculties, philosophy and theology, he contributed much to the other two, law and medicine.

Bolgar claims that Melanchthon came very close to advancing the argument which must always remain at the most bona fide defence of non-specialized literary studies. Melanchthon implied that life itself was too complex to be described in terms of special areas. If one wanted to learn how a society lived, one had to add to the information received from economists, sociologists, and historians by reading that society's literature. Only in it could one discover how a people felt and behaved in their daily struggles which make up the sum of


human experience.\(^7\) Therefore a liberal arts course is indis-

pensable for complete knowledge, especially in today's imperson-

al age of specialization.

Melanchthon was a living example of this philosophy. It was through his efforts that the philosophical faculty be-

came firmly entrenched in Protestant universities as the course preparatory to the specialized areas of learning. One can only conjecture how Luther alone would have organized Wit-

tenberg. Would he have allowed a study of the classics to precede a study of the Bible? Would he have stressed rheto-

ric and logic as much as Melanchthon did? As Bolgar states, there was no branch of study which Luther desired consciously or unconsciously to popularize or preserve. Whatever would serve God and country best is what he wanted.\(^8\) Because it was Melanchthon who gave him the suggestions, backing them up with sound reasoning, Luther followed a humanistic course.

This merger of Protestantism and humanism has been responsible for the growth and leadership of the German Pro-

testant universities in the decades following Melanchthon.

\(^7\) Bolgar, op. cit., p. 347.

\(^8\) Ibid., pp. 342-3.
According to Manschreck, Dollinger, a Roman Catholic historian, credits Melanchthon for enabling Protestants to use the treasures of classical culture, stating that he was the literary head of a mighty cause, richly endowed with classical learning, facility of expression, versatility of composition, and untiring industry.  

But to judge Melanchthon merely as a classicist who helped the cause of Protestantism would not be giving him his due credit as an educator. True, Melanchthon's philosophy of education was influenced by his humanistic background. Piety, utility, eloquence, and clarity were the key words of his philosophy. Piety was an outgrowth of his Christian background, tempered by the Reformation movement. Eloquence was an ideal shared by all humanists. The concept of utility he inherited from Rudolph Agricola. He sought clarity as a result of his practical experiences in teaching. He fervently believed that instruction should be clear to the students, and in turn, students should be able to state their ideas clearly in speech and writing.

How can we judge the effectiveness of Melanchthon's work? One can not judge it by twentieth century standards and

---

pronounce such judgments as "it was outmoded even at its time" or "could not he see that he would straight-jacket education for centuries through his insistence on Latin, the classics, disputations, and the lecture as teaching tools?" Should we condemn him for not accepting Coepernicus's theory or for believing too strongly in both astrology and God's personal direct involvement in man's life? Should we chastise him for not writing complete treatises on various subjects rather than just textbooks? Should we look down with horror on his inability to see that inquiry and investigation really should involve direct observation and experimentation, two concepts which even one hundred years after Melanchthon's death had not yet been accepted?

Perhaps we should take those four key words, place Melanchthon in the twentieth century, and speculate as to what he would do. Piety to Melanchthon was a result of religious and character education, which to him was one and the same. Meinhold claims modern man knows faith and character to be two different things. Christian belief and morality as well as the building of the heart and spirit are no longer considered identical. 10 Maybe Melanchthon would debate this point even

10 Meinhold, op. cit., p. 136.
today. Many modern educators, both religious and secular, do. Eloquence is still sought in many circles. Would Melanchthon stress it as much today as in 1530? Perhaps not, for today's needs do not require it of all. But clarity and utility are needed. And Philip Melanchthon, given the same intelligence and insight today as he had then, would certainly seek the most modern, effective, tried methods. He would, however, be quite wary of any new, untried procedures.

Should we judge him in comparison to his contemporaries? Bolgar rates Melanchthon's effectiveness as an educator on a scale with Erasmus, Sturm, and Mathurin Cordier (b. 1480), the four leading exponents of the "Pietas litterata", one of the three trends of sixteenth century humanism, the other two being modern scholarship and the emergence of the vernacular literatures. He places Erasmus lowest since, though he was the most zealous of the four, he was a theorist whose ideas were never applied as he systematized them, and therefore was the least practical of these educators. Melanchthon he places next because even though he was both a theorist and organizer, he had to make countless compromises in his organizing. Bolgar claims that what Melanchthon achieved in practice was only a pale shadow of what he had formulated in theory. Sturm he places above the two. Though Sturm was a less competent
thinker than either Erasmus or Melanchthon, yet he founded a very successful school, which served as a model for others, never equalled by his imitators. Bolgar places Cordier, a practical teacher with narrow interests, first because of his great influence through the schools in which he worked and the many textbooks which he wrote, some of which were still in use in the 1850's. 11

Should we judge him by his popularity? Students flocked to his classes, historians testify. The University of Wittenberg's student population rose from two hundred in pre-Melanchthon days to six hundred in 1520. 12 We could judge him by the immense popularity of his textbooks, which because of their usefullness ran through many editions over the years, being used by Catholic as well as Protestant schools and school systems, and serving as models for other authors' texts.

Some may say that Melanchthon really did not do anything too important. After all, the school system he advocated, the result of the first school survey in the history of world, had evolved over the preceding centuries; the teaching technique he proposed could be traced to his immediate pre-


12 Ledderhose, op. cit., pp. 35-6.
decessor, Rudolph Agricola, and to its roots in Aristotle; and many of his suggestions were really techniques and ideas fostered by contemporary humanists.

Perhaps we should consider the alternatives to Melanchthon's plan in order to judge its worth. Scholasticism would have left, at least in Luther's eyes, the church in the disorder in which it was originally. The Anabaptists had an answer -- no education. This would have left the Protestants with an unenlightened clergy and would possibly have thrown humanity back into the throes of the Dark Ages. A knowledge of the vernacular only would have helped the layman read the newly translated German Bible, but would not have helped produce any new church leaders. Higher education without the emphasis on the languages and the classics would have produced a narrow-minded, ill-experienced (education-wise), theologically bent clergy, who might never have been capable of defending its religious position or convincing anyone of its correctness.

We must judge Philip Melanchthon solely by his accomplishments. He did successfully blend humanism with Protestantism in his educational endeavors. As Hartfelder states, he was no creative genius. He was rather a gatherer, classifier, assimilator, and intellect. Planning and forming were
his specialities. He had the talent and background to do this well. Manschreck believes that Melanchthon won for Protestant Germany its ascendancy over Catholicism in education and culture. Paulsen states: "German philosophy and science, German literature and culture grew up in the soil of Protestantism, and they may be described as the result, although perhaps remote, of that spirit of freedom and independence of thought which the Reformation called into being."

Some Suggestions for Further Research

This paper has by no means exhausted the Melanchthon story. Correspondence between Melanchthon and his former students could be analyzed and the work of these ex-students in education could be studied to see to what extent Melanchthon's ideas were put into practice. It has been almost a century since someone has undertaken such a task. The era following Melanchthon's death until the beginning of the eighteenth century in German education could also be studied.

13 Hartfelder, op. cit., p. 551.

14 Manschreck, op. cit., p. 132.

15 Paulsen, The German Universities and University Study, p. 33.
Except for what we know concerning a few educators of the time, our knowledge of this subject matter is rather vague. Also, Melanchthon's Latin grammar text book could be contrasted with its predecessors, contemporaries, and successors to not only show its superior qualities or why it eventually was discarded, but also to trace the whole history and philosophy of the teaching of Latin, originally as a first language and later as a second language. Although there have been general histories of the teaching of Latin written, little has been done in the area of analyzing and contrasting specific text books.

Kristeller states that the older European university libraries bulge with Latin manuscripts written by fifteenth and sixteenth humanists. Who knows which now silent volumes hold information vital to a better understanding of that era? Perhaps other humanists, whose contributions have become lost over the centuries, may be judged just as important and worthwhile as those of whom we know so much. Although the work of the Jesuits in education has been well-detailed, perhaps studies could be made of individual, lesser known Jesuit teachers and their schools, to see to what extent Jesuit philosophy reached the children in their charge.
Finally, much study has been made in the areas of religious and liberal arts education. More attention could be paid to the other two areas of graduate study - law and medicine. Someone could trace more exactly the history and the methods of the teaching of law and medicine in the medieval, Renaissance, and later eras. To what extent did humanism influence these two areas? Did Scholasticism continue to influence them throughout the Renaissance and Post-Renaissance eras?

There is much that can be studied in all of the areas mentioned. The author of this study will feel his goal has been reached if he has been able to focus just a little more attention on one who has done so much for education and yet has remained so relatively unknown -- Philip Melanchthon.
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