

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

At N. Arûs the trap rock disappears and the road ascends a considerable hill of semi-crystalline limestone, passing Tel Tûrmûs, and then et-Tulaiyeh. At the latter village we found the governor of Sâfetâ with all his posse of ragamuffins, apparently making *caif*. Everywhere we are looked at with wonder, and often with suspicion. Franks have never been seen in these parts. From Tulaiyeh the water flows north and falls into the N. Abrosh which we crossed at a bridge of four arches—the name I failed to obtain. In Arrowsmith's map this river is placed *south* of N. Kebeer, which is a mistake. The distance between the two, by our road, is three hours' rapid riding—at least twelve miles. In twenty-five minutes from N. Abrosh is the first *karak* (division) of the village called Yesdiyeh—over the worst road I have met with out of Lebanon; twenty minutes more brought us to the second *karak* of Yesdiyeh, the inhabitants of which are Greeks and have a curious old church embowered among large oak trees. The third *karak* is fifteen minutes further, and here the sheikh of the whole resides. It being quite dark, and the road dangerous even by daylight, we pitched our tent in the yard of the sheikh—a surly, beastly looking Ansairiyeh, who gave us but a cold reception. From this to Burj Sâfetâ is one hour; to Tripoli, twelve hours; to Tortosa, six; and the same to Kulaet Husn.

Scattered over the fields to the north of Tulaiyeh, are boulders of a yellow siliceous rock, which are crowded with very curious fossils. They bear a striking resemblance to *cows' tongues*. I obtained one about a foot long, which can be compared to nothing else. These boulders are altogether foreign to the limestone rock of this region, and were probably transported from a distance. This however needs further examination.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE II.

THE STUDY OF GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT TIMES.

By Charles Siedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aurich, in the Kingdom of Hanover, now teacher of a private Classical School, Newton Centre, Ma.

AFTER the long, almost lethargic slumber following the storms of the Reformation, and interrupted, if we except political disturbances,

whose appeal was rather to the sword than the pen, only by a few schools of theology that are still doing battle together, there finally dawned forth as a necessary counterpart a new day. All things which had been considered as authentic and sacred till the middle of the preceding century were now made a subject of doubt; they were shaken to their foundations, and the question was asked whether these were still strong enough to bear the structure that was daily growing higher and heavier. On this occasion novelty had its peculiar attractions; the German fondness for all things foreign afforded a wide field to English and especially French influences, and it seemed as if the Rationalism of Kant, which was striving to establish itself in all branches of learning and life, in place of the old harmless and implicit trust in authority, were destined to extirpate and destroy this blind confidence, root and branch. Then came the French revolution, breaking in upon the world and its mechanism with such appalling power, that its vibrations will not soon cease to agitate the minds of men. In its front stalks Napoleon like a wasting demon with iron sceptre. The steps to the imperial throne which, after the example of the Byzantine emperors, he strove to rear, are red with blood; he stands forth alone in the night of his time, like a baleful meteor, and points towards the East, with threatening finger, to down-trodden humanity that lay and groaned at his feet. But the sun arose victorious here; the meteor vanished suddenly, as it had come; in its place a joyous dawn shone forth, only obscured by occasional driving clouds.

Amid such stupendous revolutions,—unexampled in extent and suddenness,—and their consequent changes, it is natural that individual elements should not at once come distinctly forth and act and react till they neutralized each other; they differ rather by almost imperceptible shades, and harmonize or conflict with one another in proportion to the greatness of their sympathies and antipathies. It is not the object of these remarks to show how this takes place in all the various relations of society; we shall content ourselves with showing the view in which Greek and Roman literature is regarded at the present day, as distinguished from former times. On the one side are the philologists of the old school, holding up the study of this literature in highways and byways, as the one thing needful for almost every man; on the other it is every day attacked with increasing zeal and violence; and decried not as merely useless, but as a positive incumbrance and hindrance to the problems the present age has to solve. Between the two extremes lie an infinite multitude of views; covenants and compromises are made upon concessions from which only a temporary truce can be extorted; the fire still glows

under the ashes, and soon bursts forth again at an unexpected moment, and the more the material that has gathered, the fiercer are the flames.

To estimate aright these conflicting opinions it is indispensably necessary to take a view of the past; for the past always forms the basis of the present. But since such a phenomenon as we are now considering is without a parallel in the history of the world; the language and literature of extinct nations maintaining such a high significance, and exercising such an important influence on life and culture as those of the Greeks and Romans have exerted on the whole western world; such a retrospect becomes doubly necessary if we would avoid the easy path of error, and do something more than blindly follow the loud brawlers on both sides, who launch forth assertions instead of proofs.

Rome had conquered the world; nothing remained then for her but to wrap herself in her shroud, for her dissolution was at hand. She had striven not to conciliate but to annihilate all national characteristics differing from her own, and though this daring attempt had failed in a few instances, as among the German nations, it had in the main succeeded. As soon as this vocation was fulfilled, she folded her hands and saw her domain divided into the Eastern and Western empires, and barbarians pour in to destroy all of her but her name.

The immediate consequence of her unbounded supremacy, was the successful attempt to thrust upon the conquered nations her language; a language whose perfection made it possible either wholly to suppress the national languages of the various provinces, or at least to throw them far in the back-ground. Had Herrman, the Cheruscan, not appeared on the stage, we should assuredly not have had the glorious German tongue, which still maintained its ground when the Latin had usurped sway, as the medium of communication among the learned.

We will direct our attention particularly to the middle ages. Christianity had chosen in the West the Latin language as its organ; yet the multitude of entirely new ideas it called forth, caused the language, already much corrupted under the emperors, to assume a garb altogether new, and in the course of time it bore hardly any resemblance to the old tongue. The efforts of the theologians to secure for Christianity the treasures of the Aristotelian philosophy which had been laid open by the Arabs, tended to the same end. The language thus built up on the foundations of the Latin, retains a general family resemblance to it only in a few external features. We cannot measure them both by the same rule, without doing to one or the other of them

the greatest injustice. *Quidditas*, *haecceitas*, *assitas*, and similar words are indeed *monstra* compared with Cicero's style ; in reality, however, they are not so, any more than *possibile* and *possibilitas* which too were unknown to Cicero ; they are rather the creations of a new mind ; but we must not imagine them to be Latin.

During the whole of the middle ages Greek was unknown, and when it was introduced into Germany by Reuchlin, (who went to Paris expressly to learn it,) and by his successors, the monks preached against it, declaring that the Devil, ever seeking the injury of man, had invented a new language, the Greek.

Under these circumstances ancient literature was passing into oblivion, and would have been lost, we may suppose, had not the eternal law of God's providence called forth a réaction. In Italy the restoration of learning began ; the Latin language was studied with ever increasing enthusiasm ; Italian literati, like Petrarch, went on distant and dangerous journeys to collect or copy manuscripts of the ancients. The Greeks—still polished and learned, like their ancestors,—who had been driven from Constantinople by their rude victors, found a welcome reception as teachers in schools and universities. Finally the art of printing was invented. The words on the leaf that the statue of Gutenberg in Strassburg holds spread out in its hand, are strikingly true : *Et la lumière fut* ; a noble inscription with which the defective Latin verses on the statue in Mainz are not to be compared.

Shortly before, the enthusiasm for Latin had passed to a singular extreme. Not only did the Ciceronians persuade themselves that everything, new and old, could and should be expressed in Cicero's terms,—Christ, to cite an instance, they called *Jupiter Optimus Maximus*,—but with the language they also exchanged the idea, and Christianity existed with the learned only in name ; Pope Leo the Tenth is said to have spoken of the "*fabulæ de Christo*," which brought much money into the church.

This new world, created with such mighty influences, was completed by the Reformation. But though its great author, Luther, elevated the German tongue by his translation of the Bible, to a degree that we should consider impossible, if we examined the language immediately before his day ; yet he was obliged like his fellow-laborers in the stupendous work, to retain the Latin as a means of communication with the learned, both in writing and speech ; for the scholars at the newly established universities spoke and wrote nothing but Latin, so that established tradition had its hallowed influence upon the great man : Latin had become the prevailing language in all church business ; and Luther had, besides, much to do with the Italians.

Still the language of Luther and the Reformers was far purer than that of the schoolmen of the middle ages, or rather the two admit of no comparison. Even Reuchlin's style is very harsh; his pupil Melancthon wrote best of all. We can see that the great moral revolution brought about by the Reformation was not without its effects even in this respect.

What is true of the prose of this age is true likewise of its poetry. Who has not heard of Petrus Lotichius Secundus, and his exquisite Latin elegies, so much admired by all true lovers of poetry? It was perhaps no loss to the fame of the young poet that he died at Heidelberg in the bloom of youth, in consequence of poison unintentionally administered to him in Italy. Burmann, the younger, edited these charming poems in two quarto volumes accompanied by learned annotations, in the style of an ancient classic; he calls Lotichius the phoenix of poets, which he really is.

But this period of advancement did not last long. The necessity of establishing the new science of theology, and the variety of philosophical systems occasioned a rapid corruption of style, in the same way that the German was corrupted by an intermixture of French. New ideas make new forms necessary, and in the philosophical writings of Leibnitz and Wolf we see almost a return to the scholastic Latinity. Notwithstanding all this, the shackles the Latin imposed were even at that time cumbersome to some, and they chose the French; Leibnitz, to name a familiar instance, wrote his *Theodicee* in that language.

On the whole, however, it was still considered absolutely necessary to learn the Latin for practical purposes; in the schools hardly anything but Latin was taught; it was made the duty of all rectors and teachers to train their pupils to speak it, and to adhere steadfastly to it as the language of conversation. But to prevent the former barbarisms from creeping in, collections of the more common ones were made of which we mention here only those of Goclenius, of the Dane Borrichius and Cellarius. Laurentius Valla, the Italian, in his *Elegantiae* and Dukerus de *Latinitate Ictorum* had a different end in view.

The case was everywhere the same as in Germany; only in Italy and France the national languages, being earlier developed and perfected, sooner maintained their proper rights. Du Thou (Thuanus) retained the Latin in his great historical work. In Holland especially did the study of the language flourish, and here a far purer style was maintained than in most other countries. When we consider the long series of renowned classical scholars who labored so zealously within

so small a sphere for centuries, we are struck with a kind of holy awe. Particularly was Leyden distinguished for possessing such scholars as Scaliger, Heinsius, Hemsterhuis and others. The great similarity in the labors of all the Dutch philologists is very striking, and only a few in these times, like Hemsterhuis and Heinsius form an exception. This similarity is the more remarkable from most of the Dutch philologists being foreigners, chiefly Germans. They were distinguished by an untiring diligence in the collection of materials; they gathered these from all quarters, and piled them up in great masses, which cannot fail to excite wonder. Oudendorp worked on Apuleius thirty years. Their labors, however, are utterly void of taste and that sort of criticism which advances the study. It either relates to the various readings, in which case only the number of manuscripts is regarded, without much attention to their relative value, or it is conjectural, and characterized by an extraordinary degree of boldness.

It is not at all strange that through the influence of so many great men all Holland became in great measure latinized. A good and elegant Latin style, as well as facility in speaking, was demanded of every educated man.

It only remains for us to cast a glance at England. With what pleasure Erasmus had previously visited his friend, Sir Thomas More, is well known. It is equally well known that the severe discipline of the English schools favored immediately, and still continues to favor, classical study. Yet these studies have not been pursued with an immediately practical view since the time of Cromwell. England early had a public political life, and had assigned both to Greek and Latin their appropriate sphere, before the nations of the continent began to inquire what rank should be assigned to these studies.

The zenith of English learning was reached by Richard Bentley, a man whose name will be mentioned with astonishment and admiration as long as philological studies are cultivated. Such learning and such keen penetration will not soon be found united in one man. Though we should not consider his declaration in the preface to Horace, "that he had taken up these studies for a half-years' recreation after severe labors," as strictly true; (which, however, were it strictly true, would set his gigantic powers in a stronger light;) yet this very book remains an imperishable monument, from which one can learn what constitutes true criticism.

Hemsterhuis, the Hollander above mentioned, was a younger contemporary of Bentley. With him commences the transition from the earlier to the later times. His boundless learning was combined with the greatest keenness; but at the same time he considered it as highly

important to act the part of the man of the world, in which he differed from the rest of the Dutch philologists. With him begins the true philosophical study of the Greek.

From the time of Thomasius the professors at the German universities had been gradually venturing to lecture in the German language. These experiments rapidly spread, since even in the middle of the preceding century almost all the lectures in the then learned professions, were read in German, in the Protestant universities at least, with the exception of that at Leipsic. John Augustus Ernesti laughed indeed at the *Prosa Muttersprache* (Mrs. mother-tongue) as he called the German; yet he contributed not a little himself by his learned and elegant expositions of the classics, first at the Thomas school at Leipsic, where he was originally rector, and afterwards as professor at the university, to the just estimation of his native tongue, and freed it from the disgrace and abuse with which the schools had loaded it. Side by side with Ernesti in Leipsic stood John Matthias Gesner; his departure to the university of Göttingen, founded by the great baron of Münchhausen was particularly advantageous for the north-western part of Germany. Both these men have done so much by their teachings and example for the proper cultivation of classical studies, that their services can never be too highly prized; multitudes of their scholars, sought out as teachers in all parts of Germany, diffused the new and improved ideas to which these great scholars had given birth.

In Holland likewise a path had been broken by the great Hemsterhuis, so that Ruhnken, who had left Wittenberg to study Greek at Leyden instead of at Göttingen, under Gesner's instruction, as he originally intended, with the aid of his fine taste, his polished and courteous manners, and his exemplary Latinity, could at once labor with effect. By degrees he forgot his German, and as he had learned a little bad Dutch and French, (the latter of which he pronounced as it was written,) merely for the daily purposes of life, he wrote in the Latin language alone, and with such accuracy and care that Gesner's Thesaurus was always to be found on his table. Neither he nor Ernesti spoke it at all. How essential he considered this language as an organ of communication among the learned is well illustrated by an anecdote related by his biographer and successor, Wyttenbach. A German professor imprudently remarked before Ruhnken, in the library at Leyden, that the foolish custom of writing learned books in Latin had long been given up in Germany. Ruhnken instantly closed the book-case, and said passionately, "Be off with your stupidity; go and find other libraries where you can meet with German books."

This speech sounds harsher indeed in the translation than in the Latin original.

Ruhnken's pupil and follower, Wytttenbach, like him wrote only Latin, and in a letter to Matthiae, who had sent him his Greek Grammar, lamented that this work was not written in Latin. Wytttenbach's style is very fine, although the *grata negligentia* is altogether too predominant. His pupils, so far as I can judge, imitated him in this respect with great zeal.

All these men recommended the study of the classics, in conformity with the hereditary opinion of the excellence of the ancient writers as to form; they wrote Latin for similar reasons, because there was need of a language common to the learned of all countries. They were all so firmly attached to their convictions that nothing could move them.

As these studies had been hallowed for centuries, so that parents almost unconsciously and mechanically wished for their children a classical education, above all things, as containing in itself all the promises. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, Basedow, a man of rare genius, but of an extremely violent and impetuous character, met with the strongest opposition in advancing his new views. He maintained that languages were only "*a means to an end,*" and therefore when compared with the ideas, so subordinate, that we ought not to trouble our heads about them, but slide over them as rapidly as possible. "In general," says he, "only what is of use for the purposes of life has any value; that alone then must be taught and learned."

The Philanthropinum was founded in Dessau; its name alone contained a severe criticism on the classical schools which now united and fought against it. In the Philanthropinum (which Basedow however did not long conduct), everything was taught in the way of amusement. In the study of the languages the grammar was banished and oral instruction took its place. We have been assured by eye witnesses, that the young pupils of the Philanthropinum spoke Latin with uncommon fluency. But what sort of Latin was it? Since few professional philologists are sufficiently versed in the language to pronounce what is good Latin, we place no reliance on the judgment of men who long ago dropped their Latin and applied themselves to studies totally different. We would believe Ruhnken or Ernesti, but not even these implicitly.

The Philanthropinists, so called, Campe and Salzmann, had great influence upon the public in spite of the outcries of the philologists, and soon began to win its confidence. They composed a great num-

ber of books, many of which were excellent for the instruction and discipline of youth, and had the art of making them highly captivating in substance and form. We need only mention Campe's *Robinson and Discovery of America*, which are even at the present day the pleasantest and most profitable reading for children. At the same time they published popular works on education itself and its means and ends, and had great influence on the minds of parents by making Love and Gentleness the most prominent objects. Time had undermined and shaken the rigor of former days in many ways; the Philanthropinists found therefore in many quarters a welcome reception. At last they founded other special institutions of their own, and so confirmed their theories by experience that but few pupils of the Salzmann Institute at Schrepfenthal (to select one instance out of many) could be found, who would not think of it with devoted affection.

The origin of all these movements, both on the part of the old school philologists, and on that of the Philanthropinists, was a correct yet vague consciousness, that has remained to the present hour, together with the party contests, which in spite of the change of names and the demands of the age, are still one and the same.

Meanwhile Heyne made his appearance at Göttingen and Wolf at Halle, and subsequently Hermann at Leipsic, three men, who have effected so much by their teachings and example that they will always be had in reverence. Heyne, self-taught rather than the pupil of Ernesti, showed how to expound the ancient poets with taste, opened new points of view in his archaeological lectures, and filled schools far and near with teachers who had sat at his feet. Wolf, likewise more of a self-made man than Heyne's scholar (who was highly commended by him—honestly too,—and not out of envy and fear in order to remove him from Göttingen as Körte, Wolf's biographer, thinks), not only defined the boundaries of classical studies with clearness and arranged the elements around one common centre, but also left works of such excellence, though still incomplete, that his influence in the whole province of philology has become colossal. His lectures, moreover, had a magic power over his hearers, through their scintillations of striking and oftentimes cutting wit, and he had the art of setting his audience on fire to a wonderful degree. Time with its rapid movement has long since begun to cover and mitigate the faults which his contemporaries could have wished removed, and to present him in his true character. And now Hermann, that venerable and every way knightly veteran, the father of metrical science, still continues to defend with his example and his mighty word, a field on which he

rules triumphant. Boeckh, Thiersch and many others are fellow-laborers at the same great work. In this way the spirit of the times could be restrained within its proper bounds. The gymnasia could not close themselves to these demands, but gradually embraced more and more of the practical studies, the arts and sciences, many perhaps to too great a degree. But they endeavored by an improved method of teaching, to regain the time lost in this way. Greek, particularly, acquired an importance not before known nor anticipated. After Dissen had shown the possibility of reading the *Odyssey* with boys, the Jackmann Institute was founded. Passow was appointed a director. In this school the classical course began with Greek, and it seemed probable that this might take the place of Latin.

At this time the well-known Examination-Law was passed in Prussia. How completely conformable this was to the age, how well it expressed the views of the time, can be seen from the zeal with which it was commended and gradually adopted, with some trifling alterations indeed, in almost all the States of Protestant Germany. It has, without doubt, effected much good, compared with which its disadvantages vanish. Its displacement by a new one, only shows the enlightened judgment of the Prussian government; it was relinquished because it had fulfilled its purpose. Life is constantly generating new forms, which no legislator may hope to repress; he can only conduct their development.

Previous to this, when Klopstock had shown by his admirable *Messiah* how to imitate in German the ancient measures, and particularly the hexameter, Voss had begun to translate the classical poets in the original metres; he has thus diffused among the mass of the people a knowledge of the ancient poets without a parallel in any other country, to say nothing of his influence on the German tongue in enriching and perfecting it. The glorious old champion may well endure the contempt with which many would visit him, even in his grave. He is still, as Heindorf says, one of the first and best men of Germany.

Meanwhile the liberation war against Buonaparte began. All Europe was strongly impressed with the great idea of freedom. Classical studies therefore could occupy but a subordinate position till the establishment of peace, and struggled for existence at schools and universities, and even from these both teachers and pupils sometimes marched to the field.

The great authors, who had raised the German language to an almost incredible perfection, had with the exception of *Goethe*, all passed off the stage. The power of the vernacular language as shown for the first time in their productions, reached its highest glory in the very

midst of the ever-memorable war, so that through them the Germans came to a consciousness of its treasures. When the perils of war were by the united energies of the people driven back, and peace was established, many looked mistrustfully upon classical literature, and thought to banish it the easier, because meanwhile the old monuments of national literature had been studied with a spirit of rivalry; before this hardly the names of these works had been known.

But the philologists too were putting forth all their strength. All branches of the study of antiquity were treated with profound learning and copiousness (generally however in German, so that, contrary to the old prevailing custom, but few compendiums were written in Latin, except those pertaining to philological subjects), and valuable manuals were published in countless numbers. But it became more and more obvious to every thinking mind, that a new age had dawned with new thoughts and ideas, and as most of the philologists continued to recommend Latin with a view to practical use in writing and speaking, they were forced to be content with a Latin syntactical form, declaring that single words were of no consequence whatever, and that in this they had the authority of Cicero and other great classical writers, who had borrowed terms from the Greek. The fundamental error of this mischievous and detrimental idea is so apparent, that we wonder how it could be long adopted and followed. We shall recur to this topic again, and would only observe in this connection, that the dangerous advice which is a consequence of it is nothing but a necessary concession proceeding from a false view of the Latin, and the ends for which it is to be studied. This rule not only violates the repeated declarations and instructions of the ancients themselves; for instance, Caesar says in his lost book *De Analogia*: *Tamquam scopulum, sic fugias insolens verbum*; but also the peculiar sanctity of nationality and language, on which an individual, especially a foreigner, has no right to intrude. Cicero indeed as a Roman had the right of drawing from other sources, when the springs of his own land failed, as the German or Frenchman who is master of his own tongue has the same right. But what should we say if a German or a Frenchman should undertake to enrich our language with new words? Yet this would not be so bad as the case in hand; for he would be contributing to a language that was still living, and that represented the culture of his age. Can we thus confer on a dead man properties and qualities he never possessed in his life-time? But apart from all this, it must be evident to all that foreign interpolators only disfigure a language, as patches of many colors do a coat of one color. A sober, honest man would never show himself on 'change in such a garment. No-

body admires the German which was written at a time when it was customary to interlard it with French. Nobody admires the German of the philosophical schools in which they are obliged to intermingle words drawn from foreign languages ancient and modern with the German words, to express their new ideas.

The writing of Greek, which has been almost entirely abandoned, especially after the decision of Ernesti in the preface to Hedericus's *Lexicon*, was likewise resumed and carried so far that in some gymnasia original compositions were required of the pupils. It is probable, however, that this extended practical course, so impossible and unsuitable, is now narrowed down to the proper bounds, which limit it to grammatical exercises.

We must here mention another important service in which Friedemann has been mainly instrumental by his *Guide to the Composition of Latin Verse*. The revival of a means of culture so useful in every point of view, which most of the German schools had abandoned, must appear to every instructor who is not behind the age, a thing most desirable. This work has made many older teachers Friedemann's grateful pupils.

The long repose which followed the wars, the growing necessities of an increasing population, and the progress of luxury among all orders, naturally turned the public mind aside from ideal and literary to material and practical pursuits. The natural sciences acquired an immense importance from the astonishing discoveries that were made. Manufacturers, artists, even common mechanics could no longer live without them; or they were soon outstripped by those who had studied the sciences when entering upon their occupation.

This pressing necessity finally called the schools for the practical arts and Polytechnic schools into being. We might reasonably expect the philologists to rejoice over the establishment of these schools; for they relieved their own institutions of much burdensome labor, which distracted their efforts without producing any good, and which was worse than useless. They gave them an opportunity of simplifying their course of instruction, which time had made unmanageable by vast additions, and rescuing from the sweeping torrent of the *Realia*, and establishing as a prominent object the fundamental studies of the gymnasia,—the classical languages, German, mathematics and religion. But the result proved otherwise. Like men of hypochondriacal history, which revels in the past, sighs over the present and has no future, they violently attacked the new institutions and the motives which led to their foundation. What strange and absurd dogmas were advanced on this occasion, even by learned and thoughtful men! All manifested a

kind of reckless contempt for the practical tendencies of the age ; most considered the natural sciences as unsuited for the mental development, and went so far as to say that such studies were highly dangerous in a moral point of view, because the teacher of natural history, for instance, was compelled to unfold the secret of procreation, which nature had veiled. The absurdity of this is too evident to need comment. And how is it in many cities and those not always large cities, where the most anxious care on the part of fond parents cannot preserve their children from impressions which poison their souls ? How is it with the domestics of individual families,—nay, how is it with school-boys and school-girls themselves ? Indeed we can but smile at the evils apprehended from the study of natural science ; for instead of confirming these evils, it lessens and prevents them.

Many said moreover that the discipline in those schools for the practical arts is bad ; but this is the fault of the teachers, not of the things taught. Others, finally, refer us to the testimony of merchants and manufacturers in favor of pupils of the gymnasia, and infer from their superiority, the superiority of those establishments. These and many similar arguments have been so often repeated and so frequently varied and ruminated, that we cannot but be surprised at the vague ideas they presuppose, and perplexed what to say to them.

The censure to which the philologists are liable for their attacks on the advocates of practical study, are applicable in a higher degree to their opponents themselves ; for not contented with the new domain allotted them, they tried with all their might to crush the study of classical literature, with its teachers and its guardians, the gymnasia. If they had their way,—which happily they do not have, and never will have,—the whole world would be turned into one great workshop, and every man would be forced to surrender himself to material things, and destitute of all ideas and aims toward anything higher, to wend his way through this life in sadness and gloom. Since, from the nature of the case, the arguments against the study of the classics have been more widely diffused than those have been which are urged in its favor by the philologists, and since many of these attacks are supported by indisputable truths ; for the philologists with an incredible obstinacy continue to defend their position with arms forged by a past age, and altogether unfit for the present, which calls for newer and better weapons ; we will here first enumerate the arguments brought against classical literature, and endeavor either to establish or refute them, according as they may merit.

Those who oppose ancient literature on the ground that they cannot learn from Homer and Virgil how to bake bread and to salt meat,

nor from Cicero how to dye a blue without indigo, we may reasonably set aside. They are perhaps modest enough, even in this immodest age, not to expect an answer; should they wish one, they must look elsewhere for it.

Many however say that only the matter of the ancient writers is of importance; and this, be it what it may, can be learned from a translation as well as from the original. Yet even this, they maintain, is often positively objectionable. If we examine the poets, for instance, and even the chastest and most delicate poets, our moral feeling is rudely shocked by their erotic nudities. It is dangerous then to put Horace into the hands of the young. Setting aside the odes and epodes, the satires especially, must make us hesitate. The finest of them, for example, the *Journey to Brundisium* and the *Instructions of Tiresias*, where Ulysses is advised to turn legacy-hunter, for the purpose of restoring his shattered fortunes, are not free from contaminating spots which may ruin youthful minds. Even Virgil, in general so pure, depicts in his *Georgics*, and in his *Aeneid* touches upon things which should be kept far from the young. The rest of the Roman poets, individually and collectively, are far more objectionable. The prose writers are no better. Though few of them are immoral in the above-mentioned sense—yet there are more even of these stains than is well—still they contain immoral ideas, they praise or defend suicide or other violent deaths and must necessarily be injurious to moral culture. What is true of the Romans is true in part at least of the Greeks. The fathers, before reading Aristophanes, always prayed to God that he would keep them free from the vice and crime which this poet openly represents. There is hardly one poet of this nation that we can call absolutely pure, and we cannot wonder therefore that even the divine Plato establishes a republic at which a Christian must shudder. Yet Plato is a great philosopher, and a famous writer. But admitting the fancied excellence of the Greek and Roman writers, (they continue,) it can all be seen through the medium of translations, as well as from the originals; and we must yield assent to the assertion of philosophers, that all the good, true and beautiful in the classics has long been the common property of the civilized world; we find it expressed better than the ancients themselves expressed it, not only in our classics but in *Ladies Magazines* and *Almanacs*.

Furthermore, it cannot be proved that the study of languages and classical literature is a necessary part of education. The ancients themselves acquired their greatness without the study of foreign languages; it should be occasional then, and as a means for special ends. But if some of the Romans studied Greek, it only shows the literary pov-

erty of this heroic people. Cicero's writings in imitation of the Greeks are his faultiest, and the odes of Horace are for the same reason the worst of his poems. In the second place, the number of the modern classics trained after the philological fashion of the day is unquestionably small, compared with those who were not. To confine ourselves to the German, it is notorious that Schiller did not know Greek at all, and Göthe hardly enough to read a Greek poet tolerably. Even Wieland, say they, according to Böttiger and others made his translations from old French versions. With the rest of our translators, and those of other nations, the case is the same.

Conversely, great philologists by profession are often but insignificant writers. In the various duties of life they play but an awkward part;—instead of the humanity from which they proudly borrow a title, we find in them a certain inhumanity, so to speak, and philological coarseness is become proverbial;—and they do not know how to value other liberal pursuits, notwithstanding their Cicero says that a common bond embraces them all. Of how few philologists can it be said that they were great statesmen or warriors! Neither Frederic the Great nor Napoleon nor old Blücher knew anything of philology. Hannibal conquered the Romans before he could decline *musa*, and Franklin never learned *τύπτω*, nor was matriculated at Göttingen or Jena.

But if it be true, (they proceed,) in spite of these remarkable facts, that ancient literature has the supreme excellence which the philologists ascribe to it, how does it happen that with the exception of a few philologists, who derive their knowledge for the most part from what they learn at lectures in the public institutions, hardly any one is to be found, who carries his classical studies beyond the academic course? Ask the greater portion of our divines, lawyers and physicians whether they ever take up a single Latin or Greek author in their leisure moments, to refresh themselves with the incomparable and divine pattern of all that is beautiful and glorious. They will tell you they have often lamented that they have no time for such reading. This timid confession is but a relic of respect for ancient customs and traditions. The case was different, it must be admitted, a hundred years ago, when we had no national literature, and when our language was rough and unpolished; and with the Italians and French of an earlier period, before their own literature had supplanted that of the ancients.

Languages are means to attain certain ends. If their study then were indispensable, which we deny, we might apply ourselves to the English, the German, the French, the Italian and the Spanish. Here

too great treasures are to be found; and we acquire something withal that can be profitably applied to the purposes of life. The English language has been enfeebled by being too much Romanized; its true strength lies in its Saxon element. If, therefore, the German, which rivals the Greek in power of combination, should be studied as the Latin and Greek have hitherto been, its influence on the culture and development of the English would be worth more than that of Greece and Rome.

The value attached to the writing and speaking of Greek and Latin, they say in conclusion, is preëminently ridiculous. The philologists are grown wise enough, to be sure, to give up writing Greek. Latin, however, every body who makes any claim to continental scholarship, must be able to speak and write. Now since not one of ten thousand educated men can utter a couple of Latin sentences with tolerable correctness, (and here we are not speaking of actual conversation, as we understand conversation in French or conversation in Italian,) and since the proportion is less in France or England than in Germany, then those who are excluded by a little knot of stiff pedants from all claims to literary acquirements, can hardly do more than laugh at such presumption; and they would be doing no injustice in casting back the censure upon their inconsiderate judges.

The philologists strive, by repeatedly asserting the need of a universal language, to make the assertion take the place of a proof. But how is it that even among philologists themselves none continue to write Latin, if we except the commentaries of the ancients—and even the best of these are now written in the vernacular tongue—and in some instances the official school and university programmes? Not even their organs, the philological journals are now written in Latin, and even in Holland, that land so true in its attachment to the philology of a past age, the *Bibliotheca Critica Nova* was suspended for want of support. And yet what more fitting place to practise this essential art than these journals afford?

How does it happen, moreover, that the rise of all the sciences dates, almost without exception, from the time instruction was first given at the universities and schools in the vernacular tongue? How does it happen that philological learning itself began to advance when Latin was abandoned in school-books and lectures? The answer is obvious; in writing Latin we are stuck in a strait waistcoat which only allows no *verba facers*, instead of bringing ideas to light; the ideas perish at their birth, because we leave them to themselves and only seek a worn out garb for them. Where the raiment is the all-essential thing, not the wearer, it is impossible in spite of all the decoration, to appear to advantage.

The ancients themselves had no language of the learned. The one so long borrowed from them is become so useless that we should like to return it to the owners, and see them take it back. But we should be obliged to return it as quietly as possible and in the dark ; by daylight they would not recognize their language, as it has been written by most moderns.

The great stress that has been laid since Wolf's time on the discipline of the intellect, which the study of the classics, and writing and speaking the languages are said to afford, the perpetual hue and cry about mental discipline, shows plainly how distressed the poor philologists are. And it is really lamentable that they should think to lay hold on this anchor of need, and to cling to it at the last, now that the others are torn away and lost. Again and again has the emptiness of their final hope been shown them ; still they stand by it, cast a mournful glance at the shifting sands on which it rests, and strike up *unisono* the old song. All is of no avail. We may point to the numerous scholars who became such without the assistance of classical schools. We may demonstrate to a certainty that like means of culture are to be found in mathematics, in the natural sciences, in English and modern literature. We see that the deaf, who *will* not hear, are the worst persons in the world to deal with ; and that nothing is left but the charitable hope that Time, the great adjuster, may effect in them what example and precept never have done nor can do.

We can see without difficulty, as was remarked above, the justice of all or the most of these attacks on classical studies, and the impossibility of warding them off one by one, without regard to the sum total of modern life in all its parts and ramifications. The arms commonly taken up against them are become mouldy and rusty. Time greedily devours his grown up children, to gather strength for the birth of new ones. But the philologists need not tremble for a moment, nor fear for the stability of their sway. The instant that destroyed it would give a mortal stab to all true culture ; the world would inevitably sink back into that night of barbarism from which it has come forth with such stern labor and at such bitter cost.

The whole dispute between the philologists and the advocates of practical studies springs from an indistinct idea of education itself ; that is of its nature, its ends and its means. The contest is therefore about elementary principles, and without a mastery of these principles, nothing can come but obstinate tenacity in asserting them. No end

to the quarrel could else be hoped for but by the exhaustion of both parties,—an end lamentable and unworthy this age of undeniable improvement, and the importance of the subject of dispute.

It will not be necessary for us to follow out in its details the idea of the word education in its most general sense, nor to enumerate the various forms in learning, social life, morals and aesthetics. We would only premise that there are two main groups of culture, if we may so express ourselves; which do not necessarily exclude each other, but can exist together, and do often coëxist, yet without the one's intruding upon the domain of the other. Both have in their external form much that is common, so that a cursory observer would easily be led to confound them.

We begin with the education of the practical man. He needs in his capacity of merchant, manufacturer, mechanic, and the like, dexterity in the use of his mental faculties, as memory, understanding, judgment and taste; he must be able to speak and write correctly and fluently his native language, and other modern languages besides, according to the nature of his particular sphere; he must be expert at figures, and have such an acquaintance with geography and history as can be drawn from common text-books. He must study for general discipline, the outlines of all the natural sciences, though some particular one may subsequently become a study for him in detail. If we add to this a certain amount of social and conventional culture, a little music or so, a more intimate acquaintance with our great English classics, and drawing as a preparation for special departments, we have nearly all that can reasonably be demanded of the practical man. These are the foundations of his future profession; this profession he may pursue with honor and profit, if he has mastered it, and the improvements which are successively made in it, and leaves nothing to be learned. He is emphatically a man of the *present*, in its strictest sense, and of the *future*, so far as it rests on this present alone. It is enough for him then to have the culture of his time, as it now is—a settled and an existing *result*. For as he has enough to do with what actually *is*, he has no time and he is under no obligations to inquire how it *became so*. This, of course, is said of a practical man in general without regard to his individual personal situation. *He, therefore, is not at all benefited by the classics*; and we can make no satisfactory answer to parents in Germany who complain of the defects of the gymnasia to which they are nevertheless obliged to send their sons. Of what use, say they, are the Latin and Greek in my case? Furthermore, they are perfectly right in demanding instruction in French as given at the gymnasia. A polished and well-

educated lady once told us in conversation, that her son, who was to be a sailor, needed to know how to swear, but not how to read Greek and Latin.

The case is quite different with scientific¹ culture which we frequently call learning; but incorrectly, for the difference between learning and science is immeasurably great. Learning is the knowledge of what others have done in any branch of study; the more data of this sort one has stored up, pertaining to any department or to several departments at once, the more learned he is. The man of science, on the other hand, is he who can unite by the power of thought these scattered elements into an organic whole, under some higher and guiding fundamental truth. Learning is a lifeless body, unless quickened by science. The usual German appellation is the reverse of the French. While the Germans call all men of science, without distinction, *learned*, the French call all learned men *savans*. In former times few men of learning were men of science; in our day many who call themselves scientific men, look with a proud contempt upon learning; and yet it is the sole condition of science.

It would be superfluous for us to inform our readers that no branch of learning can be properly comprehended, even for practical purposes, without a study of its gradual development; for no branch can assume a fixed place with a relative completeness and perfection, like some of the practical departments. In ceaseless advancement, these studies have been cultivated at different times by different persons, and their form has been perpetually modified by times and men, so that contemporaneous views by scholars of the same nation, have hardly any point of similarity; if we look to other nations the difference is far more striking. For this reason a knowledge of the laborers in each department, and of their respective services, is absolutely necessary. This knowledge furnishes the materials viewed as a matter of learning, and to this part systems belong, which, as an organic whole, are produced only by operations of the intellect, but which become for the independent thinker and inquirer, mere materials of thought furnished by others. If many yield their assent and spontaneously attach themselves to given systems, then what we call schools are formed. We hear of the school of Kant, of Hegel, of philosophical schools, of a historical school of jurisprudence, an abstract school, and so forth.

The man of business then, belonging only to the present time, has to strive only for general culture and for a knowledge of his calling in

¹ For want of a better word we use *science* and *scientific* in this connection, not in their common restricted sense, but with the broader acceptance of the German *Wissenschaft* and *wissenschaftlich*.

keeping with the age. For this purpose the high-schools and the schools for the practical arts are adapted, and in his riper years he visits the professional and polytechnic schools, which are specially and exclusively devoted to men of his class. The man of science, however, as opposed to the merely practical man, resting on the past, needs very different schools from the practical man, both as a general preparative, and as an introduction to the particular branch of study he proposes to pursue. These schools are the Latin schools and gymnasia, and after these have been visited, the universities. Their pupils are to be led to the present by a gradual historical path—by the study of the past, while those of the high-schools and the practical schools are to be immediately introduced to it, without any such study. We refer here particularly to the gymnasia, and those schools which make ancient literature their main study; for at the universities, which in Germany are for the most part professional schools, few attend philological lectures, except those who propose to become teachers. In former times the case was necessarily different.

Taking then a general view of the whole subject, it is at once evident that the science and literature of the present day has descended to us from *Rome*; she at least has furnished the most of the material. She also gave the form, which all the branches of knowledge assumed through the spirit that lives in her language, till the rise of modern literature, when men began to use their own language and to be more independent. The world lay a slave of those mighty Romans for more than a thousand years after their bodies had mouldered in the dust. Who can gaze without reverence and awe at this gigantic spirit, sweeping like a hurricane, the world with its breath, long after the body had perished and gone! It will be enough for our purpose to consider the two great institutions of public life, the State and the Church; in the former we see her historical existence, in the latter her spirit and energies.

The State depends on right, and right is defined by the law. Now the Roman right or *jus* is the foundation of our present jurisprudence, notwithstanding the number of our new law-books, (which would be quite unintelligible by themselves,) and notwithstanding all efforts for the restoration of old national jurisprudence. At the German universities, therefore, it is the main study, and must always be so; and many gymnasia tried to introduce the institutes and history of jurisprudence into their course, though only for those who intended to be law-students; on the same principle that Hebrew is taught only to those who are preparing for the ministry.

In Roman life, which was only a life in the State, we see only the

outward, objective and concrete. The individual torn from the State, appears like the link of a severed chain. His heroic courage forsook him, and though at Rome he would have looked death fearlessly in the face, in banishment he cried and mourned with the pusillanimity of a child. But no sooner was he recalled, than he was quickened with new life, and was again transformed, as with the stroke of a magic wand, into a valiant hero, whom no danger could appall, and no menaces could daunt. The example of Cicero, often as it has been adduced, will serve as an illustration. While still young, he defended amid the minions and satellites of Sulla, Roscius of Ameria, who had been brought into peril of his life by the favorites of the dictator. While consul, he hesitated not a moment to save his republic, at imminent hazard from the abyss into which the conspiracy of Catiline was about to plunge it. But no sooner had Clodius carried the sentence of banishment, so well known, but so indefinite, so vague, so strangely expressed; no sooner did Cicero see a prospect of exile from his beloved Rome, than he puts on mourning, weeps and supplicates, and at last grows utterly dispirited amid tears and lamentations. He will hearken to no consolation; he will not see his brother, and it is painful to read the letters he wrote at this period, as they all breathe the same spirit. This lasted more than a year. Called back to Rome, he is himself again; but he accepts the honorable post of proconsul of Cilicia only with repugnance because it keeps him from Rome. He employs every means after the expiration of the year, to be recalled to Rome. Though given to literary occupations in the retirement of the country, he appears again on the battle-ground, for Antony must be attacked. At the hazard of his life he wrote or delivered his far-famed Philippics, and shortly after looked forth from his litter with such calm composure into the face of Popilius Laenas and his officers, that the stern murderer quailed, and shuddered at executing his bloody work. At last the grey-haired Cicero cried: "Come, veteran! durst thou not strike off an old man's head?" He held his head still and died boldly on the soil of Italy, though he might have saved his life, if he had consented to flee. Like the monster of the old myth, which was invincible as long as it stood on the earth, but raised from it was strangled and died, so was the Roman when his foot rested not in the eternal city, or when he knew himself at variance with her. This type of *objectiveness* Rome impressed upon the Christian church, as soon as its temple was erected there. Many customs and ceremonies were transferred to it, though under different names, and the Roman language, which represents the national character she embodies, still continues to be the language of that church which bears the name of

Roman, and is distinguished from all other churches by its objective character. The principle of justification by works which forms her basis, the telling of beads, her *gratia abundans*, with the merits of the saints, her confessions and her penitence, her outward lord, the pope, and her external pomp attest this objective character as distinguished from the Protestant church, which is a subjective one; subjective to such a degree, that, as matters stand, we should be at a loss to characterize it otherwise than by the 'unity of its members in negation.' The right of free examination it claims, and the free exercise of reason exclude all authority, and allow its members to attach themselves to as many different views as there are persons.

The Catholic church can be understood only in connection with Rome, as the Protestant can be only by that against which it protests, and consequently by that which is connected with Rome.

We see without difficulty how the rays of politics and the church all shot forth from Rome, and how they penetrate all their phases. Hence follows the absolute necessity for those who devote themselves to the State or the church, to proceed from Rome to modern times. There alone can they procure the passport without which they cannot reach their journey's end in safety. To the same necessity the physician is subjected, the philosopher, in short, every one who devotes himself to scientific studies; this, however, it is not essential to show at length, if the essence and aim of scientific education, as we have exhibited them above, be granted as true.

We may here conveniently meet an objection, more specious than true, that has often been urged, but only by such as judge without a well-grounded personal knowledge, and so grasp the shadow instead of the substance. It is said that to gain this acquaintance with Rome the study of its history is sufficient. This objection is so entirely false, and yet so entirely true, according to the view with which it is made, that we must discuss it more fully.

If by history is meant the deeds and outward fortunes of a people, the knowledge of their great men and the like, as they are to be learned from the text-books and manuals of modern authors, the objection is utterly false and void. The famous saying of Buffon: "*Le style —c'est l'homme,*" in its simple grandeur and truth, is so applicable that we may take it as the foundation on which to build our argument.

The *nature of man* has of necessity been essentially the same at all times and among all nations, and it is to-day what it will be for all future time; it is therefore something universal, on which neither country nor climate nor education can have the slightest effect; for these influences modify only its particular form at a given time, and

in this particular form what we call character, consists. The nature and history of nations, is like that of individual man; like him they are the children, the productions of their time and their place, and receive the special form under which they appear, alike in all main points, from the influences mentioned above. From this it is evident, on the one hand, that deeds, heroes, and the like, considered in themselves, are but points, not united by any line. Caesar, Miltiades, Hermann, were all warriors, and one in the place of another would without doubt have gained the same renown. But why the one was a Roman, the other a Greek, the third a German, is only to be learned from the soul that animated them respectively; the form however which each has assumed, in which he manifests himself and has an outward existence, is his greatest, his most divine action,—his language. The language of a nation is the manifestation of its inmost nature. To study the language of a nation is to listen to the nation in the laboratory of its soul, the most secret recesses of its heart, and to detect the slightest beat. This is true of style in itself, that is of the characteristic way of uniting in sentences single words, the original elements, and of uniting the sentences in periods, and the periods in a continuous discourse. We speak therefore of a Latin, a French, a German style, and again of the style of Cicero, of Rousseau, of Göthe, as the characteristic way in which these writers have individually shaded and shaped the form of the national genius,—the form which in this respect is common and universal. But this is equally true not only of style in its more restricted sense, but of the way of viewing and expressing single objects; and though this field, opened rather than exhausted, is not yet measured, it contains the richest treasures, which a happy future is to bring to light. The material, concrete Roman, avoiding all idealism, formed his *homo* from *humus*, designating him therefore as the *earth-born*, the intellectual Greek expressed the same idea by ἀσθρωνος, the *up-looker*, the German by *Mensch*, doubtless from the Greek μήν; *Mensch* means then the *intelligent*. All these words evidently present the same meaning, but from quite different points of view.

We cannot show this more plainly, than by borrowing the words of Mager, counsellor of education and formerly professor of French literature at the gymnasium at Aarau; we take the liberty therefore of quoting them here. He says in the introduction to his excellent Book and Exercises on the German Language (*Deutsch Sprachbuch*):¹

“The human family divides itself into several races, each race into

¹ Stuttgart, Cast, 1842, pp. 2 and 3.

several nations, each nation into several stocks. If nations then living at a wide distance apart do not express the same ideas by the same sounds, this need not excite our wonder. (Multiplicity of languages.) But as reason is common to all men, we might imagine that languages would differ only in employing different appellations, as for instance *bellum*, *guerre*. Were this the case, one who wished to learn foreign languages, would only be obliged to learn the corresponding foreign appellation for every appellation in his mother-tongue, and then he could both understand and speak the foreign tongue. But the case is quite different. Two things are here to be considered.

“All objects in the material and intellectual world offer to man more than one side on which they can be viewed, and from which they can be named. Let us take what we will, father, man, crow, wolf, bow, etc.; each of these objects has numerous peculiarities, and is seen in many states. Now to name an object, the language must select some one peculiarity or state of the object, and take the name from that. Thus *father* is the nurturer, *man* the thinking being, *crow* the croaker, *wolf* the robber, *bow* the bent, etc. But though one language selects from an object *one* peculiarity or condition, and applies a name in conformity with it, another peculiarity or another condition in the same object may be selected in a different language, and then the appellations of the two tongues do not coincide; they *designate* the same thing but do not *signify* the same; thus the German says *Schlange*, (snake), *Floh*, (flea); he notices and indicates in these animals their *winding* (*schlingen*), and *fleeing*, while the Roman calls the animal we call *Schlange*, the *creeper* (*serpens*), and the Dane calls the flea the *runner* (*loppe*). The Germans say *Getraide* (grain); in this word is intimated that the object it designates is borne (*getragen*) by the earth; the same thing is called by the Romans *frumentum*, and is conceived of as *fruit*, as something the earth offers for our enjoyment. We say *king* (German, *König*); this word originally designates the head of a clan; the Roman *rex* means the *ruler*. The German word *Tugend* (virtue) comes from *Taugen*, the Roman *virtus* is *manliness* from *vir*. In the German language *Korn* has a wide acceptation, in the Swedish *korn* means barley, and the German *Johannisbeere* is in that language *vinbär*, and *biörk*, *birch*, in Icelandic means *tree* in general. It often happens also that different languages apply to an object exactly the same name. *Fluss* in German and *fluvius* in Latin are the *flowing*. *Fürst* and *princeps* the *First*. We see from these examples that different languages do not always coincide in the representation of ideas; they often *conceive* of the same thing, but do not

express the same; the appellations designate the same object, but do not convey the same shade of meaning.

“The second thing to be considered is this :

Where we say	<i>I shall write,</i>
the Frenchman says in two words;	<i>j'écrir-ai</i>
and the Roman in one,	<i>scrib-am ;</i>
Our	<i>I have written</i>
is in Latin,	<i>scrip-s-i ;</i>
Our	<i>I am read</i>
is in Latin,	<i>leg-or.</i>

“So we say, ‘I know that I may err;’ this idea the Roman expresses by, ‘I know myself to be able to err.’ What we (i. e. the Germans) express as follows: ‘Cicero of whom I believe that he was consul,’ is in Latin and English, ‘Cicero whom I believe to have been consul.’ The Germans say, ‘We meet to (dative) a friend;’ the French and English, ‘We meet a friend.’ The Germans say of the *sun, she*, of the *moon, he*, in Latin and French and English it is just the reverse.

“From these examples we see, first, that there are certain ideas frequently occurring (e. g. Present, Past, Future, the suffering of an action; the *I, thou*, etc.), which one language expresses by special words, another merely by changes or inflections; secondly, that different languages do not always unite words in the same way and by the same means.”

So far Mager. We see that here alone the *spirit* of a people predominates, and that with every acquisition of a foreign language a new spirit, that is, a new, peculiar form of the universal spirit in man is unfolded, and that this is greatly enriched by the attainment of so invaluable a possession. *What* Caesar, Miltiades or Hermann have done, or *what* Cicero, Demosthenes or Göthe have said and written, is, in itself, of no consequence, because we cannot prove that other men of the same nation, or of other nations, could not have done, written or said the same; but the *manner* in which they have done it, the *way* in which they have said it, is the sole characteristic of the man, for it is the shell of the individual genius which produces deeds and words. If this great truth admits no doubt, many of the above-mentioned objections, brought against the study of ancient literature by the advocates of practical learning, are completely refuted. No translation of a writer into another language—be it ever so good,—can give even a glimpse of this genius, and no manual of history can give an idea of the history of a nation, without a knowledge of their language in which it is imaged forth. We can, to be sure, acquire from trans-

lations the substance of some true and fine thoughts, and we can obtain information from works of history about facts and exploits. But the study of the language alone discloses the genius which produces them.

The whole being of the Roman is made up of *life in the State*, the objective, actual, concrete. So is his language. A stranger to abstractions, (which increase and predominate in proportion as it becomes corrupted by time and circumstances, and under the emperors, when the Roman ceased to be a Roman, grows so degenerate that it moves in pointed antitheses and witty hemistichs,) it proceeds in measured periods, moulded with the greatest art, yet easily comprehended at a glance, with the subject standing at the head, and the verb guarding the end. All defenceless and subordinate parts must be placed between these two bulwarks. Nothing can be appended, to disturb this order. With few exceptions every word forms a distinct, concrete idea: that conciseness which Livy was so fond of in the participial constructions, and the later writers far more than he, is unknown to Cicero and Cæsar, though prototypes of the Roman language. This is strictly true, however, only of Cicero as an *orator*, for the same Cicero was compelled in his capacity of *philosopher*, to take lessons of the Greeks, and after their example to coin a large quantity of words after the analogy of the Greeks, principally verbals, and in general abstracts of all kinds, which as elements foreign to the Roman tongue, (as indeed all philosophy, dealing in abstractions, is,) disfigure the fine concrete language of the great orator. After him the later writers vied with one another, we may almost say with passionate zeal, to outstrip him, and this effort had such results that within a hundred years after his death the Latin tongue was no longer like itself.

It is remarkable that Christianity, teeming with spiritual freedom, supplanted the legal religion of the Jews, just at the time that the language of law, the Roman sunk to decay; for as we have observed, Cicero is properly its keystone.

Now this objective, concrete character of the Latin, has, besides its undeniable historic consequence to the learned man, what we may call an educating power which displays itself to us in two forms, as an *introduction to abstract thinking*, which is peculiar to our times, and serve instinctively as an *effectual means of moral cultivation*, in which the scholar may reasonably be expected to be in advance of his contemporaries, whatever profession he may select.

At the first hasty glance it might seem as if all education should be carried onward from the earliest historical starting point, that is, it must begin with Greece, then be guided through Rome, and finally

closed with the Teutonic; so that with the access of new elements the former should live on. This, however, is a serious error, which would produce great evil. The young man even at the age when he is entrusted to the gymnasium has already entered the ante-chamber of modern abstractions; for these have so penetrated and leavened everything, that hardly any age, and no class in society, fails of using them, at least unconsciously. We speak of the *capture* of this or that fortress, of the *foundation* of Rome, like every body else in the world, and only the disciplined scholar is aware of the abstractions that lie in these expressions. The *foundation*, for instance, means nothing more than the *act of founding*, the *founding* in its continuance and duration, which we should always keep in view, even when we employ the word to designate the result of the act. The Roman, in his concrete language, speaks altogether differently. He calls such and such a year after the *foundation of Rome*, *post urbem conditam*, that is, after the already founded and still standing Rome.

Now nothing can be understood and comprehended without its opposite; there were no life without death, no day without the night. To the boy, then, already more or less familiar with his abstract mother-tongue, its opposite, the concrete Latin, must be presented. The more he penetrates into the nature of this language, the further he proceeds in his own, so that the start he has made in it becomes of great importance. Without the discipline of rigid thought, which a comprehension of the genius of the Latin tongue insures, he would be lost in the mazes of abstraction, and his thoughts would soar into the regions of mist, for want of a firm ground to stand upon. For in such a study lies the sole condition of that true freedom of thinking which rests on law as a foundation; not the freedom which forms the vague watch-word of the day; for this freedom is mere licentiousness which despises the law.

But if the study of Latin literature is to effect this great object, (which it can effect,) it must be pursued thoroughly. We ought then, finally, to begin to *banish all manuals and exercise-books* which would palm off the Latinity of *their own authors*. By their barbarisms, by their violations of the genius of the Latin tongue, they give the mind an entirely false direction, and quite destroy, instead of quickening it. Furthermore, we must *discard all manuals and exercise-books that are patched up from writers of all periods*, from poets and prose-writers. It seems very plausible, but in reality amounts to nothing, when such authors repeat, again and again, that they are far from all *one-sided views*; no foreigner (they say), who wished to learn German, would strive to copy the language of Göthe or Schiller, syllable for syllable; every

reasonable man would wish rather to acquire the German common to all educated men of Göthe and Schiller's time; and, to conclude, such a course is of no use for beginners. But what would the enemies of a *one-sided* course say if one should take a notion to put manuals into the hands of young German children at school, (for that, in spite of the difference of years, corresponds exactly with the commencement of a Latin course,) made up of a mosaic of words and phrases, not merely of extracts, taken from the Nibelungen-Lied, the Minnesingers and Mastersingers, the Reformers, the Silesian schools of poets, and all the writers of a later age? In fact, however, those enemies of a *one-sided* course proceed in a way no less ridiculous and far more injurious; for time would bring a remedy for such a mistaken course in German, but in Latin, a language which is no longer used in daily life, time would but render the evil greater. What can they say who would have the language common to all educated Romans at the time of Cicero and Caesar, not that of those Romans alone, if we asked them for other sources to draw from, sources which have no existence? To be sure, if we could be present at a *Thée dansant* at Marcus Tullius Cicero's, or a *Partie l'Hombre* at the *Soirées* of Julius Caesar, or would the *Sosii*, (now alas! so deaf,) but send us the newest sheets of privileged Roman journals of fashion, or the wet leaves of romances and novels of the best times of the republic; in that case we should find no trouble about the language of the educated, and we could not only learn the genuine *accent de Rome*, (like the *accent d'Orleans* in the good times of the ancien régime,) but we should know how to employ the most tasteful and latest fold of the *toga romana* to cover our nudity. Unfortunately, however, such is not the case; we have nothing to rely upon beyond Cicero and Caesar, and we cannot perceive and distinguish, in other writers what is universal and what is peculiar, as many imagine and pretend. But luckily this is not at all essential; should one but drink in the droppings of the Roman genius to be found in the remnants of Cicero's and Caesar's writings, he would have more than enough by way of preparatory discipline, to employ the labors of a whole life; everything else would fall away of itself. The feeling of the Ciceronians, so called, correct in itself, is rendered absurd only by the circumstance, that it led them to the foolish task of adapting the expressions of a thousand years back to convey the ideas of a totally different age. As long as a wig remains a wig, it cannot be dressed up so as to become a modern beaver-hat. But if it be thought that the pure spirit of man, and such is that of the beginner, may be contaminated by corrupt materials, this seems to us like wicked mockery, like impious blasphemy; we can only pardon

those who think so, on the ground that they know not what they do. The soul of a youth is something sacred; to defile it is worse than to defile the temple *men* have raised in honor of God; God the Holy One, has built it himself. But nothing is unimportant in the work of completing and adorning the temple which God has entrusted to us. The small is no less important than the great, because nothing is great or small where everything is equally necessary to the whole. So also in science, every part is equally essential.

A course of instruction in Latin, pursued according to our views,—excluding all practical aims, such as the use of Latin as a universal language, or for writing and speaking on literary and scientific subjects of the day, or the purposes of common life, views which haunt the brains of many only from reverence for hoary traditions, in spite of all the admonitions to the contrary which come from every quarter. Indeed the time when these traditions were more than traditions, when they rested on substantial grounds, has passed. This course of instruction above indicated, which pursuing earnestly only the one thing necessary, that is, surveying in its details as well as in its whole character the Roman mind as it stands forth in wondrous majesty; such a course cannot fail to be a *palaestra* in which the pupil, by wrestling with the genius of Rome, becomes acquainted not only with that, but with his own inward nature; the spirit will continue to hide him under its pinions when deceitful clouds shall afterwards threaten to envelop him; and it will hover around him unseen, when the consciousness of its concrete form fades or vanishes in the dawn of the new day. The practical theologian, lawyer or physician need not excuse himself by saying that he has no time to read the Latin classics; for if his training at school has effected what it should, its purposes must have been fulfilled with its conclusion; and if one's inclination or business do not lead him to pursue these studies in after life, he need not trouble himself further about them.

We have yet to speak of the moral training the Latin affords. What we in general call character is the individual form in which the individual man appears, as a particular link in the great chain of humanity, his nation, his race and his time. Besides the natural disposition, that is, the relations in which the faculties of the mind and heart stand to one another, education and instruction combined with life itself contribute most to human development. Different as individuals and their characters may be, they have yet all a common ground as education has a common end. The aim of education is the development and establishment of moral freedom; and this freedom is the union of the subjective desire with the objective law. The child, inasmuch as

it still obeys only the dictates of nature, strives only for what is agreeable to it or what promises to become so; it does not distinguish between the hurtful and the useful, the right and the wrong. When its education is properly conducted, it is compelled at an early age to obey without questioning the law, that is an authority from without, the will of its parents, that it may become accustomed to bow before the might of the law, and to recognize it as a thing to which it is subject, to obey it however opposed to its subjective will and pleasure. The nearer education approaches its true aim, the more will his improvement and advanced ripeness assist him in following the dictates of reason which his parents and teachers helped to establish in him, and in voluntarily fulfilling the law with the same acquiescence as when he was compelled so to do. Were then human weakness not in the way both of teachers and taught, man would infallibly conquer and suppress his animal desires to obey the law ever, without exception, yet not from compulsion but from the unrestrained impulses of reason; for this as such *can* desire nothing but the right. In this way the fundamental law of Christianity would be fulfilled; for the love it teaches is nothing more than the freedom we have described.

Now at the very time when impulses from without still continue to urge the youth to the fulfilment of the law, when he himself is beginning to see the reasons for it, though to a limited extent, and involuntarily to bow before its might, his Latin education begins,—*the study of that national character, which, in its purity, appears as the law itself.* Who does not see the beneficial effects this must have upon the youth? For though the immediate seat of the character is in the moral sphere, the intellectual powers have a vital and essential connection with it, since no part of the inward man can be affected, without affecting all the rest. The contemplation and study of the law, this logical discipline, as it may be called, must influence powerfully the morals and the will, and impress and strengthen the whole character.

It is not our plan to suggest a system of education in Latin; we have tried rather only to show its importance for our times. But as it may appear that we confine the study of this language within too narrow bounds, we must expressly protest against such an interpretation. As much as we are convinced that Cicero and Caesar are the Romans who exhibit the genius of their nation in its purest form, and who must always be the main sources of the mental cultivation that is to be drawn from the Latin; we are nevertheless far from opposing the study of the poets, and the other prose writers as Sallust, Livy and Tacitus, when the powers of the pupil are developed and trained

to reflection. They will then easily perceive that with the exception perhaps of Tibullus and Ovid there is hardly one genuine Latin poet, and that from the nature of things there could not be. In the prose-writers they can mark the speedy disappearance of the Roman mind, after its mission was fulfilled, and learn to comprehend it the better from its own counterpart.

As to writing Latin, we have already expressed our views of its importance in another place; here then we would but say, that it amounts to nothing more than the proof to an arithmetical solution. The more competent one is to reproduce the Roman form of thought, the further he has entered into the dwelling-place of the Roman mind. The nature of these exercises is what our ancestors called *imitations*, however unpleasantly the name may sound. Individual, characteristic style is a nonentity when a modern strives for it in a dead language. The need of Latin for practical purposes has long ceased to exist, since it has finally been conceded,—at least tacitly, and in practice—that every man in representing the ideas of his time must choose a corresponding form, either his mother tongue or some other modern language of equal cultivation.

The speaking of Latin, on the other hand, has scarcely any good results to set off against the great injury it does. The greatest *stylists* of modern times, men like *Ruhnken* and *Ernesti*, have never spoken Latin, because they had learned the inexpressible difficulty of only writing tolerably. If it was a hard task for them what will it be for others, who cannot hope to compare with them? And what sort of Latin will they speak? A spoken language, we must admit, is brought nearer to the mind of the speaker; and if it is a dead language, it is in a measure raised to life. But such a life as this lies always in the agonies of death. Lest the reader of these lines may imagine that I am speaking according to the maxim, *Nulla ars habet osorem nisi ignorantem*, I would observe—but for this reason alone—that I speak Latin daily in teaching, and that those who hear or have heard me, ascribe to me a more than common facility in this art. Nevertheless I must acknowledge that I have often been ashamed and vexed at seeing my education, whatever it may be, and that of others judged by my ability to speak Latin. This fluency is admired in the pupils of the Jesuit colleges, as for instance that of Freiburg in Switzerland. They speak with great readiness, but how! “*Sciunt, quod hic aut illic accusativus cum infinitivo stare debet.*”

We have hitherto in our remarks on the value of the Latin language for our age, confined ourselves to the gymnasia, its special nurses; and from the course of these observations, it will be evident

that according to our views the system of instruction there must be a grammatical one, if it is to produce fruit. The term *grammatical* we use in a broad sense, including in it an attention to the meaning of words and synonymes. The study of synonymes, however, must not be one which establishes, *à priori*, hair-breadth distinctions, which the least reading at once overthrows.

A course of school education which regards the Roman writers as compendiums of history, geography, archaeology and aesthetics must be absolutely ruinous to the young; for paradoxical as it may sound, it is nevertheless true, that we must seek in them compendiums of grammar, manuals of the *form* in which the Roman mind displays itself.

At the universities the lectures in which the Roman authors are interpreted are no longer regularly attended even by young philologists. A genial age seeks genial and philosophical modes of instruction, and prefers to erect a literary structure without foundation, or rather to take in ready-made, what can only be wrung out by painful industry; it would rather speculate than investigate. Under these peculiar circumstances we can bring this part of our subject to a speedy close, and need but to hint that if the gymnasium has properly followed and attained its aim, the university must attend to the development of the whole body of *Roman literature*, and must estimate every writer as the product of his age according to matter and manner, that the student now outwardly free—and free too he should be within,—may learn to glance over the whole domain, that he may hereafter understand with more certainty the particular branch to which he devotes himself.

While the Roman represents the objective, the Greek represents the subjective. This is attested not only by the whole political system of this nation, by which it was divided into a multitude of little States with entirely different institutions, but also by the language of the nation. While all genuine Romans show a common form of language and style so that individual characters are hardly to be recognized, among the vast number of Greek writers not two are to be found alike. Each one appears in his own individuality so sharply defined, moulded so plastically, we may say, that we can compare with them in this respect none but the Teutonic writers, different as the reasons for this phenomenon may be among Greeks and the Teutonic race. Furthermore no other instance is to be found in the languages of civilized nations, of different dialects coëxisting with equal pretension, as

in the Greek, which was divided into four chief dialects, the Ionic, Doric, Attic and Aeolic. The language itself, finally, is so unrestrained, and moves so pliantly in its loose fetters, that it is a point of the highest difficulty for the grammarian to deduce its laws, which are all modified by the great number of exceptions, and often to such an extent, that the examples accompanying the exception are as numerous as those under the rule. The whole language is penetrated and animated by countless ramifications of nerve-like particles, with the nicest shades of meaning, which in many places altogether defy our attempts to understand them.

The wondrously organized Greek displays this subjective element in its ideal, art, whose source and main principle, *beauty*, can never be defined but always felt by the susceptible and refined. All arts, at least the greater number, by far, attained under his fostering hand the highest degree of perfection and splendor. We have but to think of the Greek architects, who built their temples, of the sculptors who chiseled their statues, of their gem-engravers, of their painters and of their poets, poets such as no after ages have produced or will produce. This universal feeling of beauty, this living and moving in its being is seen also in the Greek writers who devoted themselves to the serious tasks of philosophy and history, to say nothing of the orators to whom it is natural and necessary.

Since now the scholar must thoroughly comprehend himself and his age, we must admit that the study of the Greek is indispensably necessary for the acquisition of such culture, though it would prove injurious if begun before a certain knowledge of Latin were attained. The protestant gymnasia of Germany follow in this respect the proper course, prescribed by the nature of the case.

Though the Roman character is as peculiar and distinctive as that of the Greeks, it necessarily borrowed a multitude of Greek elements, as history sufficiently teaches in the settlement of Italy by Greeks and their constant influence in Italy. This is seen most immediately in the Latin language, which is not only a branch of that great eastern trunk from which the Teutonic too shoots forth, but is penetrated through and through with the Grecian leaven. This fact appears likewise in Roman religion and mythology. Modern times have their foundation in Rome, Rome has hers in Greece; consequently, a knowledge of Greece is indispensably necessary to a knowledge of Rome. We need not here repeat what we have said above, in speaking of Rome; for *mutatis mutandis* it will all apply to Greece as the origin of Rome.

Freedom is a union of the subjective desire with the outward law.

When the boy begins to learn Latin, he is at that stage of his being which is represented by the Greek, and then the aim is to awaken him to the existence and authority of the law. The Latin is therefore in its proper place. But to reconcile the objective law with freedom, a second thing is necessary, a *conscious* recognition of his inner or subjective nature, that natural necessity, which begins to rule unperceived by him, with his first breath, and would accompany him, were it not checked, to his last hour. Alas! it does accompany many men even to their graves. This consciousness of his primeval nature nothing can impart better than the study of Greek. Experience speaks loud enough here for those who cannot penetrate deeper. In the Jesuit-schools and those of Catholic countries which do not participate in the protestant system of education, the confession of objective Christianity has of itself suppressed these studies, in spite of the zeal with which Greek was pursued in Italy at the restoration of letters. No isolated instance to the contrary, like that of Thiersch in Munich, is strong enough to refute this, as the necessary result, and no one that knows the earlier philologists of Italy will call them good Catholics.

Writers like Cicero and Caesar were a thing impossible in Greece. Though we confine ourselves to these two authors in studying the genius of the Roman people, we must allow and even require a wider choice in the study of Greek. Above all, the poets deserve our attention, because in them we see the clearest manifestation of real Greek culture, as we do that of the Romans in the historian Caesar, and the orator Cicero. Here too the gymnasia must unfold the language, and the university the literature in its representatives. For the antiquities of both nations the studies at any classical school will suffice; but it would be more profitable if the historical lessons were immediately connected with the grammatical, since the language and the history of a nation are *one*.

As to writing Greek,—for most institutions have abandoned all attempts at speaking it,—our age is returned to the proper point of view; for it is only practised for the purpose of impressing on the student the most essential principles of grammar, including etymological and syntactical forms; though some years back, a noble enthusiasm, well enough in itself, carried it beyond this point, and fancied it possible for pupils to write and for teachers to correct original compositions and orations in Greek.

The above-mentioned protestant gymnasia have also, in our opinion, established a proper proportion between the Greek and Latin; it is not right to make the number of lessons equal, as is done in many Swiss schools. And he who feels called to devote his after years ex-

clusively to Greek studies, will find sufficient preparation under the arrangements of the protestant schools.

As the Christian Teutonic character proceeds from this union of the subjective Greek with the objective Latin, a truth which cannot be fully demonstrated here; the Teutonic languages, which are the impress of the Teutonic mind, must each unite in itself the Greek freedom and the Roman formality. After the establishment of Christianity, which is the religion of freedom, guiding the whole will of man to the fulfilment of the law, and thus soaring above the law, the various German nations were united under the German emperor, and are now again united by the German Confederation; consequently, particular dialects are no longer employed by men of education in writing and speech; they are merged in the High German; and this High German blends the formality of the Latin with the suppleness of the Greek in such a way that every writer of character and originality can impress his individuality upon the common Teutonic basis. But we must refrain from expatiating on other points,—the arts, for instance, which in their various kinds among the Teutonic race approach in their perfection those of the Greeks, though they do not equal them, and jurisprudence and law, which is not far behind the Roman law. Thus much is certain—that Latin and Greek must be retained, if we would properly understand our own glorious tongue. As a State of southern Germany has lately inquired into the expediency of making Greek elective, and requiring it only of philologists and theologians, it is to be hoped that the answers to this question will satisfactorily show, that the proposed limitation would cut off an essential element of scientific culture. Its loss would soon be generally felt and gratify that false liberty, or radicalism that offers death for life. From this may our country be preserved, and not be deterred by any foolish clamor from proceeding by the safe path of history to a more glorious development and a clearer understanding of itself.