

## THE CENTENARY OF THE DEATH OF FRIEDRICH AUGUST WOLF

BY WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

A HUNDRED years ago last August there died in Marseilles the great classical scholar and greater classical teacher, Friedrich August Wolf. To most educated men his name is now connected only with the scientific presentation of the *Homeric Question*, the influence of which has permeated all branches of classical, biblical, and historical investigation since. But when we consider that Wolf always regarded his activity in publishing as secondary, that he left behind no comprehensive work, that all his books, including the famous *Prolegomena* itself, were thrown off incidentally to his teaching, appearing for the most part as editions of the classics for the use of his students, and that his supreme interest was teaching, in the course of which he built up a science of his chosen subject, we should rather be interested in Wolf the teacher, than in Wolf the scholar. For it was the enthusiasm which he infused into his students, many of whom—Philip Karl Buttmann, Ludwig Friedrich Heindorf, Immanuel Bekker, August Boeckh, Gottfried Bernhardt—were to carry on his methods and ideals in the following generation, which made him the foremost teacher of his day. But beyond the influence which he exerted on his immediate circle, it was the revolution which he made in classical studies, the bringing into prominence of a new instrument of education—what he called *philology*—and above all the spirit of enquiry which has pervaded classical education since, that still give him so prominent a place in the history of scholarship.

Whatever we may think of the merits of his contribution to the critical study of Homer, we must admit that in the domain of historical criticism as applied to ancient literature Wolf was not an originator. For almost a century before his *Prolegomena* appeared

in 1795, Richard Bentley, England's foremost classical scholar, by his controversy with Charles Boyle over the origin of the letters of Phalaris culminating in his *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Aesop*, which Parson called the "immortal dissertation," the expanded final edition of which appeared in 1699 when the Cambridge scholar was only thirty-seven, had laid down for all time the principles on which criticism must be applied to ancient records, thus marking a new epoch in modern scholarship. Wolf merely applied the same principles to the greatest of poets, while Bentley showed that Phalaris, the fifth century B. C. tyrant of Agrigentum, could not have composed the famous letters, but rather a Sophist of the age of decline who had borrowed his name, so Wolf tried to prove that the Iliad and Odyssey were not the work of a single poet Homer, but rather made up of popular ballads, their unity being merely the result of subsequent editors. It is hardly fair, therefore, to say that his novel theory was the outgrowth of the scepticism of traditional views and institutions and the glorification of the common man resulting from the French Revolution. His younger contemporary Niebuhr went a step further in applying the same critical and scientific method for the first time—it had been adumbrated only faintly by his predecessor the Dutch scholar Perizonius—to historical records in his *Roemische Geschichte*, the first two volumes of which appeared in 1811 and 1812 respectively. While wrongly believing that the early Roman legends had been transmitted from generation to generation in poetic lays—a theory soon to be proven untenable by Sir G. C. Lewis and now abandoned—Niebuhr was enabled by his criticism of the sources to separate the early period from the legends which had beclouded it since Roman days and to leave us a residue of truth. Still later, Dean Milman, in his *History of the Jews*, which appeared in 1829, extended the method to sacred history, showing that the "chosen people" in the light of our knowledge of modern Semitic peoples were developed from an ordinary Oriental tribe. Since then these principles have been extended to every field concerned with the past and its records, finally entering the domain of Christianity itself, until now science has become merely the name of a method characteristic of the spirit of investigation everywhere, in which criticism has replaced authority.

But Wolf did more than apply a new method to a restricted field. To quote from J. E. Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship*, "he was the first to present a systematic description of the vast fabric

that he called by the name of *Alterthums-Wissenschaft*, to arrange and review its component parts, and to point to a perfect knowledge of the many-sided life of the ancient Greeks and Romans, as the final goal of the modern study of the ancient world. He raised that study to the rank of a single comprehensive and independent science." Wolf used to say that "the goal of the study of antiquity was the knowledge of man in antiquity." That knowledge to him was comprehended in the term *philology*, which he regarded as "a purely human education, the elevation of all the powers of mind and soul to a beautiful harmony of the inner and outer man." If such be the goal he argued that we must turn to antiquity for instruction and that the interpretation of the ancient languages and history trained the mind. This idea he pursued so successfully that he merited Niebuhr's encomium of the "eponymous hero" of subsequent German philologists; and the even greater praise of his English admirer Mark Pattison that he was "the true author of modern classical culture." For the position that the classics still hold in this degenerate age of materialism both in Europe and America is largely the result of his life efforts. It is profitable, therefore, a century after his passing, to review briefly some of the chief events in his academic career at Halle and Berlin, and to appraise the achievements which have made him one of the great teachers and scholars of modern times.

We suffer from no lack of materials for a view of Wolf's life and activity. On his last birthday he began an autobiographical sketch, *De vita et studiis F. A. Wolfi, Philologi*, addressed to his friends and former students in Germany and Switzerland, but made little progress with it. But we have two excellent biographies written from different points of view—one, *Leben und Studien Friedr. Aug. Wolf's, des Philologen*, appearing in two volumes nine years after his death, written by his son-in-law, W. Koerte, which is naive, intimate, and sympathetic; the other, *Friedr. Aug. Wolf in seinem Verhältnisse zum Schulwesen und zur Pädagogik dargestellt*, appearing in two volumes in 1861-1862, by J. F. J. Arnoldt, accurate and unimaginative, the true Prussian official's account of his subject. There is also the brief *Erinnerungen an Friedrich August Wolf*, published only a year after Wolf had departed, by the loving and reverent pen of one of his Swiss pupils, Professor Hanhart of Basel. From these and minor sources, we can get a fairly complete picture of the man and his career.

Wolf was born February 15, 1759, in Hainrode at the foot of the Harz in the province of Hannover in the same year in which Porson was born in England and two hundred years, lacking three days, after the birth of the French classicist Casaubon in Geneva. Like Porson and his older contemporary Winckelmann, Wolf was of humble extraction, his father the village schoolmaster and organist, his mother the daughter of the clerk of a neighboring town. He owed his spiritual awakening to his mother, who was musical, thus again exemplifying Buffon's famous truism *qu'en général les enfants tiennent de leur mère leurs qualités intellectuelles et morales*, and to his ambitious father the beginnings of his systematic education. Before he was two or knew his letters, his father had taught him many Latin words and a feeling for grammatical relationship, and thus early he showed as precocious a memory as Porson or Macaulay. At four he could read, write, sing and play on the piano. When he was eight, the family moved to the nearby Nordhausen where the father reached his highest preferment, assistant-master in a girls' school. On entering the gymnasium there Wolf already knew the rudiments of Greek and French, and his memory had improved so that he could repeat fifteen lines on hearing them once.

Wolf was to stay ten years at Nordhausen, until he was ready for the university. There he had three successive masters, each of whom impressed him differently. The first was Johann Andreas Fabricius, author of an *Outline of a General History of Learning* (1752-4), and then a man over seventy whose mode of instruction was "to pour out information in full streams" over the heads of his pupils. He was succeeded in 1769, two years after Wolf's entrance, by a real student, J. C. Halle, who, two years later at the age of thirty-eight, was to fall a victim to his zeal for study. Lastly, there was one Johann Friedrich Albert, regarded by teachers and students alike as an ignoramus and negligent of his duties, since under his direction the school was closed for months at a time. Under him Wolf fell into bad habits, especially through the influence of Frankenstein, the music master, whom he regarded with affection and later called a "diamond in the rough." Heretofore a model of industry Wolf now was regarded as an example of laziness. Evidently he had learned all the Greek and Latin his teachers could impart, and so he began the study of modern languages with his new-found friend—French, Italian, Spanish, English, and Dutch, at the same time taking Hebrew lessons with a Jew of the village. He had to read his Don Quixote with the help of a Dutch translation in lieu

of a Spanish lexicon, and for his Italian he borrowed a dictionary for a brief time and copied out all the words he did not recognize from his knowledge of Latin and French. He also learned to play a half-dozen musical instruments, to sing and to dance, and he even fell in love with his dancing teacher, a young widow. But during the last two years of his stay at Nordhausen, he renounced his frivolous habits and now, though nominally still at school, spent most of his time at home with his books, working till long after midnight in a cold room, his feet in a basin of water and one eye bandaged to rest the other. He read all the books in the school library, borrowed others from the teachers, the village minister and doctor, and carried quantities more home from the library of one of the masters at Ilfeld. He read the classics with feverish industry, committing several books of Homer to memory.

Now at eighteen he was ready for Göttingen, attracted there by the renown of the classicist Christian Gottlob Heyne, its chief ornament. He matriculated on April 8, 1877, as *studiosus philologiae*. A year before he had visited the town on foot to find out the requirements of entrance, armed with a letter to Heyne, then Prorector and Professor of Eloquence and Director of the Philological Seminary. Wolf never forgot his reception by the great Greek scholar and the latter's seeming contempt for his own chosen field. Asked who had advised him to study what he called philology, Wolf replied it had been his ambition from childhood to study the classics. Heyne retorted that he should study either theology or law, and dip into the classics only in moments of leisure. But Wolf replied that he was ready to make any sacrifice in order to gratify his taste for "the greater intellectual freedom" furnished by the classics. His idea of freedom aroused Heyne's ridicule and he was admonished that "the young must obey their elders," and that "the classics led only to starvation," pointing his remarks by letters lying on his table written by rectors and co-rectors of schools all over Germany, who were destitute because of indulging their tastes for the classics. He added that conditions were little better even in Göttingen, and that there were only four or six chairs of philology in Germany. When Wolf answered that he aspired to one of these, he was curtly dismissed. But Heyne was evidently impressed by his wide reading, for he invited him to attend his lectures on Homer the following year.

Wolf was now again at Göttingen to be enrolled as a student of philology, a *Fach* which the Prorector Baldinger told him existed

only in his own imagination, and advised him, as Heyne had done before, to enroll as *studiosus theologiae* or *juris* if he really wished to become a school-master. But he finally had his way, being the first student of philology at Göttingen or anywhere else—except a few isolated cases at Erlangen between 1749-1777. Thus his matriculation marks an epoch in the history of classical learning. Wolf again visited Heyne, now Rector, and was more curtly received than before. Heyne's reception taught Wolf a lesson he never forgot. In later life when Professor at Halle he never allowed himself to be too busy to see students, believing that the first call on a teacher's time was their needs. He even went to the other extreme, contrary to all academic custom, visiting his students in their rooms, taking long walks with them in vacation, and lending them books. Hanhart says he frequently saw Wolf in bookshops at Halle buying back books which he had lent to unscrupulous students who sold them. He gave farewell dinners to those who were leaving which lasted long after midnight. But such intimacy never bred disrespect, for every one of his students remained his enthusiastic admirer.

At the first meeting of Heyne's course on Homer, Wolf took down a list of the books recommended and immediately collected them from the library. Frequently he spent from twenty to thirty hours in preparation for the next lecture, as no student ever took his teacher's suggestions more in earnest. But he soon found that Heyne's methods were superficial and aimed chiefly at reading the Iliad through, accompanied by little textual criticism. When at the end of the fifth week only the first book had been read, Wolf left the class in disgust. Just as Gibbon found his fourteen months at Magdalen "unprofitable," and left for Lausanne to carry on his reading alone, Wolf found his five weeks with Heyne unprofitable and continued his studies by himself in his room, following the habit he had learned at Nordhausen. Heyne soon discovered his absence and took his revenge at the beginning of the next semester by refusing Wolf admittance to his class in Pindar on the ground it was *privatum* and open only to advanced students. Wolf's demand for an examination was unheeded and as a consequence he renounced all lectures. He likened Heyne's seminarists to the Muses, and the Professor himself to Apollo. A little later, however, Heyne invited him to join the Seminar on completing the usual written exercise, but Wolf disdainfully refused. This was certainly an unfortunate policy on the part of Wolf, whatever Heyne's treatment of him had

been. Though lacking in originality and charm, still Heyne was the best classical teacher of his day. Wolf's attitude toward him was merely the first instance of what was to be so prominent in his later life at Halle and especially Berlin. At the former place his supercilious manner was to alienate all his colleagues but one—Semler, for whom he had a real affection; at Berlin the same temper in an aggravated form was to embitter his whole nature and destroy his influence with colleagues and students alike. But we must admit with Mark Pattison that Wolf was an unusual student. Not since Gibbon had entered Oxford in 1754 with a "stock of learning which might have puzzled a doctor" had any student so gifted as Wolf entered any university.

On retiring from Heyne's influence Wolf became very industrious. He seldom appeared on the street, never attended a *kneipe* during his student days, and never indulged in the coarser pleasures of student life. His only intimates were among the faculty, his only recreation walking. He was so jealous of his time that he dressed in three minutes and avoided the necessity of going to the barber by having his hair cut short and wearing a wig. This along with his mantle, which the students called his *pallium philologicum*, made him look far older than he was. He read so late into the night that by the end of October he became very ill, recovering only with difficulty, his sickness necessitating his return home for a long rest. Thereafter he worked only to midnight, and reduced his twenty pipes a day to only one, smoked after breakfast—a custom he kept up ever after. Such industrious habits do not seem to have been exceptional among poor and ambitious students of the eighteenth century in Germany. We are told that Heyne himself, when a student at Leipsic, slept only two nights a week for a whole semester in order to use books which he could borrow only for brief periods. During his second semester, on his return from his enforced rest, Wolf applied himself to the Homeric poems with the greatest care, and it was at this time that he thought he detected differences in tone and language in the various books, which was later to bear fruit in his launching of the *Homeric Question*. In the third semester he showed his range of interest by hearing lectures outside his main subject, on natural history, psychology, philosophy, church history and the New Testament. But in his fourth and last term, apart from a course in the Odyssey with Glandorf, he heard no more lectures. By that time he was giving lectures himself in Greek,

Latin, and English, which indicates that he intended to habilitate as a Privat-dozent at Göttingen.

Heyne, however, was unwilling to have him as a colleague, and recommended Wolf to be Assistant Rector of a select boys' school at Ilfeld. Here he remained from October, 1779, to April, 1782, during which years his ideas about Homer and Plato were slowly forming. Thus, in 1780, when only twenty-one, he offered a Berlin publisher a *Dissertation on the Origin of the Homeric Poems*, but was advised to wait. In the next year, he became Rector at Ilfeld and in 1782 was married. It was in the latter year that he published his first work on Plato, the text of the *Symposium* with German notes, written to arouse interest in his immediate students. In its preface he adroitly referred to Frederick the Great and his minister of education, von Zedlitz, as the "philosopher on the throne" and "enlightened minister," respectively, which was later to bear fruit in a call to Halle. Meanwhile, from April, 1782, to December of that year, he was Rector at a school in Osterrode in the Harz. His success at Ilfeld and Osterrode brought him two calls as Rector of gymnasia, one at Hildesheim, the other at Gera. It was at this time that he was invited also to Halle as Professor of Philology and Pedagogy. As the salary there was only three hundred thalers, and the one at Gera was nine hundred and included a seat in the Consistory, Wolf visited Semler at Halle for advice. To his argument that Gera was a "fat land where the cows' bellies touched the grass," Semler answered that Gera then "was good for cows, but Halle for scholars." As Wolf found that his teaching at Gera might be trammelled by certain religious requirements, he finally decided on Halle. Three months after beginning his work there his salary was increased one-half from the added Professorship of Eloquence.

On coming to Halle, April 3rd, 1783, Wolf was twenty-four years old and with a reputation as a successful teacher. In fact, he was at the threshold of a splendid career, for he was to remain for twenty-three years, the golden years of promise and accomplishment. To understand his success at Halle it is necessary to know something of the conditions obtaining there in the time of Frederick the Great. It was, in a word, a critical time in the history of German university education. The initial impulse of the Renaissance had long since spent itself and a condition of atrophy had characterized classical studies in Germany and elsewhere for over a century and a half. This state of decay had been somewhat overcome in Germany from about the middle of the eighteenth century on, by



the labors of our great classical scholars: Johann Mathias Gesner at Göttingen (1734-61), Johann August Ernesti at Leipsic (1742-81), Johann Joachim Winckelmann, the founder of the science of Classical Archaeology, who lived most of his later life in Rome (1755-68), and Heyne, Gesner's successor at Göttingen (1763-1812). Of these Gesner was the real prototype of Wolf and a great teacher and scholar whose influence had reinvigorated classical learning. He had come to Göttingen at its foundation and was Professor of Poetry and Eloquence and head of the Classical Seminary there for twenty-seven years. He had outlined his encyclopaedia of philology, philosophy, and history as a syllabus for his lectures and at Göttingen represented the New Humanism as opposed to the Old—teaching the classical languages not to imitate their style, but to assimilate their content. He was the prophet of the new era and the precursor of Lessing, Winckelmann, Goethe, and Wolf. He had an able coadjutor in his reforms and ideas in the person of Ernesti at Leipsic.

In the years just preceding Wolf's coming to Halle there had grown up in German education a new tendency, which, though ultimately derived from the influence of Rousseau and Locke, was to take, unfortunately, the form of a reaction against the classics. German education was, indeed, in a period of *Sturm und Drang*. The representatives of the new tendency aimed at a more modern and practical training, and so found fault with the pedantic methods of the traditional curriculum, the predilection of the classicists for details of grammar. Theology, as well as the classics, was to suffer in the new demand for a more up-to-date instruction. To them, Rousseau's slogan "back to nature" meant the teaching of "realities," in which Greek and Latin were at best merely the keys by which the treasures of ancient literature could be unlocked. The whole movement naturally found a ready response among the people and the press. Its chief representative was J. B. Basedow, who, in 1774, had formed at Dessau a school known as the *Philanthropinum*, where the new pedagogy was nurtured, the new ideas comprehensively being known as *Philanthropinism*. In 1778 Basedow had left Dessau, he and his followers being the open enemies of classical training. One of the Dessau teachers, Ernst Christian Trapp, had been at Halle since 1779 as Professor of Pedagogy and head of the "Training School" there, and by Wolf's advent there the Philanthropinists were in full sway.

At this time the classics were taught at Halle in the Theological Seminar as ancillary to theology. Since 1757 the Seminar had been in charge of Semler, but in 1778 it was expanded by being connected with the Training School. In 1779 Trapp became Inspector, though Semler continued as its Director. So the fate of the Classics was largely in Trapp's hands, and Trapp was the protagonist of the philanthropists at Halle. His idea was to produce teachers and to make an independent profession of teaching. Humanistic courses formed only part of the scheme, Trapp confining his activities to the pedagogical side. But he was to prove a failure, and it was his resignation which made Wolf's appointment possible and Wolf had been recommended partly to remove the stigma that Halle was not a school of philology. He saw his opportunity for reform and threw himself into his work with vigor. He had nothing but contempt for the superficial Philanthropinists, though praise for the ideas of Locke and Rousseau which they had cheapened.

At first Wolf took too much for granted on the part of his students and got little response. At Göttingen the conditions were different. Gesner and Heyne had long prepared the way for classical study, while at Halle Wolf had no predecessor and the Philanthropinist theories were still strong. Undismayed he gave up the Training School and, in order to conquer hostility to the classics, he lectured only on philology. Like Trapp he saw that better teachers must be trained if the general tone of education was to be raised. To do this and as a supplement to his lecture course he founded in 1787 the Philological Seminary, parallel to the old Theological one, in which to train classical teachers directy. It was to have twenty-four men, each with a stipend of forty thalers for two years, Wolf himself as Director to receive one hundred. No first year man was to be admitted except as an auditor, and none at all without a knowledge of Greek and Latin.

To treat adequately the complex subject of philology, he gave for the first time in 1785 a course on the Encyclopaedia of Philology, as a general introduction to the whole subject of antiquity. He repeated this outline course with additions nine times at Halle and eight more at Berlin. He divided it into four parts: introduction, including the philosophy of grammar, Greek and Latin grammar, interpretation, and criticism; ancient geography, history, chronology, mythology, antiquities, and the history of literature and art; archaeology, epigraphy, and numismatics; and, lastly, the history of all disciplines from the beginning of the middle ages to his time. It was

not until 1807 that this material was published in outline, his famous *Darstellung der Alterthums-Wissenschaft* which we shall mention again later. Wolf began his lectures with the warning that examinations should not be the goal, but that the student should aim to be of use to himself and the state: *perverse studere eosqui examinibus studeant; recte studet qui sibi et vitæ studet*. To study liberal studies in an illiberal way was to bring them to a level even below that of the technical arts, and whoever was interested only in passing an examination, did just this. Furthermore, the study of the classics was not for *Brot-studenten*, but only for those who felt the inner call. They should never be pursued for practical purposes; the physician should not study Greek for terminology, nor the theologian nor jurist for practical examples. Nor did Wolf aim to fill his students with information. He had seen the folly of this when a youth at Nordhausen in the case of the garrulous Fabricius. His aim was rather to suggest and stimulate. The student was to do the work, he was merely to direct. At the *Uebungen* of the Seminar they read papers, interpreted and disputed, Wolf having indicated the method at the opening meeting. His lectures were merely additional instruments of instructions, but always secondary in importance. He never wrote them out, but carefully prepared them, using a few notes in their delivery. We can judge of their content from the publication years later of the notebooks of several of his auditors. Moreover, Wolf always spoke in Latin, a practice which he continued later at Berlin, even though the practice there was to cost him dear. At the very beginning of the eighteenth century, Thomasius here at Halle had dared to inaugurate the habit of lecturing in German. The new custom had aroused the ridicule of the Dutch scholars who spoke of the *horribilis mugitus vernaculi sermonis* as incompatible *apud severam nationem Germanorum*. But Wolf still believed that an earnest classical student should be able to write, speak, and think in Latin. That he was a graceful and telling speaker is known from several sources. One of his Halle students, Fröhlich (1798-1802), later wrote an account of Wolf in which he called his lectures "witty, clever, and sarcastic. Karl von Raumer heard him in 1803 and Goethe in 1805. The former, in his *Geschichte der Pädagogik* (1843-54), speaks of the "peculiar attraction of his vast learning, interest, and criticism." The latter, who during a visit at Halle prevailed upon one of Wolf's daughters to let him secrete himself behind a curtain of his lecture hall, speaks in his *Tag-und Jahreshefte* of his manner as the "spontaneous deliverance of a full mind,

a revelation issuing from a thorough knowledge, and diffusing itself over the audience with spirit, taste, and freedom.”<sup>1</sup> His own distinguished pupil Bernhardt, the historian of Greek and Latin Literature, likened his lectures to witty conversations rather than formal teaching. And another pupil, Hanhart, speaks of the possibility of hearing a heart beat in the class room, so great was the attention of the auditors to his discourse. We are told that his pupils later on copied his mannerisms—his rapid entry into the lecture hall, his constant hemming, and his eyes riveted on his book. Only one bust, that of Lessing, ornamented his room, symbolic of his critical spirit.

During the twenty-three years of his teaching at Halle, Wolf delivered fifty different courses of lectures which ranged over the entire field of antiquity, not only the texts of authors, but all phases of ancient culture. Some of these courses were subsequently repeated up to ten times. Körte lists all the courses given at Halle between 1783 and 1806. Among Greek authors Wolf lectured on Homer's Iliad (10 times), Odyssey (3), Hymns (2), Hesiod (1), Theognis (1), Pindar (2), Aeschylus (1), Aristophanes (4), Herodotus (2), Thucydides (1), Xenophon (3), Plato (7), Aristotle (1), Aeschines and Demosthenes (4), Longinus (1), Lucian (2), Matthew and Mark (1); among Latin authors, Terence (1), Cicero (11), Horace (9), Tacitus (3), Suetonius (4), and Paternulus (1). He gave systematic courses in Mythology (3), Geography (1), Chronology (1), Numismatics (1), Painting (1), Greek and Roman Metres (1), History of Greek Literature (10), Most Ancient Greek Poetry (3), Introduction to Homer (2), Greek Tragedy (2), Greek and Roman Drama (2), Greek and Roman Literature (1), Greek Grammar (2), Latin Composition (2), Greek and Roman Antiquities (1), Greek Antiquities (7), Roman Antiquities (8), Roman Life (6), Foundations of History (1), Ancient History (7), History of Rome (1), History of Philology (1), and the *Encyclopaedia philologica* (10). He gave his lectures in cycles of three years—six semesters—lecturing on an average fourteen hours a week in the summer semester and seventeen in winter, while the ordinary ambitious Privat-dozent of his day averaged fourteen. So varied a program impresses us that we are in the presence of a great scholar and teachers. Our own classical teachers, with their hackneyed repetitions of the same courses, in which not only Latin is separated

<sup>1</sup> Translated by Mark Pattison, in his *F. A. Wolf, North British Review*, June, 1865, p. 37 (reprinted in Nettleship, *Essays by the Late Mark Pattison*, I, 1889).

from Greek, but subdivisions in each are parcelled out and remain permanently fixed, may read the list with profit.

One would expect few books from a scholar who carries such a schedule of work. Yet the list of Wolf's publications is neither short nor unimportant. While Winckelmann influenced the learned world only through his writings, Wolf influenced a narrower circle through the lecture-hall and seminar. In a letter to Ruhnken at Leyden he gave the key-note to his life interest by saying *docendo aliquando plus quam scribendo delector*. Years later, Niebuhr truly said that he was "before all things a teacher." Consequently, all he wrote grew out of the immediate needs of his teaching. He used to call his books *parerga*, and we are told that he wrote with difficulty, always polishing and never satisfied, driving his printer to distraction by eleventh-hour corrections. In 1783 appeared his edition of Hesiod's *Theogony*; in 1784-85 an edition of Homer; in 1786 *Selected Dialogues of Lucian*; in 1787 four Greek plays; in 1789 the *Leptines of Demosthenes*, which was to inspire his great pupil August Boeckh years later to write his *Public Economy of Athens* (1817). Even the famous *Prolegomena*, which appeared in 1795 (2nd ed. 1859, 3rd, 1872, 4th, 1875), was produced without premeditation or idea of its future fame, merely to meet an immediate need. The Francke press in Halle asked him to prepare a second edition of his school-text of Homer, 1784-5, now exhausted. As it was to contain no notes, Wolf proposed to tell in the Preface the history of the text and his method of treating it. As he had been meditating on Homer for over twenty years and had frequently lectured on the text and introduction, he merely wrote off his arguments. In this way there grew an octavo volume of 280 pages, the first part of a work whose full title was *Prolegomena ad Homerum, sive de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma, variisque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi*. The first volume gave a historical account of the accidents to the text through transmission. The proposed second volume was to give the internal proofs, the discrepancies and traces of joining in the text, in support of his contention that the Iliad especially was a conglomeration of fragments, owing its unity mainly to the alleged recension in the time of the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus. Since Wolf's fame as a scholar rests mainly upon this work, the first volume of which was completed when he was only thirty-six, we shall discuss its value somewhat at length.

Homeric scholarship in Wolf's day was practically where the Alexandrine critics had left it. In the seventeenth century scholars

had left it alone and by the middle of the eighteenth the text generally used was one reprinted from earlier Venetian and Florentine editions. Clarke in England had cleared the text of some of the more prominent errors, and Ernesti in Germany had made further progress by 1759, the Ernesti-Clarke text being thereafter commonly used in both countries. In 1788 de Villoison, after spending some time in Venice collating manuscripts and transcribing scholia, published the Venetian Scholia, though he and his immediate contemporaries were quite unconscious of the use to which these scholia might be put in revealing the difficulties which the Alexandrines had met. In the words of Professor Sandys, "the last scholar of the old school had unconsciously forged the weapons for the first scholar of the new." For whatever the merits or defects in form or theory, the appearance of the *Prolegomena* was to usher in a new epoch in the history of philology.

Though written in Latin for the learned world, the *Prolegomena* was to receive little recognition from classical scholars until the following generation, but was to be immediately read and discussed by educated men in general. While Wilhelm von Humboldt greeted it as a "great work which must take its place as a canon of editing," most of his contemporaries had anything but praise for the radical views expressed. Not a scholar in England, Holland, or France spoke in its behalf, not even Ruhnken in Leyden, to whom as *principi criticorum* Wolf had dedicated the work. De Villoison, angry at Wolf's use of his publication of the Venetian scholia, called it a "literary impiety," and the ancient historian Sainte-Croix condemned it without reading it as *un paradoxe litteraire* in 1798. France was not to feel the influence of the new theories until years afterwards through Fauriel, who was only twenty-two in 1795. In England, Peter Elmsley, also twenty-two at that time, was to show little interest in the *Prolegomena*. In his long review of Heyne's *Homeri Carmina* in eight volumes (1802), anonymously written for the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1803, he merely noted that Heyne's text alterations were mostly copied from Wolf's edition—but not a word about the *Homeric Question*. Later, in 1813, in a list of ten men who had studied the details of Greek, his own name appears, but not that of Wolf. In England the only approving voice was that of Flaxman, the sculptor. In Germany only the two Schlegels, Fichte, and, for a season, Goethe—though the latter by 1798 had returned to his faith in the unity—spoke for Wolf, while Schiller, Klopstock, Wieland, and Voss—the popular translation of Homer

by the latter had also appeared in 1795—were against him. Niebuhr, who was nineteen at the time of reappearance of the *Prolegomena*, and who was certainly influenced by Wolf's critical spirit, showed his disapproval of his Homeric views in the first volume of his *History of Rome*, 1811, by speaking of "the unity which characterizes the most perfect of Greek poems." Herder, whose prize essay on the *Origin of Language*, 1792, was to prepare the way for the rise of linguistic science, in an anonymous review of Wolf's work which, under the title of *Homer, ein Günstling der Zeit*, appeared in the *Horen* for September, 1795, stated that he had long regarded Homer like Thot and Hermes, as a "constellation of lesser stars," and that his boyhood belief in the distinct authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey had been confirmed by seeing the Venetian scholia on his recent visit to Italy. Wolf, in his answer in the October number of the *Jena Literary Gazette*, asked the public to withhold its judgment until the appearance of a German translation of his work—a translation that never was published. Heyne's attitude was similar to that of Herder. Wolf, in a letter dated November 18, 1795, had asked him to answer Herder, but before receiving it Heyne's review had already appeared in the *Göttingen Gelehrte Anzeigen* of November 21st, in which he called Wolf's book the "first fruits" of de Villoison's work, and added that he himself had made use of the same ideas years before in his lectures on Homer, thereby intimating that Wolf had gotten them when his student. Shortly before, however, in February, 1795, he had written Wolf that criticism was subsidiary with him, and since he and Wolf had such different aims neither stood in the way of the other. In a later number of the *Anzeigen*, December 19, 1795, he once more stated unequivocally that "he had already for thirty years entertained ideas which agreed in many respects with those contained in the *Prolegomena*." Also in a letter dated February 28, 1796, in answer to Wolf's of November 18, he complimented the latter on his researches and again wrote that it had long been a dominating thought of his that "the Iliad was a web woven from many separate pre-existing lays," and that he as well as others—for he had talked with Herder about it as far back as 1770—had held these ideas as a "matter of course." But he did not recall the essay on Homer which Wolf said he had sent him in 1779 nor did he recall the earlier implication of plagiarism. In 1797 Wolf replied to these charges by publishing in pamphlet form his *Letters to Heyne*, which had appeared in the journal *Deutschland* in 1796 and 1797.

Doubtless Heyne was hurt because his now famous pupil had dedicated his work to a German scholar living outside Germany and not to himself. But it is quite reasonable to believe the claims of both himself and Herder of having held the same views about the Homeric poems long before Wolf. It is just as reasonable also to clear Wolf of the charge of plagiarism. He had publicly stated his views since 1791, and the fact that he was not indebted for them to Heyne's lectures in his student days of 1777 was proved by the publication of the notes of Heyne's course on Homer taken by one of Wolf's fellow-students of the time. Wolf, then, cannot be said to have originated the theory of diverse authorship, for he was merely the first to launch it in a scientific manner. The ideas contained in the *Prolegomena* had been for a long time "in the air." Over two centuries before his work appeared, i. e., in 1583, Casaubon had noted the famous passage in Josephus *Contra Apionem* to the effect that writing was not known in the time of the Trojan War and that consequently the content of the poems was transmitted by memory from generation to generation until put together from separate lays in Peisistratus' day, ideas which were probably well known to the critics of Alexandria. From this passage, of which Wolf was to make so much, the French scholar had already concluded that a sound text was not to be expected. In 1713 Bentley had concluded that Homer, whom he dated around 1050 B. C., wrote a "sequel of songs" collected into the later epics in Peisistratus' time. In 1730 the Italian Vico, though unknown to Wolf, had said that Homer was merely a collective appellation for many successive poets. Wolf had certainly seen the Michaelis translation (1773, 2nd ed., 1778) of Robert Wood's *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer*, 1769, in which the English scholar had repeated Josephus' assertion about the absence of writing in Homer's day. Thus without doubt, Wolf's theories were shared more or less by scholars of his own and preceding day. It is only a marvel that no one before him had essayed to present them in a scientific manner.

Today, the external arguments which Wolf adduced in support of his thesis of diverse authorship are no longer valid—that writing was not known in Homer's day, that the length of the poems precluded the possibility of their being publicly recited, that no occasion existed in early days for such recital, and that proofs existed of tampering with the text in the interest of Athens. The *vox totius antiquitatis* to which he so confidently appealed for the tradition of the Peisistratidean recension in the sixth century B. C., is now known



to have been late, being first noted in Cicero, and later in Pausanias, Aelian, and Josephus. It has often been remarked that Wolf, though he lived twenty-nine years after the *Prolegomena* appeared, never published the second volume nor left anything of the sort in his literary *Nachlass*. Although he projected two more editions of the Homeric text, one with a commentary in several volumes, only the one without notes, in two volumes published in 1804-07 by Göschen in Leipsic with Flaxman's illustrations, was completed, and Wolf's main interest in it is shown by his boast in the Preface that it did not contain a single printer's error—a remarkable achievement, which surpassed the edition of 1784-85 which contained only about ten errors! His interest in the *Homeric Question* seems to have ended with the *Prolegomena*. Why he never returned to so fascinating a field has never been explained satisfactorily. De Quincy thought he "had raised a ghost he could not lay," while Friedländer believed he was afraid that he might find his earlier conclusions invalid.

It was Wolf's successors, a long line of critics, who were really to supply the second part of the *Prolegomena*, to point out the differences in language and metre, religion and geography, manners and customs in the poems. His great follower Lachmann, Professor at Berlin, 1825-51, did this for the Iliad. Indeed, his *Betrachtungen über Homer's Ilias*, 1837 (reprinted 1847, 1865, 1874) was far more an epoch-making contribution than Wolf's. In it he applied to the Iliad Wolf's analysis which he already in 1816 had applied to the Niebelungen-noth. While he resolved the German epic into twenty primitive lays, which were first unified in the early thirteenth century, he dissected the Iliad, on the basis of inconsistencies and contradictions in detail, into eighteen independent lays, if not by as many minstrels. But both Wolf and Lachmann, and the latter's follower Köchly, were gradually to be supplanted by the "expanded nucleus" theory of Gottfried Hermann, 1831-32 and 1840 which, with variations may be said to be the prevailing view of the separatist school yet. On the other hand, Kirchhoff's *Die Composition der Odyssee*, 1869, in which he predicated a ninth century "Return" to which additions were constantly made, is now the basis of the view of the Odyssey held by most scholars of the Wolfian tradition today, though Wolf himself had upheld the relative "integritas" of that poem.

Wolf's greatness, then, consists rather in his critical spirit than in his results, a spirit which separated him from his contemporaries

and predecessors, though it has brought results quite different than those he anticipated. In face of the zealous advocacy of the unity of the Homeric poems which in very recent years has been resolutely away from the Wolfians, we can no longer say, as did Mark Pattison sixty years ago, that "no scholar will again find himself able to embrace the unitarian hypothesis." But the Wolfians held the stage almost alone until well on into the present century, as quotations from only two recent books will show. Thus Mrs. Wilmer Cave Wright in her *History of Greek Literature*, 1907, says: "Time which makes all heresies orthodox, has suppressed the unitarians in their turn, and all scholars are now *Chorizontes*, i. e., like the Alexandrine "Separatists" who believe in the dual authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey. Professor Breasted, in his more recent *Ancient Times*, 1916, speaks of "the ancient bards" who gave "the world its greatest epic in the Iliad," and says that the Epic cycle of poetry was "not the work of one man, but a growth of several centuries by generations of singers, some of which were still living even after 700 B. C., when they were first written down." Unfortunately, the zeal of the advocates of both schools has not been unaccompanied by expressions of mutual contempt. Thus von Wilamowitz, the present German protagonist of diverse authorship, in his *Iliad und Homer*, 1920 (2nd edition) calls the believers in unity "fanatics" and the Iliad a "miserable patchwork"; while an ardent representative of the opposing camp has expressed his contempt of the Wolfians by a wholesale condemnation of German scholarship, unfortunately not uncommon in these post-bellum days: "Wolf, Lachmann, Kirchhoff, Wilamowitz, and a long list of famous names have done much to convince the world that German erudition is blind and stupid, bent on making false facts in order to support a false theory." Such views are extreme when we must admit that if the Wolfian hypothesis is full of difficulties, no theory yet advanced has been generally accepted. We are minded to quote a wise saying of Ephorus which has its bearing on this as on many other similar questions: "If writers could only be present at the actual transactions, it would be far the best of all modes of learning."

The immediate effect of the *Prolegomena* on the fortunes of its author was to give him a call as Professor *Linguae et antiquitatis Graecae ut et rei numismaticae*, at Leyden. But an addition of three hundred thalers to his salary kept him at Halle. However, in 1779, in company with one of his daughters, Wolf visited Ruhnken, and was amazed to find that the latter, reputed the foremost classical

scholar of the continent, could not lecture nor speak in Latin, and had to converse in French or Dutch. In 1798 Wolf received another call, this time to Copenhagen as Director of Secondary Education in Denmark, which ultimately also fell through. Three years later he published his edition of the four orations *post reditum* of Cicero, and in 1802 his *Suetonius*, the only evidence of his literary activity in the latter years of his stay at Halle.

Wolf had no intimation that his work at Halle was soon to be cut short. In August of 1806 Prussia declared war on Napoleon, and three days after the battle of Jena, October 14, 1806, French troops entered the ancient city on the Saale. Though free of personal danger, Wolf was involved in the fate of the university, for on the 20th October, it was closed by order of the French commandant, and the students were sent home under French passports. The battle of Jena, then, as Karl von Raumer said, was the "fateful turning-point" of Wolf's life. He immediately wrote to Goethe his plight and was advised to spend what Wolf liked to call his *otia gallica* in revising for publication his survey of classical culture, the *Encyclopaedia philologica*. This revision, entitled *Darstellung der Alterthums-Wissenschaft* was published as the leading article in the first number of the *Museum der Alterthums-wissenschaft*, a literary journal founded in 1807 by Wolf and his pupil Buttman. In the spring of 1807, on the advice of von Humboldt, he moved to Berlin, destined never again to see Halle, even though later invited to resume his work there. But Halle was thenceforth to belong to Napoleon's new kingdom of Westphalia and Wolf would not return. The next seventeen years of his life were to be spent in Berlin, where he arrived April 2nd, 1807, twenty-four years almost to a day after his arrival in Halle.

It was at this time that plans were maturing for founding the University of Berlin. Wolf himself, soon after his arrival, had written the minister von Beyme about the need of replacing the university of Halle, now lost to Prussia, by a new "General Teaching Institute" at Berlin connected with the old Academy of Sciences. In his reply of September 5th, 1807, the minister expressed his pleasure with Wolf's suggestion, but said that he himself had long entertained the same idea. He also expressed the hope that Wolf might find a position in the new institution similar to the one he had held at Halle. In fact by September 4th the cabinet order for such a school had been signed by the king, out of which three years later was to grow the University of Berlin. Everyone imagined that

Wolf, now in the prime of his life and fame, would find a prominent place in the circle of scholars to be gathered from all Germany to form the new faculty. But Wolf, as we shall see, was to play quite a different role in the new institution, though he was able to place in it his two ablest scholars, Boeckh as Professor of Eloquence and Classical Literature in 1811, and Bekker as Professor of Poetry in 1812.

In September, 1807, Wolf received a call as Professor of Latin and Archaeology at Charkow. Soon after he received a pension from the King of eight hundred thalers in consequence of which in October of that year he was appointed *Visitor* to the Joachimsthal Gymnasium. At about the same time he was enrolled as foreign member of the Munich Academy of Sciences, and in December of the following year he was called as Librarian and Professor of Literature and Antiquities at Landshut. His refusal of the latter made it clear that he wished to remain in Berlin. During 1809-1810 his old friend von Humboldt became President of the Education Section of the Prussian Department of the Interior at Königsberg. In February, 1809, Wolf asked that he appoint him to any position that was agreeable to the King and suitable to his abilities, since he wished to do all he could for the Academy and the new university, but "without belonging to the actual body" of the latter. This meant that he would like to lecture at his pleasure, but be relieved from the ordinary professorial duties. Von Humboldt, sensing that his secret ambition was to be something more than a professor, in February, 1810, got a place created for him as Director of the Scientific Deputation of the Department of Public Instruction for the term of one year, and at the same time a seat on the board of public instruction of which he himself was President, with duties of general oversight over all scientific work in Prussia, including the inspection of gymnasia and especially the one at Joachimsthal. But it was soon clear that Wolf was not satisfied with his new duties, and that he coveted becoming *Staatsrath* in connection with general education. Von Humboldt tried to convince him that his title of Director outranked that of *Staatsrath*, and that his seat on the board made him the equal of the latter, minus its duties and red-tape. Wolf, therefore, took his seat along with Schleiermacher, Bernhardi, Erman, and others, but soon showed that he possessed neither the tact nor patience to work with them, and by March resigned on the plea of ill-health, reserving the status of an "extraordinary" member only. Schleiermacher replaced him as Director, and the board

invited him to found a Philological Seminary in the new university similar to the one at Halle. Wolf gradually withdrew from all active co-operation with the board and the inspection of gymnasia, though his work on the latter was to prove invaluable.

In the late summer of 1810, Wolf visited Vienna and Munich. While in the former city he received word from the Ministry of Public Instruction that lectures would begin at the opening of the university in the middle of October, and that he should state at once what courses he wished to give and in what capacity. Wolf answered that he still believed, as he had earlier expressed himself in letters to von Beyme and von Humboldt, that members of the Academy as well as professors should have the privilege of lecturing. He also asked a delay of two weeks before he should return to Berlin. A second note warned him to begin his work at the time announced and that certain lectures had already been assigned to him. In the meantime his staunch supporter von Humboldt had been delegated to go to Vienna as Ambassador, and Wolf had to fend for himself. He was finally, therefore, taken at his word and began to lecture at the university from his seat in the Academy and was given a salary of nine hundred thalers. As time went on, he found his new position anything but agreeable. He could lecture only at unfavorable hours when the regular professors were not busy. He also found that his lectures were badly attended, as he sometimes had only one regular student. Bad health made him irregular and so narrowed his circle of students, but his insistence on using Latin in face of the now general custom of using German narrowed it more. The fact that Boeckh, formerly his pupil, but now his colleague, had many students naturally made him resentful. Moreover, a change was being gradually wrought in the very nature of the man, due to disappointment, ill-health, petty annoyances, and many other causes, and this was to rob his lectures of the old Halle charm. Everyone remarked the change, colleagues and students, the latter wittily explaining it by saying that "the Halle Wolf was being devoured by the Berlin wolf."

In short, the story of Wolf's life at Berlin is a sad one, very different from that of the happy days at Halle. Wounded pride and bitterness gradually oppressed him. It had been better for his fame and comfort if his career as scholar and teacher had ended at Halle, for in Berlin he added nothing or little to either. It is difficult to analyze just what was the matter that he could not "find" himself in his new surroundings, as he had in the old. In Halle he had felt

himself *facile princeps*, and could feel and show a quiet contempt for his colleagues. He doubtless expected to fill a similar place in the larger city, but on finding he was only one among equals, his old vanity made him disappointed, fractious, and embittered. Wolf had always been a petty tyrant in his domestic circle, behavior which had necessitated a separation from his wife in 1802. Thereafter for many years he had lived with his second daughter until her marriage to Koerte, who tells us in his biography that Wolf's friends approved of the divorce. During the last ten years of his life he lived with one servant, who had a difficult time managing his exacting and irascible master. His nature, which had displayed its idiosyncrasies at Halle for the most part in the more intimate relations of the home life was to show itself in the wider ones of public life at Berlin. He, of course, ascribed the ill-feeling which his bearing excited on all sides to envy, and was fond of quoting Themistocles that "he who is not envied, has done nothing." Goethe remarked the change in his friend's nature during a visit of the latter to Weimar in 1816. - In a letter to a friend he says that Wolf "not only contradicts everything one says, but denies everything that exists," and further speaks of the "preposterous temper which makes his society intolerable," and adds that his ways are contagious, even making Goethe himself say "just the opposite of what he thought."

Under such changed conditions Wolf's work suffered greatly. Between 1810 and 1823 he offered only five new lecture courses. During the last years he advertised two courses a term, but delivered only one. We might expect that he would have turned to literary work as a solace during these embittered years. But in the entire seventeen years at Berlin his output was small and not very good if compared with his work at Halle. We have already mentioned the publication of the *Darstellung* in the *Museum der Altherthumswissenschaft*, which he founded along with others in 1807, and dedicated to Goethe. But this was merely the fruit of his oft-repeated lectures at Halle on the *Encyclopaedia philologica*. Soon after he quarreled with his pupil and co-editor Buttmann and resigned, so that the journal continued only to 1811. In that year he brought out a critical text and translation of the *Clouds*, and a text of the *Phaedo*. In 1812 he published a minor work, *Geographica Graeca*, and, with Bekker's collaboration, the text of the *Enthyphro*, *Apoloogy*, and *Crito*, and in 1813 he produced the first satire of Horace in Latin and German along with the scholia. The Plato of 1812 just mentioned was not a labor of love, but of spite against a former

pupil. Years before in Halle, Wolf had invited an enthusiastic pupil, Heindorf, to join him in an edition of Plato's works. As no progress was made, Heindorf had gone to work by himself and in 1802 had produced the first of four volumes which included twelve dialogues, the entire work being finished in 1810 and dedicated to his former master. In the preface of the 1812 edition, dedicated to von Humboldt, Wolf advertised with Bekker to edit Plato's *opera omnia Graece et Latine*, with critical apparatus, notes, and a philosophic commentary in special volumes, one of which was to be devoted to Plato's life, work, and teaching, the whole to be completed in seven to ten years. In this way he showed his contempt of Heindorf's completed work. In 1816 appeared the first volume of his last considerable work, the *Analecta*, to be completed in 1820. In its preface he referred to Heindorf by name in most ungenerous terms to the effect that at the time of the invitation extended to the latter in Halle he had regarded him as "fitted merely to be a subordinate collaborator, perhaps for the taking of exact excerpts and variants, or for the preparation of a good index," and spoke contemptuously of his "meekly subservient followers." Such expressions and especially the last, which were so out of place in a scientific work, had a most unexpected result. Buttman, with the help of several of his friends—Schleiermacher, Niebuhr, Savigny, J. G. Schneider, and even Wolf's favorite pupil Boeckh—wrote a scathing protest on behalf of the injured Heindorf who was now in an advanced state of disease, dying two months later in Halle whither he had been called from Breslau as professor. In it they said that in critical ability Heindorf far outdistanced his former master and that they recognized "the fearful symptoms of an approaching literary bankruptcy" in Wolf, who after all was merely a Dozent at the university with a corresponding salary! Wolf pretended not to read the protest, and, in Schleiermacher's words, became more than ever "the distinguished hermit." Wolf's revenge on Schleiermacher who, when professor and university preacher at Halle, had come under his influence almost as a pupil, was relentless. He printed one sentence from his own text of the *Phaedo* along with the latter's German translation of it—Schleiermacher had translated most of Plato between 1804 and 1810—and marked the errors in the German by italics, thus showing there were almost as many mistakes as words. At about the time of the Buttman protest another appeared written by Voss, father and son, entitled, *F. A. Wolf, der Metriker*, in which the two went even further in denouncing Wolf, maintain-

ing that Heindorf far outshone his teacher in scientific attainments and grammar, and challenging Wolf to declare himself further about the *Homeric Question*—an allusion to Wolf's promised second volume of the *Prolegomena*.

Wolf's health now gradually failed. In 1819 and 1820 he received his last public honors, in 1819 being elected as foreign member of the French *Academie des Inscriptions et belles lettres*, to which his name had been proposed before in 1811 but rejected on the ground that he had "doubted the existence of Homer," in 1820 as foreign member of the Academy of Herculanean Antiquities at Naples, and in the same year, through Goethe's influence, as foreign honorary member of the Society of Mineralogy at Jena. It was also in 1820 that his last work was published, the *Apologia Socratis* for gymnasium use, which was cut from the edition of 1812.

We now come to the closing scene of Wolf's unhappy life, for death was to be the only solution of his difficulties. During his entire stay at Berlin his health had been indifferent. He had made several journeys for his health, in 1814 to Wiesbaden, in 1815 to the Baltic, in 1816 to his old home in Hainrode and Nordhausen, to Osterrode, Göttingen, and Weimar, in 1818 to the North Sea, and in 1820 a more extended one to Switzerland to see his old pupils there. In January of 1822 he had been very ill, and in fact never regained his health. He celebrated his sixty-fifth birthday in 1824 with the presentiment it would be his last. As the spring came on his health grew worse, and he was finally induced to follow his physician's advice to visit the Riviera and the baths at Nice. He asked for a year's leave of absence from the university on full pay, but was told he must follow the usual custom of taking a sabbatical year on half salary, which meant he could not go at all. He immediately wrote to the King, pointing out that his proposed absence from duty was not for pleasure, but to save his life. So certain was he of a favorable answer that he left Berlin on April 4th before it came, both the answer and his passport overtaking him in Frankfurt. He journeyed slowly south by Weimar, where Goethe tried to dissuade him from so long a journey, to Strassburg, Lyons, and St. Peray, remaining a week at the latter place as a guest on the estate of the Faure family. From Montpellier he made an excursion to Certe where he saw the Mediterranean for the first time. He reached Marseilles on July 16, having been nearly three and a half months on the way. He was fated to go no further. Because of the unaccustomed heat he became imprudent in his diet, and soon



cholera morbus and other complications developed. For a time he grew better, but a recurrence of the same symptoms in a severer form ended in his death on the evening of August 8, with only his physician present. Wolf's fortitude at the end so impressed the latter that he wrote to a friend in Weimar that "he was happy to have seen a scholar die with such dignity," and expressed the hope he might die similarly.

Just twenty-four hours after his death, Wolf was laid to rest in the city churchyard in the classic soil of Massilia. Years later, in 1852, his daughter made every effort to locate the grave, but further than that it was one of three in a certain corner of the graveyard, it could not be identified. So the idea of setting up a fitting monument at the grave was given up, only a Latin epitaph marking its approximate site. Instead, a marble bust of Wolf, copied by Heidel from one by Tieck, was placed in the Aula of the University of Halle, where he had enjoyed his greatest success, by the association of German philologists. His unknown tomb once more illustrates the words of Pericles that

Ἄνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος.