

Cambridge
Texts in the
History of
Philosophy

Herder

Philosophical Writings

Edited by
Michael N. Forster

This page intentionally left blank

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY



HERDER
Philosophical Writings

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Series editors

KARL AMERIKS

Professor of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame

DESMOND M. CLARKE

Professor of Philosophy at University College Cork

The main objective of Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy is to expand the range, variety and quality of texts in the history of philosophy which are available in English. The series includes texts by familiar names (such as Descartes and Kant) and also by less well-known authors. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. The volumes are designed for student use at undergraduate and postgraduate level and will be of interest not only to students of philosophy, but also to a wider audience of readers in the history of science, the history of theology and the history of ideas.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book.

JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON HERDER

Philosophical Writings

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

MICHAEL N. FORSTER

University of Chicago



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2004

First published in printed format 2002

ISBN 0-511-03139-4 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN 0-521-79088-3 hardback

ISBN 0-521-79409-9 paperback

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	page vii
<i>Chronology</i>	xxxvi
<i>Further reading</i>	xxxix
<i>Note on the texts and translation</i>	xlii
Part I General Philosophical Program	
How Philosophy Can Become More Universal and Useful for the Benefit of the People (1765)	3
Part II Philosophy of Language	
Fragments on Recent German Literature (1767–8) [excerpts on language]	33
Treatise on the Origin of Language (1772)	65
Part III Philosophy of Mind	
On Thomas Abbt's Writings (1768) [selections concerning psychology]	167
On Cognition and Sensation, the Two Main Forces of the Human Soul (1775) [preface]	178
On the Cognition and Sensation of the Human Soul (1778)	187

Contents

Part IV	Philosophy of History	
	On the Change of Taste (1766)	247
	Older Critical Forestlet (1767/8) [excerpt on history]	257
	This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity [an early introduction]	268
	This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity (1774)	272
Part V	Political Philosophy	
	Letters concerning the Progress of Humanity (1792) [excerpts on European politics]	361
	Letters for the Advancement of Humanity (1793–7) [excerpts concerning freedom of thought and expression]	370
	Letters for the Advancement of Humanity (1793–7) [excerpt on patriotism]	374
	Letters for the Advancement of Humanity (1793–7) – Tenth Collection	380
	<i>Index</i>	425

Introduction

Herder is a philosopher of the very first rank. Such a claim depends mainly on the intrinsic quality of his ideas, and I shall attempt to give a sense of that in what follows. But another aspect of it is his intellectual influence. This has been immense both within philosophy and beyond (far greater than is generally realized). For example, Hegel's philosophy turns out to be an elaborate systematic extension of Herderian ideas (especially concerning God, the mind, and history); so too does Schleiermacher's (concerning God, the mind, interpretation, translation, and art); Nietzsche is strongly influenced by Herder (concerning the mind, history, and morals); so too is Dilthey (in his theory of the human sciences); J. S. Mill has important debts to Herder (in political philosophy); Goethe not only received his philosophical outlook from Herder but was also transformed from being merely a clever but conventional poet into a great artist mainly through the early impact on him of Herder's ideas; and this list could go on.

Indeed, Herder can claim to have virtually established whole disciplines which we nowadays take for granted. For example, it was mainly Herder (not, as is often claimed, Hamann) who established certain fundamental principles concerning an intimate dependence of thought on language which underpin modern philosophy of language. Through those ideas, his broad empirical approach to languages, his recognition of deep variations in language and thought across historical periods and cultures, and in other ways, Herder inspired Wilhelm von Humboldt to found modern linguistics. Herder developed modern hermeneutics, or interpretation theory, into a form that would subsequently be taken over by Schleiermacher and then more systematically articulated by Schleiermacher's pupil Böckh. In doing that, he also established the methodological foundations of

nineteenth-century German classical scholarship (which rested on the Schleiermacher-Böckh methodology), and hence of modern classical scholarship generally. Herder arguably did more than anyone else to establish the general conception and the interpretative methodology of our modern discipline of anthropology. Finally, Herder also made vital contributions to the progress of modern biblical scholarship (not only developing general hermeneutics, but also, for example, defining the genres of Old Testament poetry more adequately than had been done before, eliminating the bane of allegorical interpretations of Old Testament texts such as the Song of Solomon, and establishing the correct chronology of the four gospels of the New Testament).

The aim of the present volume is to make texts by Herder¹ in core areas of philosophy available to Anglophone readers so that his quality and influence as a philosopher can be studied.² To this end, the volume focuses mainly on earlier works. Herder writes in an essay here that “the first, uninhibited work of an author is . . . usually his best; his bloom is unfolding, his soul still dawn.”³ Whether or not that is *generally* true, it certainly applies to Herder himself, whose earlier writings do indeed tend to be his best. This fact, together with their other notable virtue of brevity, motivated this volume’s concentration on them.

Reading Herder: some preliminaries

In certain ways Herder’s philosophical texts are easier to read than others from the period. For example, he avoids technical jargon, his writing is lively and rich in examples rather than dry and abstract, and he has no large, complex system for the reader to keep track of. But his texts also have certain compensating peculiarities which can cause misunderstanding and misgiving, and which require explanation.

¹ Two editions of Herder’s works have been used for this volume: U. Gaier et al. (eds.), *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985–); B. Suphan et al. (eds.), *Johann Gottfried Herder Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1887–). References to these editions take the form of the primary editor’s surname initial followed by volume number and page number (e.g. G2:321 or S5:261).

² Two areas have been omitted (except insofar as they are touched on in passing) in order to keep the scale of the volume reasonable: Herder’s philosophy of religion (very important for questions of influence, but less intrinsically relevant given modern philosophy’s secular sensibilities) and his aesthetics (philosophically fascinating, but perhaps less fundamental, and also unmanageably extensive).

³ *On the Cognition and Sensation of the Human Soul* (1778). After a first occurrence most titles will be abbreviated in this introduction.

First of all, Herder's writing often seems emotional and grammatically undisciplined in a way that might perhaps be expected in casual speech but not in philosophical texts. This is intentional. Indeed, Herder sometimes deliberately "roughed up" material in this direction between drafts (e.g. between the 1775 and 1778 drafts of *On the Cognition*). Also, when writing in this way he is often using grammatical-rhetorical figures which, though they can strike an untutored eye as mere carelessness, receive high literary sanction from classical sources and are employed artfully (e.g. anacoluthon, aposiopesis, brachylogy, chiasmus, hendiadys, oxymoron, and hysteron proteron).⁴ Moreover, he has several serious philosophical reasons for writing in this way rather than in the manner of conventional academic prose. First, this promises to make his writing more broadly accessible and interesting to people – a decidedly nontrivial goal for him, since he believes it to be an essential part of philosophy's vocation to have a broad social impact. Second, one of his central theses in the philosophy of mind holds that thought is not and should not be separate from volition, or affect; that types of thinking which aspire to exclude affect are inherently distorting and inferior. Standard academic writing has this vice, but spontaneous speech, and writing which approximates it, do not. Third, Herder is opposed to any grammatical or lexical strait-jacketing of language, any slavish obedience to grammar books and dictionaries (he would be critical of such institutions as Duden in Germany and the *Chicago Manual of Style* in the USA). In his view, such strait-jacketing is inimical, not only to linguistic creativity and inventiveness, but also (much worse), because thought is essentially dependent on and confined in its scope by language, thereby to creativity and inventiveness in thought itself.

Another peculiarity of Herder's philosophical writing is its unsystematic nature. This is again deliberate, for Herder is largely hostile towards systematicity in philosophy (a fact reflected both in explicit remarks and in many of his titles: *Fragments . . .*, *Ideas . . .*, etc.). He is in particular hostile to the very ambitious type of systematicity aspired to in the tradition of Spinoza, Wolff, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel: a theory whose parts form and exhaust some sort of strict overall pattern of derivation. Moreover, he has compelling reasons for this hostility. First, he is very skeptical that such systematic designs can be made to work (as opposed

⁴ I have indicated some examples of such figures as they occur in the translation.

to creating, through illicit means, an illusion that they do). Second, he believes that such system-building leads to a premature closure of inquiry, and in particular to a disregarding or distorting of new empirical evidence. Scrutiny of such systems amply bears out these misgivings. Herder's well-grounded hostility to this type of systematicity established an important countertradition in German philosophy (which subsequently included, for example, Friedrich Schlegel, Nietzsche, and Wittgenstein).

On the other hand, Herder is in *favor* of "systematicity" in a more modest sense: a theory which is self-consistent and maximally supported by argument.⁵ He does not always achieve this ideal (so that interpreting him calls for more selectivity and reconstruction than is the case with some philosophers).⁶ But his failures are often only apparent: First, in many cases where he seems to be guilty of inconsistency he really is not, for he is often developing philosophical dialogues between two or more opposing viewpoints, in which cases it would clearly be a mistake to accuse him of inconsistency in any usual or pejorative sense; and (less obviously) in other cases he is in effect still working in this dialogue mode, only without bothering to distribute the positions among different interlocutors explicitly, and so is again really innocent of inconsistency (examples of this occur in *How Philosophy Can Become More Universal and Useful for the Benefit of the People* [1765] and *This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity* [1774]). Moreover, he has serious motives for this method of (implicit) dialogue. Sometimes his motive is simply that when dealing with religiously or politically delicate matters it permits him to state his views but without quite stating them as his own and therefore without inviting trouble. But there are also philosophically deeper motives: He takes over from the precritical Kant an idea (inspired by ancient skepticism) that the best way for a philosopher to pursue the truth is by setting contrary views on a subject into opposition with one another and advancing towards the truth through their mutual testing and modification. Also, he develops an original variant of that idea on the sociohistorical plane: analogously, the way for humankind as a whole to attain the elusive goal of truth is through an ongoing contest between opposing positions,

⁵ This marks an important point of methodological contrast with Hamann, whom Herder already criticizes for failing to provide arguments in an essay from early 1765 (G1:38–9).

⁶ In this connection, Charles Taylor wisely comments that "deeply innovative thinkers don't have to be rigorous to be the originators of important ideas" ("The Importance of Herder," in E. and A. Margalit [eds.], *Isaiah Berlin: A Celebration* [Chicago, 1991]). The converse holds as well: thinkers can be very rigorous without originating any important ideas.

in the course of which the best ones will eventually win out (this idea anticipates, and inspired, a central thesis of J. S. Mill's *On Liberty*). This yields a further motive for the dialogue method (even where it does not lead Herder himself to any definite conclusion), in effect warranting the rhetorical question: And what does it matter to the cause of humankind and its discovery of the truth whether those opposing positions are advanced by different people or by the *same* person? Second, Herder's appearance of neglecting to give arguments is often, rather, a principled rejection of arguments of *certain sorts*. For example (as we are about to see), he has a general commitment to empiricism and against apriorism in philosophy which leads him to avoid familiar sorts of apriorist arguments in philosophy; and a commitment to noncognitivism in ethics which leads him to refrain from familiar sorts of cognitivist arguments in ethics.

Herder's general program in philosophy

Hamann's influence on Herder's best thought has often been greatly exaggerated, but Kant's was early, fundamental, and enduring. However, the Kant who influenced Herder in this way was the precritical Kant of the early and middle 1760s, not the critical Kant (against whom Herder later engaged in distracting and rather ineffective public polemics). Some of Kant's key positions in the 1760s, sharply contrasting with those he would later adopt in the critical period, were a (Pyrrhonist-influenced) skepticism about metaphysics, a form of empiricism, and a (Hume-influenced) noncognitivism in ethics. Herder took over these positions in the 1760s and retained them throughout his career.⁷

Herder's 1765 essay *How Philosophy Can Become*, rough and fragmentary as it is, is a key for understanding the broad foundations of his philosophy, and the debts these owe to the precritical Kant of the early and middle 1760s. The essay was written under strong influence from Kant, and especially, it seems, Kant's 1766 essay *Dreams of a Spirit Seer*, which, Herder reports, Kant sent him before publication "a sheet at a time."

⁷ It should by no means be inferred that Herder's debt to the *precritical* Kant is a debt to an *inferior* Kant. On the contrary, for all their greater novelty, systematicity, and fascination for professional philosophers, Kant's contrary later positions in the critical period – for example, that a noumenal freedom of the will, afterlife of the soul, and God must be believed in as presuppositions of morality; that much in natural science and philosophy can be known completely a priori; and that morality rests on a single principle analogous in character to the logical law of contradiction, the "categorical imperative" – are ultimately far less philosophically defensible than the precritical positions just mentioned.

Herder's essay answers a prize question set by a society in Berne: "How can the truths of philosophy become more universal and useful for the benefit of the people?" This question is in the spirit of the *Popularphilosophie* that was competing with school philosophy at the time. Kant himself tended to identify with *Popularphilosophie* at this period, albeit only transiently, and Herder's selection of this question shows him doing so as well, though in his case the identification would last a lifetime. Philosophy should become relevant and useful for people as a whole – this is a basic ideal of Herder's philosophy.

Largely in the service of this ideal, Herder argues in the essay for two sharp turns in philosophy, turns which would again remain fundamental throughout his career. The first involves a rejection of traditional metaphysics, and closely follows an argument of Kant's in *Dreams of a Spirit Seer*. Herder's case is roughly this: First, traditional metaphysics, by undertaking to transcend experience (or strictly, and a little more broadly, "healthy understanding," which includes, besides empirical knowledge, also ordinary morality, intuitive logic, and mathematics), succumbs to unresolvable contradictions between its claims, and hence to the Pyrrhonian skeptical problem of an equal plausibility on both sides requiring suspension of judgment ("I am writing for Pyrrhonists"). Also (Herder adds in the *Fragments on Recent German Literature* [1767–8]), given the truth of a broadly empiricist theory of concepts, much terminology of traditional metaphysics turns out to lack the basis in experience that it would need in order even to be meaningful, and hence is meaningless (the illusion of meaningfulness arising largely through the role of *language*, which spins on, creating illusions of meaning, even after the empirical conditions of meaning have been left behind).⁸ Second, traditional metaphysics is not only, for these reasons, useless; it is also *harmful*, because it distracts its adherents from the matters which should be their focus: empirical nature and human society. Third, by contrast, empirical knowledge (or strictly, and a bit more broadly, "healthy understanding") is free of these problems. Philosophy ought therefore to be based on and continuous with this.

Herder's second sharp turn concerns moral philosophy. He remains indebted to Kant here, but also goes further beyond him. Herder's basic claims are these: (1) Morality is fundamentally more a matter of sentiments

⁸ This diagnosis in terms of language seems to go beyond the precritical Kant. However, it has deep precedents and roots in the empiricist tradition – especially Bacon and Locke.

than of cognitions.⁹ (Herder's sentimentalism is not crude, however; in the *Critical Forests* [1769] and *On the Cognition* he acknowledges that cognition plays a large role in morality as well.) (2) Cognitivist theories of morality – espoused in this period especially by Rationalists such as Wolff, but also by many other philosophers before and since (e.g. Plato and the critical Kant) – are therefore based on a mistake, and hence useless as means of moral enlightenment or improvement. (3) But (and here Herder's theory moves beyond Kant's), worse than that, they are actually *harmful* to morality, because they weaken the moral sentiments on which it really rests. In *This Too* and *On the Cognition* Herder suggests several reasons why. First, abstract theorizing weakens the sentiments generally, and hence moral ones in particular. Second, the cognitivists' theories turn out to be so *strikingly* implausible that they bring morality itself into disrepute, people reacting to them roughly along the lines: "If this is the best that even the experts can say in explanation and justification of morality, morality must certainly be a sham, and I may as well ignore it and do as I please." Third, such theories distract people from recognizing and working to reinforce the *real* foundations of morality: not an imaginary theoretical insight of some sort, but a set of causal means for inculcating moral sentiments. (4) More positively, Herder accordingly turns instead to determining in theory and promoting in practice just such a set of causal means. In *How Philosophy Can Become* he stresses forms of education and an emotive type of preaching (two life-long preoccupations of his in both theory and practice). Elsewhere he adds exposure to morally exemplary individuals, morally relevant laws, and literature (along with other art forms). Literature is a special focus of Herder's theory and practice. He sees it as exerting moral influence in several ways – not only through relatively direct moral instruction, but also through the literary perpetuation or creation of morally exemplary individuals (e.g. Jesus in the New Testament) and the exposure of readers to other people's inner lives and a consequent enhancement of their sympathies for them (a motive behind his publication of the *Popular Songs* [1778–9] from peoples around the world). Herder's

⁹ Hume had provided a compelling (though not uncontested) argument for this position in terms of morality's intrinsic motivating force and cognition's motivational inertness. The precritical Kant was evidently influenced by this argument, and there are indications in *This Too* that Herder was as well.

development of this theory and practice of moral pedagogy was lifelong and tireless.

Herder's philosophy of language

The materials in the present volume relevant to this topic include not only those in the philosophy of language section but also those in the philosophy of mind and history sections.

The *Treatise on the Origin of Language* (1772) is Herder's best-known work on language. It is mainly concerned with the question whether the origin of language must be accounted for in terms of a divine source (as Süßmilch had recently argued) or in purely natural, human terms. Herder argues against the former view and for the latter. His motives are not strictly secular. Rather, he is assuming a position from Kant's *Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens* (1755) that explanations in terms of natural laws are not only explanatorily superior to, but also *ultimately better testimony to God's role in nature* than, ones in terms of particular divine interventions in nature. Still, he probably felt the attractiveness of his case to a secular standpoint to be an advantage – and it is from such a standpoint that it will interest a modern philosopher. Herder's *positive* argument for a human origin is perhaps made best, not in *On the Origin* itself (where it gets entangled with the polemics against Süßmilch), but in the *Fragments* (as excerpted here). The argument is especially impressive for its methodology: its adducing of a number of independent empirical considerations that seem to converge on the conclusion of a human origin, and the admirably tentative, fallibilist spirit in which it does this.

However, for all its broad plausibility, this whole case is unlikely to be a modern philosopher's main reason for interest in Herder's ideas about language – deriving its zest, as it does, from a religious background that is no longer ours. Of much greater modern relevance is Herder's theory of interpretation, including his theory of the relation between thought, concepts, and language. This theory is scattered through many works (several included here). The following are its main features.

Herder's theory rests on, but also in turn supports, an epoch-making insight: (1) Such eminent Enlightenment philosopher-historians as Hume and Voltaire still believed that, as Hume puts it, “mankind are so much the same in all times and places that history informs us of nothing

new or strange.” What Herder discovered, or at least saw more clearly and fully than anyone before, was that this was false, that peoples from different historical periods and cultures vary *tremendously* in their concepts, beliefs, and other propositional attitudes, perceptual and affective sensations, etc. He also saw that similar, if usually less dramatic, variations occur even between individuals in a single culture and period.¹⁰

(2) Because of these radical differences, and the gulf that consequently often divides an interpreter’s own thought from that of the person he wants to interpret, interpretation is often an extremely difficult task, requiring extraordinary efforts.¹¹

(3) In particular, the interpreter often faces, and must resist, a temptation falsely to assimilate the thought which he is interpreting to someone else’s, especially his own.¹²

How is the interpreter to meet the challenge? Herder advances three fundamental theses concerning thought, concepts, and language which underpin the rest of his theory of interpretation. The first two of these made a revolutionary break with a predominant Enlightenment model of thought and concepts as separable from and prior to language, thereby establishing not only modern interpretation theory but also modern linguistics and philosophy of language.

(4) Thought is essentially dependent on, and bounded in scope by, language – i.e. one can only think if one has a language, and one can only think what one can express linguistically.¹³ An important consequence of this principle for interpretation is that an interpreted subject’s language is a reliable indicator of the scope of his thought.

(5) Meanings or concepts are not to be equated with the sorts of items, in principle autonomous of language, with which much of the philosophical tradition has equated them – for example, the referents involved, Platonic forms, or the “ideas” favored by the British empiricists and others. Instead,

¹⁰ These positions are prominent in many works, e.g. *On the Change of Taste* (1766) and *On the Cognition*.

¹¹ See e.g. *On the Origin*. To his credit, Herder does not draw the more extreme – and misguided – conclusion to which some more recent philosophers, such as the Davidsonians, have been tempted that the task would be *impossible*.

¹² This theme is prominent in *This Too*.

¹³ This principle is already prominent in the *Fragments*. Indeed it can be found even earlier in Herder’s *On Diligence in Several Learned Languages* (1764).

To his credit, Herder normally refrains from more extreme, but philosophically untenable, versions of this principle, later favored by Hamann and Schleiermacher, which *identify* thought with language, or with inner language.

they consist in *usages of words*.¹⁴ Consequently, interpretation will essentially involve pinning down word usages.

(6) Conceptualization is intimately bound up with (perceptual and affective) sensation. More specifically, Herder develops a quasi-empiricist theory of concepts according to which sensation is the source and basis of all our concepts, though we are able to achieve nonempirical concepts by means of a sort of metaphorical extension from the empirical ones – so that all our concepts ultimately depend on sensation in one way or another.¹⁵ This position carries the important consequence for interpretation that any understanding of a concept must somehow recapture its basis in sensation.

Herder also has two further basic principles in interpretation theory:

(7) A principle of *secularism* in interpretation: religious assumptions must not influence the interpretation of texts, even sacred texts. In particular, the interpreter of a sacred text such as the bible may neither rely on receiving divine inspiration himself when interpreting nor on the original authors having received it, and having therefore produced a text that was true and self-consistent throughout.¹⁶

(8) A principle of *methodological empiricism* in interpretation: interpretation must not be conducted in an a priori fashion but must always be based on, and strictly faithful to, exact observations of linguistic and other relevant evidence. This applies when determining word usages in order to determine meanings,¹⁷ when conjecturing an author's psychology;¹⁸ and when defining literary genres, or the purposes and rules that constitute them.¹⁹

¹⁴ The positive side of this doctrine and its rejection of the “way of ideas” are already prominent in the *Fragments*. For Herder's rejection of Platonic forms, see *Johann Gottfried Herder Briefe*, ed. W. Dobbek and G. Arnold (Weimar, 1977–), 1:179–80 (a letter from 1769). The *Fragments* and *On the Origin* already develop several points which speak against equating concepts with referents (e.g. that language is originally and fundamentally *expressive* rather than designative or descriptive in nature), and Herder goes on to reject this explicitly in the *Ideas*.

Note that this doctrine promises a much more satisfactory justification and explanation of doctrine (4) than the one that Herder explicitly gives in *On the Origin* (which in effect just amounts to an illicit stipulative redefinition of “language” to include a certain fundamental aspect of thought, namely the recognition of “characteristic marks [*Merkmale*]”). Herder already gives the superior justification and explanation in question in the *Fragments* and *On Diligence*.

¹⁵ For this doctrine, see e.g. *On the Origin* and *On the Cognition*. This doctrine might seem at odds with the preceding one, but it need not be. For a *usage* of words implicitly requires a *context*, and the context in question might very well essentially include certain sensations.

¹⁶ This principle is already prominent in writings by Herder on biblical interpretation from the 1760s not included in this volume.

¹⁷ This point is prominent in the *Fragments*. ¹⁸ See e.g. *On Thomas Abbi's Writings* (1768).

¹⁹ For a classic expression of this position on genres, see Herder's essay *Shakespeare* (1773).

Beyond this, Herder also advances a further set of interpretative principles which can sound more “touchy-feely” at first hearing (the first of them rather literally so!), but which are in fact on the contrary deeply motivated:

(9) Especially in *This Too*, Herder famously proposes that the way to bridge radical difference when interpreting is through *Einfühlung*, “feeling one’s way in.” This proposal has often been thought (e.g. by Meinecke) to mean that the interpreter should perform some sort of psychological self-projection onto texts. But, as the context in which it is introduced in *This Too* shows, that is emphatically not Herder’s idea – for that would amount to exactly the sort of assimilation of the thought in a text to one’s own which he is above all concerned to *avoid*. The same context makes clear that what he has in mind is instead an arduous process of historical-philological inquiry – so *Einfühlung* is really a metaphor here. What, though, more specifically, is the cash value of the metaphor? It has at least five components: First, it implies (once again) that there typically exists a radical difference, a gulf, between an interpreter’s mentality and that of the subject whom he interprets, making interpretation a difficult, laborious task (it implies that there is an “in” there which one must carefully and laboriously “feel one’s way into”). Second, it implies (*This Too* shows) that this process must include thorough research not only into a text’s use of language but also into its historical, geographical, and social context. Third, it implies a claim – deriving from Herder’s quasi-empiricist theory of concepts – that in order to interpret a subject’s language one must achieve an imaginative reproduction of his perceptual and affective sensations.²⁰ Fourth, it implies that hostility in an interpreter towards the people he interprets will generally distort his interpretation and must therefore be avoided.²¹ (Herder is also opposed to excessive identification with them for the same reason.) Fifth, it also implies that the interpreter should strive to develop his grasp of linguistic

²⁰ In writings on the Old Testament Herder astutely forestalls some obvious objections here, noting that this reproduction need not involve actually *sharing* the sensations. So his idea is that a sort of imaginative reproduction of an interpreted subject’s sensations is possible which, while more than a mere propositional grasp of them, is also less than an actual sharing of them, and that only this is required for interpretation. This is an important idea: for example, it suggests an effective response to Gadamer’s concern that discrepancies in “pre-understanding” preclude unprejudiced interpretation.

²¹ Some of Herder’s own successes as an interpreter came from following precisely this principle – e.g. his recognition, in contradiction of antisemitic interpreters such as Kant, that the viewpoints of the Old and New Testaments were far more continuous than discontinuous.

usage, contextual facts, and relevant sensations to the point where this achieves something of the same immediate, automatic character that it had for a text's original audience when *they* understood the text in light of such things (so that it acquires for him, as it had for them, the phenomenology more of a feeling than a cognition).

(10) In addition, Herder insists on a principle of *holism* in interpretation.²² This principle rests on several motives, including the following. First, in order to begin interpreting a piece of text an interpreter needs to know ranges of linguistic meanings which its words can bear. But, especially when texts are separated from the interpreter by radical difference, such knowledge presents a problem. How is he to pin down the range of possible meanings, i.e. possible usages, for a word? This requires that he collate the word's known actual uses and infer from these the rules which govern them, i.e. usages, a collation which in turn requires that he look to remoter contexts in which the same word occurs (other parts of the text, other works in the author's corpus, works by other contemporaries, etc.), or in short: holism. Second, even when that is done, a piece of text considered in isolation will usually be ambiguous in relation to such ranges, and in order to resolve the ambiguities the interpreter will need to seek the guidance provided by surrounding text. Third, an author typically writes a work *as* a whole, conveying ideas not only in its particular parts but also through the manner in which these are fitted together to make up a whole (either in instantiation of a general genre or in ways more specific to the particular work). Consequently, readings which fail to interpret the work as a whole will miss essential aspects of its meaning – both the ideas in question themselves and meanings of particular parts on which they shed vital light.

(11) In *On Thomas Abbt's Writings* and *On the Cognition* Herder makes one of his most important innovations: interpretation must supplement its focus on word usage with attention to authorial *psychology*. Herder implies several reasons for this. A first has already been mentioned: Herder's quasi-empiricist theory of concepts with its implication that in order to understand an author's concepts the interpreter must recapture his relevant sensations. Second, as Quentin Skinner has stressed (in some of the most important work on interpretation theory since Herder), understanding the linguistic meaning of an utterance or text is only a

²² This insistence is especially prominent in the *Critical Forests* (not included in this volume).

necessary, not a sufficient, condition for understanding it *tout court* – in addition, one needs to establish the author’s illocutionary *intentions*. For example, a stranger tells me, “The ice is thin over there”; I understand his linguistic meaning perfectly; but is he simply informing me? warning me? threatening me? joking? . . . Third, Skinner implies that one can determine linguistic meanings prior to establishing authorial intentions. That may perhaps *sometimes* be so (e.g. in the example just given), but is it *generally*? Herder implies not. And this seems right, because commonly a linguistic formula’s meaning is ambiguous in terms of the background linguistic possibilities, and in order to identify the relevant meaning one must turn, not only (as was mentioned) to larger bodies of text, but also to hypotheses, largely derived therefrom, about the author’s intentions (e.g. about the subject matter that he intends to treat). A fourth reason consists in the already-mentioned fact that authors typically express some ideas in a work not explicitly in its parts but holistically, and that these need to be determined both for their own sakes and for the light they shed on the meanings of parts. Fifth, Herder also sees a source of the need for psychological interpretation in the second limb of his doctrine of radical difference: *individual* variations in mode of thought even within a single culture and period. Why does any special need arise here? Part of the answer seems to be that when one is interpreting a concept that is distinctive of a particular author rather than common to a whole culture, one typically faces a problem of relative paucity and lack of contextual variety in the actual uses of the word available as empirical evidence from which to infer the rule for use, or usage, constitutive of its meaning. Hence one needs extra help in this case, and knowledge of authorial psychology may supply this.

(12) In the same two works Herder also argues that interpretation, especially in its psychological aspect, requires the use of *divination*. This is another principle which can sound disturbingly “touchy-feely” at first hearing; in particular, it can sound as though Herder means some sort of prophetic process enjoying a religious basis and perhaps even infallibility. However, what he really has in mind is (far more sensibly) a process of hypothesis, based on meager empirical evidence, but also going well beyond it, and therefore vulnerable to subsequent falsification, and abandonment or revision if falsified.

(13) Finally, a point concerning the general nature of interpretation and its subject matter. After Herder, the question arose whether interpretation

was a science or an art. Herder does not really address this question, but his considered inclination would clearly be to say that it is *like* rather than unlike natural science. There are several reasons for this. First, he assumes, as did virtually everyone at this period, that the meaning of an author's text is as much an objective matter as the subjects addressed by the natural scientist.²³ Second, the *difficulty* of interpretation that results from radical difference, and the consequent need for a *methodologically subtle and laborious* approach to it in many cases, constitute further points of similarity with natural science. Third, the essential role of "divination" qua *hypothesis* in interpretation constitutes another important point of similarity with natural science. Fourth, even the subject matter of interpretation is not, in Herder's view, sharply different from that dealt with by natural science: the latter investigates physical processes in nature in order to determine the forces that underlie them, but similarly interpretation investigates human verbal (and nonverbal) physical behavior in order to determine the forces that underlie it (Herder explicitly identifying mental conditions, including conceptual understanding, as "forces").

Herder's theory owes many debts to predecessors. Hamann has commonly been credited with introducing the revolutionary doctrines concerning thought, concepts, and language (4) and (5). But that seems to be a mistake; Herder was already committed to them in the 1760s, Hamann only later. Instead, Herder is indebted for (4) to a group of authors, including Abbt and Süßmilch, who were influenced by Wolff, and for (1), (2), (5), (7), (8), and (10) to Ernesti. However, Herder's borrowings incorporate important refinements, and his overall contribution is enormous.²⁴

Herder's theory was taken over virtually in its entirety by Schleiermacher in his hermeneutics. Certainly, Schleiermacher's theory is also directly influenced by sources which he shares with Herder, especially Ernesti, but such fundamental and famous positions in it as the supplementing of "linguistic" with "psychological" interpretation and the identification of "divination" as the method especially of the latter are

²³ This assumption has been stigmatized as "positivist" by Gadamer, but on the basis of very dubious philosophical arguments. H. D. Irmischer in "Grundzüge der Hermeneutik Herders," in *Bückerburger Gespräche über J. G. Herder 1971* (Bückerburg, 1973), questions the sort of characterization of Herder's position given here, arguing that Herder anticipates Gadamer's own conception of meaning as something relative to a developing interpretative context. There are some things in Herder which can suggest such a view. But it is clearly not his considered position. This can be seen, for example, from the excerpts included in this volume from *On Thomas Abbt's Writings*.

²⁴ Concerning some of these issues, see my "Herder's Philosophy of Language, Interpretation, and Translation: Three Fundamental Principles" (forthcoming in *The Review of Metaphysics*).

due entirely to Herder. Moreover, where Herder and Schleiermacher *do* occasionally disagree, Herder's position is almost always philosophically superior. For example, unlike Herder, Schleiermacher standardly inclines to inferior versions of doctrine (4) which *identify* thought with language, or inner language (such versions are easily refutable by counterexamples). He attempts to establish the deep individuality of interpreted subjects, not like Herder in an empirical way and as a rule of thumb, but in an a priori way as a universal truth, and with the extremely counterintuitive consequence that exact understanding never occurs. He worsens Herder's theory of psychological interpretation by introducing the unhelpful idea that this should consist in identifying, and tracing the necessary development of, a single authorial "seminal decision [*Keimentschluß*]" (for how many texts are written and properly interpretable in that way?). He worsens it again by restricting the evidence for authorial psychology to textual evidence only, instead of also including nonlinguistic behavior as Herder does. Finally, he mistakenly sees the role in interpretation of "divination," which like Herder he understands as a method of fallible and revisable hypothesis from meager empirical evidence, as a ground for sharply *distinguishing* interpretation from natural science, and hence for classifying it as an art rather than a science, instead of as a ground for *assimilating* them (a mistake caused by a false assumption that natural science works by plain induction).

Herder's philosophy of mind

Herder also develops an extremely interesting and influential position in the philosophy of mind. His position is thoroughly naturalistic and anti-dualistic in intent. In *On the Cognition* he tries to efface the division between the mental and the physical in two specific ways. First, he advances the theory that minds consist in forces (*Kräfte*) which manifest themselves in people's bodily behavior – just as physical nature contains forces which manifest themselves in the behavior of bodies.²⁵ He is officially agnostic about what force is, except for conceiving it as something apt to produce a type of bodily behavior, and as a real source thereof (not just something reducible to it). This strictly speaking absolves his theory from some common characterizations and objections (e.g. vitalism),

²⁵ Note that the general notion of mental forces (*Kräfte*) was already common before Herder among Rationalists such as Wolff and Süßmilch.

but also leaves it with enough content to have great virtues over rival theories: On the one hand, it ties types of mental states conceptually to corresponding types of bodily behavior – which seems correct (e.g. desiring an apple does seem conceptually tied to apple-eating behavior), and therefore marks a point of superiority over dualistic theories, and over mind-brain identity theories as well. On the other hand, it also avoids *reducing* mental states to bodily behavior – which again seems correct, in view of such obvious facts as that we can be, and indeed often are, in particular mental states which receive no behavioral manifestation, and hence marks a point of superiority over outright behaviorist theories.

Second, he also tries to explain the mind in terms of the phenomenon of irritation (*Reiz*), a phenomenon recently identified by Haller and exemplified by muscle fibers contracting in response to direct physical stimuli and relaxing upon their removal – in other words, a phenomenon which, while basically physiological, also seems to exhibit a transition to mental characteristics. There is an ambiguity in Herder's position here: usually he wants to resist physicalist reductionism, and so avoids saying that irritation is purely physiological and fully constitutes mental states; but in the 1775 draft of *On the Cognition* and even in parts of the published version, that *is* his position. And from a modern standpoint, this is another virtue of his account (though we would certainly today want to recast it in terms of different, and more complex, physiological processes than irritation).²⁶

A further important thesis in Herder's philosophy of mind affirms that the mind is a unity, that there is no real division between its faculties. This position contradicts theorists such as Sulzer and Kant. However, it is not in itself new with Herder, having already been central to Rationalism, especially Wolff.²⁷ Where Herder is more original is in rejecting the Rationalists' reduction of sensation and volition to cognition, establishing the unity thesis in an empirical rather than apriorist way, and adding a normative dimension to the thesis – this is not only how the mind *is* but also how it *ought* to be. This last idea can sound incoherent, since if the

²⁶ This second line of thought might seem at odds with his first one (forces), but it need not be, for, given his official agnosticism about what forces are, it could, so to speak, fill in the “black box” of the hypothesized real forces, namely in physicalist terms. In other words, it turns out (not as a conceptual matter, but as a contingent one) that the real forces in question consist in physiological processes.

²⁷ Herder's introduction to his 1775 draft (included here) shows that he is fully aware of this debt. Hamann can therefore claim little credit as an influence here (though he can claim somewhat more for the further doctrines indicated in the next sentence).

mind is this way by its very nature, what sense is there in prescribing to people that it should be so rather than otherwise? But Herder's idea is in fact the coherent one that, while the mind is indeed this way by its very nature, people sometimes behave as though one faculty could be abstracted from another, and try to effect that, and this then leads to various malfunctions, and should therefore be avoided.

Herder's whole position on the mind's unity rests on three more specific doctrines of intimate mutual involvements between mental faculties, and malfunctions that arise from striving against them, doctrines which are in large part empirically motivated and hence lend the overall position a sort of empirical basis.

The first concerns the relation between thought and language: not only does language of its very nature express thought (an uncontroversial point), but also, as we saw, according to Herder thought is dependent on and bounded by language. Herder bases this further claim largely on empirical grounds (e.g. concerning how children's thought develops with language acquisition). The normative aspect of his position here is that attempts (in the manner of some metaphysics) to cut language free from the constraints of thought or (a more original point) vice versa lead to nonsense.

A second area of intimate mutual involvement concerns cognition and volition, or affects. The claim that volition is and should be based on cognition is not particularly controversial. But Herder also argues the converse, that all cognition is and should be based on volition, on affects (and not only on such relatively anemic ones as the impulse to know the truth, but also on less anemic ones). Herder is especially concerned to combat the idea that *theoretical* work is or should be detached from volition, from affects. In his view, it never really is even when it purports to be, and attempts to make it so merely impoverish and weaken it. His grounds for this position are again mainly empirical.

A third area of intimate mutual involvement concerns thought and sensation. Conceptualization and belief, on the one hand, and sensation (both perceptual and affective), on the other, are intimately connected according to Herder. Thus he advances the quasi-empiricist theory of concepts mentioned earlier, which entails that all our concepts, and hence also all our beliefs, ultimately depend in one way or another on sensation. And conversely, he argues – anticipating much recent work in philosophy (e.g. Hansen and Kuhn) – that there is a dependence in the other direction

as well, that the character of our sensations depends on our concepts and beliefs. Normatively, he sees attempts to violate this interdependence as inevitably leading to intellectual malfunction – for example, as was mentioned, metaphysicians’ attempts to cut entirely free from the empirical origin of concepts lead to meaninglessness. His grounds for this position are again largely empirical.

Herder also has further important doctrines in the philosophy of mind. One of these is a doctrine that linguistic meaning is fundamentally social, so that thought and other aspects of human mental life (as essentially articulated in terms of meanings), and therefore also the very self (as essentially dependent on thought and other aspects of human mental life, and defined in its specific identity by theirs), are so too. Herder’s version of this position seems meant only as an empirically based causal generalization. It has since fathered attempts to generate more ambitious arguments for stronger versions of the claim that meaning – and hence also thought and the very self – is socially constituted (e.g. by Hegel, Wittgenstein, Kripke, and Burge). However, it may very well be that these more ambitious arguments do not work, and that Herder’s version is exactly what should be accepted.

Herder also insists that, even within a single culture and period, human minds are deeply individual, deeply different from each other – so that in addition to a generalizing psychology we also need a psychology orientated to individuality. This is an important idea which has had a strong influence on subsequent thinkers (e.g. Schleiermacher, Nietzsche, Proust, Sartre, and Manfred Frank). Herder advances it only as an empirical rule of thumb. By contrast, a prominent strand in Schleiermacher and Frank purports to make it an *a priori* universal truth. But Herder’s position is again the more plausible one.²⁸

Finally, like predecessors in the Rationalist tradition and like Kant, Herder sharply rejects the Cartesian notion of the mind’s self-transparency, instead insisting that much of what occurs in the mind is unconscious, so that self-knowledge is often deeply problematic. This is

²⁸ The previous doctrine of the sociality of meaning, thought, and self might seem inconsistent with this doctrine of individuality. However, even when the doctrine of individuality is pushed down as far as the level of meanings, there need be no inconsistency here, provided that the doctrine of sociality is asserted only as an empirically grounded causal rule, as Herder asserts it, rather than as a stronger doctrine about social practice constituting the very essence of meanings. Society, so to speak, provides a common semantical clay, which, however, then often gets molded in individual ways.

another compelling position which has had a strong influence on subsequent thinkers.

This whole Herderian philosophy of mind owes much to predecessors in the Rationalist tradition, but it is also in many ways original. The theory is important in its own right, and it exercised an enormous influence on successors – for example, on Hegel in connection with anti-dualism, the role of physical behavior in mental conditions, faculty unity, and the sociality of meaning, thought, and self; on Schleiermacher in connection with anti-dualism and faculty unity; and on Nietzsche in connection with the interdependence of cognition and volition, or affects, the individuality of the mind and the need for a corresponding sort of psychology, and the mind's lack of self-transparency.

Herder's philosophy of history

Herder's philosophy of history appears mainly in two works, *This Too* and the later *Ideas for the Philosophy of History of Humanity* (1784–91). His fundamental achievement in this area lies in his development of the thesis mentioned earlier, contradicting such Enlightenment philosopher-historians as Hume and Voltaire, that there are radical mental differences between historical periods, that people's concepts, beliefs, and other propositional attitudes, perceptual and affective sensations, etc., differ in major ways from one period to another. This thesis is already prominent in *On the Change of Taste* (1766). It exercised an enormous influence on such successors as Hegel and Nietzsche.

Herder makes the empirical exploration of the realm of mental diversity posited by this thesis the very core of the discipline of history. For, as has often been noted, he takes relatively little interest in the "great" political and military deeds and events of history, focusing instead on the "innerness" of history's participants. This choice is quite deliberate and self-conscious. Because of it, *psychology and interpretation* inevitably take center-stage in the discipline of history for Herder.

It is less often noticed that Herder has deep philosophical reasons for this choice, and hence for assigning psychology and interpretation a central role in history. To begin with, he has *negative* reasons directed against traditional political-military history. Why, one might ask, *should* history focus on the "great" political and military deeds and events of the past? There are several possible answers. A first would be that these

deeds and events are fascinating or morally edifying. But Herder will not accept this. For one thing, he denies that mere fascination or curiosity is a sufficiently serious motive for doing history. For another, his anti-authoritarianism, anti-militarism, and borderless humanitarianism cause him to find the acts of political domination, war, and empire which make up the vast bulk of these “great” deeds and events not morally edifying but morally repugnant.²⁹

This leaves two other types of motivation that might be appealed to for doing the sort of history in question: because examination of the course of such deeds and events reveals some sort of overall meaning in history, or because it leads to efficient-causal insights which enable us to explain the past and perhaps also predict or control the future. Herder is again skeptical about these rationales, however. This skepticism is clearest in the material included here from the *Older Critical Forestlet* (1767–8), where, in criticism of the former rationale, he consigns the task of “the whole ordering together of many occurrences into a plan” not to the historian but to the “creator . . . painter, and artist,” and in criticism of the latter rationale, he goes as far as to assert (on the basis of a Hume- and Kant-influenced general skepticism about causal knowledge) that with the search for efficient causes in history “historical seeing stops and prophecy begins.” His later writings depart from this early position in some obvious ways, but in less obvious ways remain faithful to it. They by no means *officially* stay loyal to the view that history has no discernible meaning; famously, *This Too* insists that history does have an overall purpose, and that this fact (though not the nature of the purpose) is discernible from the cumulative way in which cultures have built upon one another, and the *Ideas* then tells a long story to the effect that history’s purpose consists in its steady realization of “humanity” and “reason.” However, Herder clearly still harbors grave doubts just below the surface. That is visible in *This Too* from the work’s ironically self-deprecating title; Pyrrhonian-spirited motto; vacillations between several incompatible models of history’s direction (progressive? progressive and cyclical? merely cyclical? even regressive?); and morbid dwelling on, and unpersuasive attempt to rebut, the “skeptical” view of history as meaningless “Penelope-work.” (A few years later Herder would write that history is “a textbook of the nullity of all human things.”) It is

²⁹ Here Herder’s position is *continuous* with that of his arch opponent in the philosophy of history, Voltaire, who also anticipates him by turning away from political-military history towards a history of culture.

also visible in the *Ideas* from the fact that Herder's official account there of the purposiveness of history is contradicted by passages which insist on the *inappropriateness* of teleological (as contrasted with efficient-causal) explanations in history. Herder's official position certainly had a powerful influence on some successors (especially Hegel), but it is this quieter counterstrand of skepticism that represents his better philosophical judgment. Concerning the prospect of finding in history's "great" deeds and events efficient-causal insights that will enable us to explain the past and perhaps also predict or control the future, Herder's later works again in a sense stay faithful to his skeptical position in the *Older Critical Forestlet* – but they also modify it, and this time for the better, philosophically speaking. The mature Herder does not, like the Herder of that work, rest his case on a *general* skepticism about the role or the discernibility of efficient causation in history. On the contrary, he insists that history *is* governed by efficient causation and that we should try to discover as far as possible the specific ways in which it is so. But he remains highly skeptical about the *extent* to which such an undertaking can be successful, and hence about how far it can take us towards real explanations of the past, or towards predicting or controlling the future. His main reason for this skepticism is that major historical deeds and events are not the products of some one or few readily identifiable causal factors (as political and military historians tend to assume), but rather of chance confluences of huge numbers of different causal factors, many of which, moreover, are individually unknown and unknowable by the historian (e.g. because in themselves too trivial to have been recorded, or because, in the case of psychological causes, the historical agent failed to make them public, deliberately misrepresented them, or was himself unaware of them due to the hidden depths of his mind).³⁰

Complementing this negative case against the claims of traditional political-military history to be of overriding importance, Herder also has positive reasons for focusing instead on the "innerness" of human life in history. One reason is certainly just the sheer interest of this subject matter for Herder and others of his sensibility – but, as was mentioned, that would not be a sufficient motive in his eyes. Another reason is that his discovery of radical diversity in human mentality has shown there to be a

³⁰ Herder's arguments against these three rationales, though more fully stated individually elsewhere, are all in a way briefly summarized in the Tenth Collection of the *Letters for the Advancement of Humanity* (1793–7), Letters 121–2 (included in this volume).

much broader, less explored, and more intellectually challenging field for investigation here than previous generations of historians have realized. Two further reasons are moral in nature. First, Herder believes, plausibly, that studying people's minds through their literature, visual art, etc. generally exposes us to them at their moral best (in sharp contrast to studying their political-military history), so that there are benefits of moral edification to be gleaned here. Second, he has cosmopolitan and egalitarian moral motives for such study: because literature, visual art, etc. make us acquainted with different peoples, at different social levels, including lower ones, and at their most sympathetic, it promises to enhance our sympathies for different peoples at different social levels, including lower ones (unlike elite-focused and morally unedifying political-military history). Finally, doing "inner" history is also an important instrument for our *nonmoral* self-improvement. First, it serves to enhance our self-understanding. One reason for this is that it is by, and only by, contrasting one's own outlook with the outlooks of other peoples that one recognizes what is universal and invariant in it and what by contrast distinctive and variable. Another important reason is that in order fully to understand one's own outlook one needs to identify its origins and how they developed into it (this is Herder's rightly famous "genetic method," which subsequently became fundamental to the work of Hegel, Nietzsche, and Foucault). Second, Herder believes that an accurate investigation of the (nonmoral) ideals of past ages can serve to enrich our own (nonmoral) ideals and happiness. This motive finds broad application in his work. An example is his exploration of past literatures in the *Fragments* largely with a view to drawing from them lessons about how better to develop modern German literature.³¹

Herder's decision to focus on the "innerness" of history's participants, and his consequent emphasis on psychology and interpretation as historical methods, strikingly anticipated and influenced Dilthey. So too did Herder's rationale for this, as described above, which is indeed arguably superior to Dilthey's, especially on its positive side.

Finally, Herder is also impressive for having recognized, and, though not solved, at least grappled with, a problem that flows from his picture of history (and intercultural comparisons) as an arena of deep variations in human mentality. This is the problem of skepticism. He tends to run

³¹ As often in this introduction, the reasons listed in this paragraph are culled from a large number of writings only some of which are included in this volume.

together two problems here: first, that of whether there is any meaning to the seemingly endless, bewildering series of changes from epoch to epoch (or culture to culture); and, second, the problem that the multiplication of conflicting viewpoints on virtually all subjects that is found in history (or in intercultural comparisons) produces, or at least exacerbates, the ancient skeptic's difficulty of unresolvable disputes forcing one to suspend belief on virtually all subjects. The first problem has been discussed. Here it is the second that concerns us. This is a problem that Troeltsch would make much of in the twentieth century, but Herder had already seen it.

Herder is determined to avoid this sort of skepticism. He has two main strategies for doing so, which are inconsistent with each other. His first is to try to defuse the problem at source by arguing that, on closer inspection, there is much more common ground between different periods and cultures than it recognizes. This strategy plays a central role in the *Ideas*, where in particular "humanity" is presented as a shared human value. Herder's second strategy is rather to acknowledge the problem fully and to respond with relativism: especially in *This Too* he argues that – at least where questions of aesthetic, moral, and prudential value are concerned – the different positions taken by different periods and cultures are equally valid, namely for the periods and cultures to which they belong, and that there can therefore be no question of any preferential ranking between them. The later *Letters* vacillates between these two strategies.

Neither of these strategies is satisfactory. The first, that of asserting deep commonalities, is hopeless (notwithstanding its eternal appeal to empirically underinformed Anglophone philosophers). For one thing, it flies in the face of the empirical evidence. For example, Herder in this mode sentimentally praises Homer for his "humanity," and thereby lays himself open to Nietzsche's just retort that what is striking about Homer and his culture is rather their *cruelty*.³² For another thing, it flies in the face of Herder's own better interpretative judgments about the empirical evidence – for example, his observation in *On the Change of Taste* that basic values have not only changed through history but in certain cases actually been inverted (an observation which strikingly anticipates Nietzsche's brilliant insight that an inversion of ethical values occurred in later antiquity).

³² Nietzsche, *Homer's Contest*. The historical issue here is of course very complicated.

Herder's alternative, relativist, strategy, while more promising, is not in the end satisfactory either (even concerning values, where its prospects seem best). There are several potential problems with it. One which is of historical interest but probably not in the end fatal is this: Hegel in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* and then Nietzsche in his treatment of Christian moral values saw the possibility of accepting Herder's insight that there were basic differences in values but nonetheless avoiding his relativism by subjecting others' values to an internal critique, a demonstration that they were internally inconsistent. For example, Nietzsche (whose version of this idea is the more plausible) traced back such Christian values as forgiveness to a contrary underlying motive of resentment (*ressentiment*). However, in order to work, such a response would need to show that the inconsistency was *essential* to the values in question, not merely something contingent that could disappear leaving the values consistently held – and this it probably cannot do. A more serious problem is rather a double one which Nietzsche again saw. First, we cannot in fact sustain such a relativist indifference vis-à-vis others' values. (Do we, for example, *really* think that a moral rule requiring the forcible burning of dead men's wives is no better and no worse than one forbidding it?) Second, nor does the phenomenon of fundamental value variations require us to adopt such an indifference. For, while it may indeed show there to be no universal values, it still leaves us with a better alternative to indifference: continuing to hold our values and to judge others' values in light of them, only now in a self-consciously nonuniversal way. (As Nietzsche put it, "My judgment is *my* judgment." Or if we reject Nietzsche's extreme individualism, "Our judgment is *our* judgment," for some less-than-universal *us*.)

Herder's political philosophy

Herder is not usually thought of as a political philosopher. But he was one, and moreover one whose political ideals are more admirable, thematic foci of more enduring relevance, and theoretical stances more defensible than those of any other German philosopher of the period. He was interested in political philosophy throughout his career, but his most developed treatment of it occurs late, in a work prompted by the French Revolution of 1789: the *Letters* (including the early draft of 1792, important for its frank statement of his views about domestic politics).

What are the main features of Herder's political philosophy? Let us begin with his political *ideals*, first in domestic and then in international politics. In domestic politics, the mature Herder is a liberal, a republican and democrat, and an egalitarian (this in circumstances where such positions were not commonplaces, and were embraced at a personal cost). His liberalism is especially radical in demanding virtually unrestricted freedom of thought and expression, including freedom of worship. He has several reasons for this position. First, he feels that such freedom belongs to people's moral dignity. Second, he believes that it is essential for individuals' self-realization. Third, as was mentioned earlier, he believes that people's capacities for discerning the truth are limited and that it is through, and only through, an ongoing contest between opposing viewpoints that the cause of truth gets advanced. (J. S. Mill later borrowed these considerations – partly via intermediaries such as von Humboldt – to form the core of his case for freedom of thought and expression in *On Liberty*.) Herder is also committed to republicanism and democracy (advocating a much broader franchise than Kant, for example). He has several reasons for this position, each deriving from an egalitarian concern for the interests of all members of society. First, he thinks it intrinsically right that the mass of people should share in their government, rather than having it imposed upon them. Second, he believes that this will better serve their *other* interests as well, since government *by* also tends to be government *for*. Third, he in particular believes that it will diminish the warfare that is pervasive under the prevailing autocratic political systems of Europe, where it benefits the few rulers who decide on it but costs the mass of people dearly. Finally, Herder's egalitarianism also extends further. He does not reject class differences, property, or inequalities of property outright, but he opposes all hierarchical oppression, argues that all people in society have capacities for self-realization and must receive the opportunity to realize them, and in particular insists that government must intervene to ensure that they do (e.g. by guaranteeing education and a minimum standard of living for the poor).

Concerning international politics, Herder is often classified as a “nationalist” or (even worse) a “German nationalist,”³³ but this is deeply

³³ For example, by R. Ergang, in *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York, 1931), and K. R. Popper, in *The Open Society and its Enemies* (London, 1945), who includes Herder in a sort of Hall of Shame recapitulating the rise of German nationalism.

misleading and unjust. On the contrary, his fundamental position in international politics is a committed cosmopolitanism, in the sense of an impartial concern for *all* human beings. This is a large part of the force of his ideal of “humanity.” Hence in the *Letters* his slogan is “No one for himself only, each for all!” and he approvingly quotes Fénelon’s remark, “I love my family more than myself; more than my family my fatherland; more than my fatherland humankind.”

Herder does indeed *also* insist on respecting, preserving, and advancing national groupings. But this insistence is unalarming, for the following reasons. First, for Herder, this is emphatically something that must be done for *all* national groupings *equally* (not just or especially Germany!).³⁴ Second, the “nation” in question is not racial but linguistic and cultural (Herder rejects the very concept of race). Third, nor does it involve a centralized or militaristic state (Herder is an advocate of such a state’s disappearance and replacement by loosely federated local governments with minimal instruments of force). Fourth, Herder’s insistence on respecting national groupings is accompanied by the strongest denunciations of military conflict, colonial exploitation, and all other forms of harm between nations; a demand that nations instead peacefully cooperate and compete in trade and intellectual endeavors for their mutual benefit; and a plea, indeed, that they actively work to help each other.

Moreover, Herder has compelling reasons for his insistence on respecting national groupings. He believes that the deep diversity of values between nations entails that homogenization is ultimately impracticable, only a fantasy; that it also entails that, to the extent that homogenization *is* practicable, it cannot occur voluntarily but only through external coercion; that in practice attempts to achieve it, for example by European colonialism, are moreover coercive from, and subserve, ulterior motives of domination and exploitation; and, furthermore, that real national variety is positively valuable, both as affording individuals a vital sense of local belonging and in itself.

Herder’s fundamental principle of cosmopolitanism was not new, of course. In particular, it was shared by, and no doubt partly due to, his

³⁴ Herder certainly worked especially hard in Germany’s interests. However, this was from a version of what we would today call the principle “Think globally, act locally” (hence when he lived in Riga, a Russian possession, during the 1760s his efforts instead focused on the interests of *Russia*) and from a (realistic) sense of Germany’s present inferiority in comparison with neighbors such as France and Britain. Unlike Fichte for example, Herder never claimed or sought Germany’s *superiority*, instead emphatically rejecting all such ideas of a “Favoritvolk.”

former teacher Kant, who published his own version of it in his essay *Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View* (1784). However, Herder's version of the position is more attractive than Kant's. First and foremost, it is a "nasty little secret" about Kant that, alongside his official cosmopolitan concern for all human beings (or, more accurately, and significantly differently, for the "rationality" in all human beings), he harbored some very intellectually irresponsible (i.e. empirically counterevidenced, unevidenced, or at best underevidenced) and morally objectionable prejudices about human beings of various sorts. In particular, he was a misogynist, an antisemite (a passage in his *Lectures on Ethics* in effect says that all Jews are liars because all Jews are cowards), and a racist (he published a seminal essay on racial taxonomy, and makes wholesale negative remarks about such races as African negroes in his *Anthropology*). In sharp contrast, and to his eternal credit, Herder emphatically rejected such prejudices, and worked tirelessly to combat them. Thus, as can already be seen in *How Philosophy Can Become*, far from being a misogynist, he is a proto-feminist who recognizes women's potentials and seeks to make possible their realization; far from being an antisemite, he wrote works on the Old and New Testaments which give extremely favorable interpretations of ancient Judaism and stress its continuity with Christianity, and in several places he expresses disgust at modern persecutions of Jews by European Christians; and far from being a racist, he rejects the very concept of race, instead preferring the linguistic-cultural concept of a nation or people, and he argues for equal respect for all peoples, and in particular denounces colonialism and slavery in the strongest terms. Second, Herder's insistence on, and arguments for, combining cosmopolitanism with respect for different national groupings (discussed above) are a further point of superiority. The critical Kant's implausible assumption of the implicit universal acceptance of a single moral standpoint (the "categorical imperative") prevented him from seeing a real issue here, let alone feeling the weight of Herder's arguments. A third and final point of superiority is the foundation of Herder's position on a plausible noncognitivism in ethics, instead of on the critical Kant's implausible cognitivist ethical theory.

Some readers may have nodded in assent up to this point, but still feel inclined to object that all this does not yet really amount to a political *theory*—such as other philosophers have given, including some of Herder's contemporaries in Germany. In a sense that is true, but philosophically

defensible; in another sense it is false. It is true in this sense: There is certainly no grand metaphysical theory underpinning Herder's position – no Platonic theory of forms, no correlation of political institutions with “moments” in a Hegelian Logic, no “deduction” of political institutions from the very nature of the self or the will à la Fichte and Hegel, etc. But that is deliberate, given Herder's skepticism about such metaphysics. And is it not indeed philosophically a *good* thing? Nor does Herder have any elaborate account purporting to justify the moral intuitions at work in his political position as a sort of theoretical insight – in the manner of Kant's theory of the “categorical imperative” or Rawls's theory of the “original position,” for example. But that is again quite deliberate, given his noncognitivism in ethics, and his rejection of such theories as both false and harmful. And is he not right about this, and the absence of such an account therefore again a *good* thing? Nor is Herder sympathetic with such further tired staples of political theory as the state of nature, the social contract, natural rights, the general will, and utopias for the future. But, again, he has good reasons for skepticism about these ideas.³⁵ This, then, is the sense in which the objection is correct; Herder does indeed lack a “political theory” of *these* sorts. But he lacks it on principle, and is arguably quite right to do so.

On the other hand, he does have a “political theory” of another, and arguably more valuable, sort. For one thing, consistently with his general empiricism, his position in political philosophy is deeply empirically informed. For instance, as can be seen from his *Dissertation on the Reciprocal Influence of Government and the Sciences* (1780), his thesis about the importance of freedom of thought and expression, and the competition between views which it makes possible, for producing intellectual progress is largely based on the historical example of ancient Greece and in particular Athens (as contrasted with societies which have lacked the freedom and competition in question). And in the 1792 draft of the *Letters* he even describes the French Revolution and its attempts to establish a modern democracy as a sort of “experiment” from which we can learn (e.g. whether democracy can be successfully extended to nations much larger than ancient Athens). For another thing, conformably with his general noncognitivism about morals, he is acutely aware that his political position ultimately rests on moral sentiments – his own and, for its

³⁵ For some helpful pointers about this, see F. M. Barnard, *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 54–5, 64–6, 105–6, 141.

success, other people's as well. Hence, for example, the Tenth Collection of the *Letters* stresses the fundamental role of moral "dispositions" or "feelings" as required supports for his political position's realization. This standpoint absolves him of the need to do certain sorts of theorizing – not only precluding cognitivist groundings of the moral intuitions in question, but also promising short, effective answers to some problems that would probably look like real brain-teasers to a cognitivist.³⁶ However, it also leads him to engage in another sort of theorizing, namely theorizing about how, and by what means, people's moral sentiments should be molded in order to realize the ideals of his political position. His discussion of moral "dispositions" in the Tenth Collection is an example of such theorizing (in this case concerning the how rather than the means; some of his theorizing about means was sketched earlier). *These* two sorts of theorizing *are* deeply developed in Herder, and they are arguably much more pointful than the sorts which are not.

In short, to the extent that Herder's political philosophy really is theoretically superficial, it is arguably, to borrow a phrase of Nietzsche's, "superficial – *out of profundity*" (whereas more familiar forms of political philosophy are profound out of superficiality). And in another, more important, sense it is not theoretically superficial at all.

These, then, are some features of Herder's positions in the several areas of philosophy covered by the present volume which seem to me noteworthy. A number of years ago Isaiah Berlin and Charles Taylor attempted to bring Herder's philosophical importance to the attention of Anglophone philosophy. Anglophone philosophy was quick to recognize the quality of the messengers, but has been paradoxically slow to heed their message. It is my hope that the present volume may help to rectify this unfortunate situation.

³⁶ For example: How do you reconcile your cosmopolitanism with your respect for different nations when these nations turn out to have really inhumane practices? This problem would probably strike a cognitivist as the discovery of an embarrassing contradiction in Herder's position. But to a noncognitivist like Herder it instead just looks like the sort of practically challenging but theoretically unpuzzling conflict that can *always* in principle arise when one has multiple sentiments, or commitments. How do you reconcile your devotion to Mary with your commitment to your job when your job requires you to neglect her?

Chronology

- 1744 Johann Gottfried von Herder is born in Mohrungen, a small town in East Prussia, to Johann Herder, a clothmaker and girls' school teacher. He grows up in humble circumstances.
- 1755 Kant publishes his *Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens*, a work that would come to exercise a lifelong influence on Herder.
- 1762 Herder enrolls at the University of Königsberg, where he meets and studies with Kant, who accords him special privileges and attention because of his unusual intellectual abilities. Later in this period he begins a lifelong friendship with the irrationalist philosopher Hamann.
- 1764 Herder leaves Königsberg to take up a school-teaching position in Riga which he will hold until 1769. He publishes the significant early essay *On Diligence in Several Learned Languages*.
- 1765 He writes the programmatic essay *How Philosophy Can Become More Universal and Useful for the Benefit of the People* under strong influence from Kant.
- 1766 He writes the essay *On the Change of Taste*. Kant publishes his *Dreams of a Spirit Seer*.
- 1767 Herder begins publishing his first major work, on the philosophy of language and literature, the *Fragments on Recent German Literature* (1767–8).
- 1768 He publishes *On Thomas Abbt's Writings*.
- 1769 He publishes the first three parts of an important work in aesthetics, the *Critical Forests*. He resigns his position in Riga and subsequently spends a period traveling – first to France; then through Holland and Germany, where he meets his future wife

- Karoline Flachsland in Darmstadt; then to Strasbourg, where he meets, and has a powerful impact on, the young Goethe.
- 1771 Herder wins a prize from the Berlin Academy for his best-known work in the philosophy of language, the *Treatise on the Origin of Language* (published 1772). He takes up a position as court preacher to the ruling house in Bückeburg which he will hold until 1776.
- 1773 He publishes a seminal essay, *Shakespeare*, which contrasts ancient and Shakespearean tragedy as distinct genres and defends the latter against critics.
- 1774 He publishes his first major essay on the philosophy of history, *This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity*.
- 1776 He is appointed General Superintendent of the Lutheran clergy in Weimar, partly through Goethe's influence, a post in which he will remain for the rest of his life.
- 1778 He publishes the important essay in the philosophy of mind, *On the Cognition and Sensation of the Human Soul*. He begins publishing an influential collection of translations of popular poetry from around the world, *Popular Songs* (1778–9).
- 1781 Kant publishes his *Critique of Pure Reason*.
- 1782 Herder begins publishing his most important work on the Old Testament, *On the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (1782–3).
- 1784 He begins publishing his well-known longer work on the philosophy of history, the *Ideas for the Philosophy of History of Humanity* (1784–91). Hamann finishes his *Metacritique on the Purism of Pure Reason*, an attack on Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*.
- 1785 Kant publishes two condescending reviews of Herder's *Ideas for the Philosophy of History of Humanity*. Jacobi publishes letters in which he reveals and rejects Lessing's Spinozism, thereby opening a famous controversy on this subject.
- 1787 Herder publishes an influential work in the philosophy of religion, *God. Some Conversations*, in which he defends a modified version of Spinoza's monism.
- 1788 Hamann dies. Kant publishes his *Critique of Practical Reason*.
- 1789 The French Revolution begins. Herder welcomes it enthusiastically.
- 1790 Kant publishes the last of his three *Critiques*, the *Critique of Judgment*.
- 1793 Herder begins publishing a work largely on political philosophy, written in reaction to the French Revolution, the *Letters for the Advancement of Humanity* (1793–7).

Chronology

- 1794 He begins publishing a series of essays concerned mainly with the origins, character, relations between, and proper principles for interpreting the parts of the New Testament, the *Christian Writings* (1794–8).
- 1799 He publishes the first of two works criticizing aspects of Kant's critical philosophy, *A Metacritique on the Critique of Pure Reason*, directed against the theoretical philosophy of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*.
- 1800 He publishes the second of his works criticizing Kant's critical philosophy, the *Calligone*, directed against the aesthetic theory of Kant's *Critique of Judgment*.
- 1803 Herder dies.
- 1804 Kant dies.

Further reading

Translations

Herder has not been very extensively translated into English. Indeed, many important works have not yet been translated at all. H. Adler, E. A. Menze, *On World History* (Armonk, 1996) contains short excerpts on history from a variety of works, prominently including the *Ideas*. F. M. Barnard, *J. G. Herder on Social and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1969) is especially helpful, including good (partial) translations of Herder's *Journal of My Journey in the Year 1769*, the *Dissertation on the Reciprocal Influence of Government and the Sciences*, and the *Ideas*, as well as a very good introduction. F. H. Burkhardt, *God. Some Conversations* (New York, 1940) is a translation of Herder's most important work in the philosophy of religion. T. Churchill, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (London, 1800) is a translation of the *Ideas*. J. Marsh, *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (Burlington, VT, 1833) is a translation of Herder's most important work on the Old Testament. E. A. Menze, K. Menges, M. Palma, *Johann Gottfried Herder: Selected Early Works, 1764–7* (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1992) contains some early essays and excerpts from the *Fragments*. J. H. Moran, A. Gode, *On the Origin of Language* (Chicago, 1986) contains a partial translation of *On the Origin*. H. B. Nisbet, *German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism: Winckelmann, Lessing, Hamann, Herder, Schiller, Goethe* (Cambridge, 1985) contains two pieces of Herder's on aesthetics, including his important essay *Shakespeare*.

Secondary literature in English

Concerning general treatments, I. Berlin, *Vico and Herder* (New York, 1976) is concise and excellent. R. T. Clark Jr., *Herder: His Life and Thought* (Berkeley, 1955) is fairly detailed and useful though unimaginative. F. C. Beiser, *The Fate of*

Further reading

Reason (Cambridge, MA, 1987), ch. 5, covers several topics helpfully, including Herder's philosophies of language, mind, and religion. Concerning Herder's general program and his debts to the precritical Kant, J. H. Zammito, *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology* (Chicago, 2001) is helpful. Concerning Herder's philosophy of language, two essays by C. Taylor are especially useful: "The Importance of Herder," in E. and A. Margalit (eds.), *Isaiah Berlin: A Celebration* (Chicago, 1991), and "Language and Human Nature," in C. Taylor, *Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers 1* (Cambridge, 1996). Concerning Herder's philosophy of history, A. O. Lovejoy, "Herder and the Enlightenment Philosophy of History," in his *Essays on the History of Ideas* (Baltimore, 1948), is a helpful short treatment which explains Herder's position in the context of Enlightenment thought. F. Meinecke, *Historism: The Rise of a New Historical Outlook* (London, 1972), ch. 9, is especially helpful. Concerning political philosophy, R. Ergang, *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York, 1931) is informative both on Herder's political thought and on his general intellectual influence (though marred by an assimilation of Herder's form of nationalism to later German, state-centered nationalism, and by an unduly warm assessment of such a position – for both of which flaws Barnard, Berlin, and Beiser are good correctives). F. M. Barnard, *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism* (Oxford, 1965) is helpful, esp. chs. 3–5 on Herder's political thought. F. C. Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution, and Romanticism* (Cambridge, MA, 1992), esp. ch. 8, is outstanding, among other things decisively refuting the lingering myth that Herder and other German philosophers of his age were apolitical. Concerning other subjects, H. B. Nisbet, *Herder and the Philosophy and History of Science* (Cambridge, MA, 1970) provides an excellent account of Herder's stance towards science. R. E. Norton, *Herder's Aesthetics and the European Enlightenment* (Ithaca, 1991) is helpful both on aspects of Herder's aesthetic theory and on Herder's general relation to the Enlightenment (though the Herderian theory correlating different art forms one-to-one with different senses on which Norton largely focuses is far from the most philosophically interesting aspect of Herder's aesthetics).

Secondary literature in German

This is extensive. By far the most helpful single item remains R. Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken* (Berlin, 1880) – a classic, detailed intellectual biography whose treatment is outstanding (despite a Kantian bias and an occasional unwarranted note of condescension). Also extremely helpful are the specific textual commentaries in U. Gaier et al. (eds.), *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985–). H. D. Irmischer has written several important

Further reading

articles relevant to the subjects covered in this volume, including “Grundzüge der Hermeneutik Herders,” in *Bückerburger Gespräche über J. G. Herder 1971* (Bückerburg, 1973), and “Grundfragen der Geschichtsphilosophie Herders bis 1774,” in *Bückerburger Gespräche über J. G. Herder 1983* (Bückerburg, 1984). A. F. Kelletat, *Herder und die Weltliteratur* (Frankfurt am Main, 1984) is an excellent, unpretentious treatment of Herder’s interest in world literature, and in particular his theory and practice of translation. T. Willi, *Herders Beitrag zum Verstehen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1971) is a very good treatment of Herder’s work on the Old Testament. Two fairly useful recent collections of essays which cover a broad range of topics are G. Sauder (ed.), *Johann Gottfried Herder 1744–1803* (Hamburg, 1987) and M. Bollacher (ed.), *Johann Gottfried Herder: Geschichte und Kultur* (Würzburg, 1994).

Note on the texts and translation

The texts are based on two excellent German editions: U. Gaier et al. (eds.), *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985–) and B. Suphan et al. (eds.), *Johann Gottfried Herder Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1887–). References to these editions take the form of the primary editor's surname initial followed by volume number and page number (e.g. G2:321 or S5:261). The former edition is the main source, with the latter serving for the 1775 draft of *On the Cognition*, supplements to other texts, and certain emendations. I have occasionally also made emendations myself, but conservatively and always with an explanatory footnote.

The translator of Herder works in the shadow of Herder's own formidable theory and practice of translation. His theory of translation is represented in this volume by the selections from the *Fragments*. Two principles of the theory, both deeply grounded in his philosophy of language, are particularly noteworthy: First, translation proper (*Übersetzung*) (which he distinguishes sharply from mere imitation [*Nachbildung*], a genre which, however, he also tolerates and sometimes practices) can and should cope with the discrepancies that frequently occur between concepts, or word usages, in the original language and concepts, or word usages, in the language into which the translation is to be done by “bending” the (closest) latter word usages over the course of the translation.¹ This in particular entails preferring to give uniform translations of a given word/concept in the original rather than varying translations, despite (and indeed in a way for the sake of) the greater impression of strangeness to which this will give rise in certain contexts. The alternative

¹ On this see, besides the *Fragments*, also *Popular Songs*, G3:26.

way of proceeding can make for smoother reading, but only at the unacceptable cost of a sacrifice in the exactness with which readers of the translation can grasp the author's meaning. Second, translation should also attempt to reproduce the more musical and stylistic features of the text translated. This is not, for Herder, merely a desirable luxury over and above the more fundamental goal of faithfully reproducing meaning; it is also a requirement for the latter. One reason for this is that the musical and stylistic aspects of a text provide readers with indispensable clues to the exact character of the authorial sensations which, according to Herder's quasi-empiricist theory of concepts, are internal to the author's meanings.²

The present volume aims at translation proper, a faithful reproduction of meaning (rather than mere imitation). The texts involved here do not pose the challenges that Herder's two principles are designed to address in as high a degree as some (e.g. conceptual discrepancy is a bigger problem with ancient texts, and musical-stylistic features are more important in poetry than in prose). Nonetheless, they do pose them to a degree, and I have generally attempted to conform to Herder's two principles as far as possible where they are relevant – not because they are Herder's, but because they seem to me broadly correct.

Accordingly, I have attempted to translate important terms in a uniform way as far as possible (e.g. *Menschheit*, which Herder sometimes uses in a more or less descriptive, morally neutral way and sometimes in a way which connotes a moral ideal, is always translated as *humanity* rather than sometimes as the morally neutral *humankind* and at other times as the more morally suggestive *humanity* – a choice made easy in this case by the fact that even in standard English *humanity* is sometimes used in a descriptive, morally neutral way). However, a few important terms resisted uniform translation for various reasons (prime examples are *bilden/Bildung*, which, depending on the context, appear here as *form/formation*, *educate/education*, *civilize/civilization*, *cultivate/cultivation* or *culture*; a less extreme example is *Geist*, which, depending on the context, becomes either *mind* or *spirit*).³ In such cases, I have compensated by indicating the single German word involved in square brackets or footnotes.

² See e.g. G2:1159: it is essential to preserve Shakespeare's rhymes in translation because of the semantically relevant nuances of feeling which only they convey exactly.

³ Such cases illustrate an important point about Herder's injunction to "bend" usages in translation: this cannot well be sustained as an absolute requirement, only as a presumption.

I have also attempted to preserve the musical and stylistic features of the texts as far as possible. This in particular meant preserving, rather than smoothing out, the deliberate roughness of Herder's writing – including his use of such artfully rough rhetorical devices as anacoluthon, chiasmus, and hysteron proteron.⁴

With regard to punctuation, the translation is much freer. Some of Herder's idiosyncrasies have been kept for various reasons (e.g. his use of quotation marks not only for quotations but also for emphasizing statements of his own), but otherwise punctuation has been freely modernized in the interest of conveying his meaning as effectively as possible.

Some more detailed observations concerning these and other matters relating to the translation can be found in footnotes at relevant points in the texts.

Lettered footnotes are Herder's own; numbered footnotes mine. Square brackets, [], indicate an editorial supplement to Herder's texts, or the original German wording; curved brackets, (), are Herder's own.

⁴ In this spirit, Herder praised Abbt's translations of Latin authors for preserving the distinctive roughness of the originals rather than smoothing it out into easier-to-read "Frenchified German."

Part I General Philosophical Program

How Philosophy¹ Can Become More Universal and Useful for the Benefit of the People² (1765)

[Introduction]³

If any science has been an object of contradictions, and yet amid these stones and earthen clods that have been cast at it an object of reverence, then it is exalted philosophy [*Weltweisheit*].⁴ Since its beginning it had constantly been a source of annoyance to the one party, a corner-stone of truth to the other; and this so peculiar phenomenon of contradiction has not merely been a mark of distinction and a shibboleth, so to speak, among whole ages, peoples, and sects, but philosophy has had to survive this metamorphosis of judgment at one time and among one people, indeed often in different phases of one and the same person. This is indeed as remarkable a phenomenon of the human understanding for a person who is not a scholar as it is a remarkable thing for a person who is not a politician when people conflict with people. Philosophy has become a Proteus among the nations. Where it was victorious, behold, it generally built its throne on the ruins of mathematics and experiences from physics; but commonly it remained an ally of philology, with which it also commonly associated

¹ *Philosophie*. In this essay Herder also uses the more colorful word *Weltweisheit* more or less interchangeably with this word.

² This title is taken by Herder's German editor from a letter that Herder wrote to Hamann about this essay on 23 April 1765. An earlier draft of the essay actually bore the similar but not identical title *How Can the Truths of Philosophy Become More Universal and Useful for the Benefit of the People?* There would be a good argument for retaining the latter title.

³ Headings in square brackets are supplied by Herder's German editor in light of an essay plan for this essay which Herder wrote.

⁴ Herder uses this word more or less interchangeably with *Philosophie* in this essay. Literally it means *world-wisdom*, but I have translated both terms as *philosophy* throughout.