

How little the standpoint and the methods of pure criticism are able to deal with larger historical subjects is nowhere more visible than if we consider two historical works which have had a considerable influence and reputation outside of Germany; they themselves differ from each other greatly in their general character and in the historical conception of their authors. These two works are Theodor Mommsen's 'Roman History' and Ernst Curtius' 'Greek History.' I will deal first with the latter. Ernst Curtius (1814-96) was brought up under the influence of that conception of the task of philology which had been elaborated in the school of F. A. Wolf mainly by Böckh (1785-1867), Welcker (1784-1868), and Otfried Müller (1797-1840). The life-plan of the latter, to write a comprehensive history

42.
Ernst
Curtius.

whole of Niebuhr's conception regarding the sources of the Republican History of Rome "can, of course, not really be proved, but that it is supported by the analogy of German and Italian Chronicles, the development of the Florentine Chronicles especially serving as an example" (Wachsmuth, *loc. cit.*, p. 30). And Wilamowitz (in *Lexis*, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 464) says: "Niebuhr's greatness lay, certainly not in his Roman History, which he did not continue beyond the age about which no real history can be written; it lay rather in this that he, for the first time, carried in his mind a comprehensive picture of the history of the old world, which, in spite of all the casualty of reports preserved or lost, he formed for himself out of the large connections of events and political forces." The same writer refers also to the overwhelming impression which must have been produced by

his Lectures on Ancient History at Bonn, where he exchanged the activity of statesmanship and diplomacy for that of a professorial chair. But Richard Garnett tells us ('Encyclopædia Britannica,' 9th ed., p. 493) that the notes of Niebuhr's Lectures on Ancient History and Geography "disappointed expectation," and "would not of themselves have made a great reputation." As to Ranke, I shall, in a later chapter, have an opportunity of dealing with the school of historiography which has arisen in Germany in opposition to what is termed the school of Ranke; here it may suffice to refer the reader to the careful analysis of Ranke's method in O. Lorenz's 'Die Geschichtswissenschaft,' vol. ii., 1891; also the Articles by W. Freytag on Ranke's 'Conception of History' in the 'Archiv für Systematische Philosophie,' vol. vi. p. 129, &c.; p. 311, &c.