

flexible to lead to a variety of emendations and interpretations, forming a very suitable opportunity for oral discussion and combined work.¹ This was recog-

¹ "On a philosophical foundation Hermann appears to us as the φιλόλογος κατ' ἐξοχήν, as a philologist in the real sense of the word, i.e., as the propounder of the λόγος in its twofold and inseparable nature, *ratio* and *oratio*, thought and word in one; the former representing the inner, the latter the outer side of the activity which constitutes the essence of Mind. A thought becomes fully apparent only when it is spoken; the word without the full content of the thought is an empty sound. From this peculiarity of Hermann's nature, combined with his absolute truthfulness, there follows with psychological necessity his indifference towards everything that cannot be clearly thought and spoken, . . . and even out of this peculiarity there sprang with the same necessity the comprehensive conception which Hermann had of his science, and which he followed throughout. Language is to him the highest artistic production of the human mind; hence it appears, in spite of its natural origin, frequently as the result of conscious incisive thought. Thus voice and language are the picture of mind and life. Language exists, therefore, not only to be empirically used, but also to be rationally understood; it has its definite laws, which it is the object of science to discover in general and in detail. In this way Hermann conceived of language at a time when there could yet be no mention of a general science of language. The languages of the two civilised peoples of antiquity—foremost the language of the Greeks—are as such alone worthy of study, but still more so as the means of giving us an under-

standing of the greatest masters who have ever lived, for their written monuments are the greatest works of art which we possess; and they are, further, likewise the best—indeed, the only means by which we can understand also the other monuments; they alone speak to us; other monuments without them remain to us dumb. Thus the correct understanding and the thoroughgoing interpretation of the ancient authors is the main task of philology; criticism and exegesis are indissolubly united. . . . In this sense also Hermann is the model of the genuine philologist."—('Gottfried Hermann,' by H. Koechly (1874), p. 13, &c.) In the same sense a much later writer says: "There still remains what the nineteenth century, especially also in Germany, has considered to be the very kernel of philology—criticism and interpretation of authors. To this also has reference the much-lauded philological method, which came to be appraised as being the best preparation for all the mental sciences, just as formerly Latin used to be considered in the schools. . . . The belief in the possession of a method as an ever-ready sorcerer's wand was the most precious gift that the numerous pupils of Ritschl received from this teacher, whose fascinating personal activity can only be compared with that of Hermann. He who reads, e.g., Ritschl's 'Parerga' and Haupt's earliest 'Berlin Programmes' has indeed the sense of a quite peculiar confidence through a dialectic which certainly produces at times quite insignificant results; at times also such as have since been found to be erroneous. These writings will as