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Editorial

The issues of the journal Philobiblon are no longer thematic except for “unique” occasions. However, this is not to say that the texts published in the journal are in no ways related as to their subject matter or scientific level or horizon, or their outlined and interconnected multidisciplinary and humanistic approach which, of course, joins them both in essence and “atmosphere”. It is this consideration which allows us now—that is, on the occasion of conceiving the present issue—to group the texts published in our main section MAN – BOOK – KNOWLEDGE – SOCIETY under a subtitle equally inventive, connective, and cumulative: Delicacies of History, Memory, and Textual Criticism.

The subtitle is inspired primarily by the sensibility of Luminiţa Florea’s excellent study dedicated to the connections of music, pharmacy, and spices in the Middle Ages; this is continued—again in the sense of intellectual “delicacies” represented, I think, by all the studies of this section—by the text of architect Gheorghe Vais on medieval libraries, then the study of Zsuzsanna Tóth, presenting the stages of the restoration of a medieval codex important for the history and culture of this region. This perspective is organically broadened by István Fehér M.’s hermeneutic analyses regarding the philological problems of historical-critical and life-work editions. Next, not accidentally, comes precisely the analysis of the translation and edition history of Plato’s and Aristotle’s works in Romanian culture. The texts of Elena Chiaburu and Éva Farkas-Wellmann come in the completion of the horizon and atmosphere created by these works, treating the adjacent subjects of funerary inscriptions in Moldavia and the funeral orations of a Hungarian preacher from Transylvania, respectively; then the texts of Roxana Bălăucă and Anamaria Susin discuss matters of everyday life, the former in the historical context of the Daily Notes of Queen Marie of Romania, preserved in the collections of the Lucian Blaga Central University Library in Cluj, and the latter in the contemporary perspective on the quality of daily life in Parkinson’s disease. The third direction that the articles of this issue take, within the same horizon, level, and “atmosphere”, is contoured by the investigations of Eleonora Sava regarding the symbolic mechanisms of the manner in which traditional Romanian communities tend to perceive crisis situations, which are then followed by the artistic and aesthetic meditations of Teodora Cosman as reflections on an album of family photographs… Moreover, this issue is illustrated by the paintings of Teodora Cosman, linked first of all to the atmosphere and role of the human and historical memory of photography, being, together with the rest of the studies, also veritable “delicacies of history, memory, and criticism” themselves. “Delicacies” which are completed and “spiced”—in the more intimate introductory space reserved for the Chief Editor and his Editorial—by some of the superb poems of Zorica Sentić, a poetess originating from Serbia, remarkable by the profound naturalness of the feminine universality by which she addresses us all in the second person singular. That is, addressing us as: “You”.

István Király V.
Chief Editor
Zorica Sentić

Zorica Sentić originates from the territory currently called Serbia of the former Yugoslavia. She now lives in France. Her poems written in Serbian and French have been translated into several languages. Her poetry of “cosmicality”, or rather “the phenomenological Other”, lacking any kind of mannerism, calls upon and questions us all as You, in second person singular, with a feminine universality. **Contacts:** E--mail: zorica.sentic@gmail.com **Web Adresses:** http://zoricasentic.blogspot.com/, www.darujmorec.com, http://www.facebook.com/zorica.sentic

---

1 Zorica Sentić originates from the territory currently called Serbia of the former Yugoslavia. She now lives in France. Her poems written in Serbian and French have been translated into several languages. Her poetry of “cosmicality”, or rather “the phenomenological Other”, lacking any kind of mannerism, calls upon and questions us all as You, in second person singular, with a feminine universality. **Contacts:** E--mail: zorica.sentic@gmail.com **Web Adresses:** http://zoricasentic.blogspot.com/, www.darujmorec.com, http://www.facebook.com/zorica.sentic
être un mot
je voudrais être
un mot
compiqué
impossible
da mettre au pluriel
être rare
le mot unique
dans ton dico
je voudrais être un verbe
que tu ne
conjugerais
qu’au présent
et au futur

français: Zorica Sentić

translated by Paul Dauwe

to be a word
I would like to be
a word
complicated
impossible
to put in the plural
be rare
the single word
in your dictionary
I would like to be a verb
that you only
would conjugate
at the present
and with the future

she was lost
under the umbrella of hope
while standing on the tedious balcony
under the shower of accusation
on the bench of assumption
on the path of wondering
on the rim of a well
I have found madness
in the pool of light
on the tracks of memory
I have lost all illusions
and have looked for the victories
on the tracks of life
I was lost and I marvelled
the wheat fields
and the many paths
leading to the gardens of Eden
to the valleys covered with snow
right to the top of the highest mountain
I will look for you
I might be destroyed
yet I could conquer it
and if I find myself
I will write to you

translated by Jelena Pavlović

somewhere
I’m somewhere here
between the words and tomorrow
somewhere where I’m sitting
nothing stops me
but I’m staying
speechless
waiting
for my words to begin
somewhere
still waiting
between the words and tomorrow
for these words
just born
and not yet spoken
I am here
but I would prefer to be next to you
and to fly
only to land on your shoulder
on your tomorrow
somewhere
on your land
i gave birth to these words
still speechless
If you would only
whisper

translated by Jelena Pavlović
éteins le silence
éteins le silence et tais toi
ferme les yeux et regarde en toi
si t’aperçois l’ombre d’une lumière
si t’entends un bruit, un cri ou un éclat de voix
t’as encore foi
tu saisiras l’essentiel
et peut-être
verras-tu l’invisible
dans cette multitude d’amas
dans ce tas de pourquoi
des pépites perdues
des réponses–questions
si tu discernes en toi
dans la pénombre d’un de tes pourquoi
la lueur d’un éclat
une empreinte qui traîne en toi
sans doute un cri, un mot que t’as pas compris
dans cet immense magma
lors de l’explosion des réponses sans questions

une âme amie plane la nuit
du côté de chez toi
ne sois pas surpris
si un peu d’elle, tu discernes en toi

si tu la discernes en toi
tu pénétreras et percevras
les certitudes de tes doutes d’autrefois
ai foi au moins en toi
si t’as pas en elle

parle toi
tu apercevras des pluriels de comment

il n’est jamais trop tard

un soir
tu t’écouteras
un autre
tu t’entendras

elle
elle sera toujours là
alors, souvent, regarde en toi
ferme les yeux et tais toi
tu trouveras ta vérité
elle
c’est peut-être moi
éteins le silence
MAN – BOOK – KNOWLEDGE – SOCIETY

Delicacies of History, Memory and Textual Criticism

ORIGINAL STUDIES AND ARTICLES
A Feast of Senses: Grinding Spices and Mixing “Consonances” in Jacques of Liège’s Theoretical Works*

Luminița FLOREA
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston

Keywords: Jacques of Liège, 14th-century music theory, medieval spices, medieval pharmacy, medieval cooking, medieval interval theory

Abstract: Sensory experiences conjured up in medieval and Renaissance theory treatises involve hearing, seeing, and often smelling. In the works examined in this paper, music theory, cooking, and pharmacy were drawn together by virtue of a commonality of methods. According to 14-th century music theorist Jacques of Liège, palatal sensations accumulating within a multi-course meal would lead to superior gastronomic satisfaction; and repetitious rubbing and mincing would increase the scent released by the species aromatice. The intellect should work in similar ways: repetition and accumulation of previously analyzed and learned concords must be applied towards a better understanding of those still to be learned. The joy derived from hearing sound mixtures is similar to the satisfaction an Epicurean cook experienced from retaining the few aromata deemed most delicate to the palate.

E-mail: l_florea@yahoo.com

*Take good spices, that is, ginger, cloves, cinnamon, and galingale, and grind them in a mortar; then take a handful of sage and grind well in the same mortar with the spices; then take eggs and hardboil them; remove the yolk and grind with the sage; blend with wine, cider, or malt vinegar; take the egg white and chop finely and add to the sage mixture; put in pig’s trotters or (other) cold meat and then serve.

MS London, British Library, Add. 32085, ff. 117v-119v, “How One Should Make Food and Spiced Wine,” no. 3 Sage sauce

*Sage sauce;

1 Lat.: cyperus longus; also called galangal.

2 “Saugee;” see Constance B. Hieatt and Robin F. Jones, “Two Anglo-Norman Culinary Collections Edited from British Library Manuscripts Additional 32085 and Royal 12.C.xii,” Speculum 61 (October 1986): 859–882, at 863 (for the Anglo-Norman text) and 874 (for the modern English translation). The authors date the first manuscript in the late thirteenth century; the second belongs in the first four decades of the fourteenth century. They were both redacted in Anglo-Norman and thus printed in the article in question; a modern English translation is provided in ibid., 873–879.
For how could anyone be a good cook if his taste is not exquisitely delicate? … Nor will anyone be able to practice music optimally if his ears are not cleaned.

Francesco Salinas

A good cook is half a physician, for the chief physic (the counsel of a physician excepted) doth come from the kitchen.

Andrew Borde

In a succinct piece published in 1974 and suggestively titled “Unfamiliar Sources – Or Cooking With Music,” Madeau Stewart proposed that a whole body of sources that might include references to music and its making had remained unexplored. Stewart believed that, once identified and investigated, unexpected – and apparently improbable – suppliers of information such as conversation manuals, fashion and calligraphy books, and even cookbooks would yield surprising results.

In those examined by Stewart, references are mostly to musical instruments as objects of material culture; the cookbooks she brought to attention are not likely to touch upon the conceptual side of music. Yet conversely, examination of music theory treatises shows that medieval and Renaissance music theorists speak from time to time of mundane delights such as fine food and wine, and pungent flavors and smells. Sensory experiences conjured up in works of theory involve hearing, seeing, and sometimes smelling – as noted by Christopher Page in his study on Tinctoris’s use of olfactory comparisons.

Some music theorists described the semitone as “the sweetness and condiment of all song;” some likened the musician (both theorist and composer) to a cook – the

1 Francisco Salinae Burgensis Abbatis Sancti Pancratii de Rocca Scalegna in regno Neapolitano, et in Academia Salamanticensi Musicae Professoris, de Musica libri Septem, in quibus eius doctrinae veritas tam quae ad Harmoniam, quam quae ad Rhythmum pertinet, iuxta sensus ac rationis iudicium ostenditur, et demonstratur (Salamanca, 1577), Liber quartus, 227.


4 Christopher Page, “Reading and Reminiscence: Tinctoris on the Beauty of Music,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 49 (Spring 1996): 1–31, especially 17–21; Page (ibid., 17) quotes a passage from Tinctoris’s Liber de arte contrapuncti and remarks that the theorist’s discussion of works by Ockeghem, Dunstable, Binchois, Dufay and other masters “invokes the beauty of their music in language that refers to the way their compositions smell.”

5 See the theoretical corpus known as Ars nova, in Philippi de Vitracico Ars nova, ed. Gilbert Reaney, André Gilles, and Jean Maillard, Corpus scriptorum de musica 8 ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1964), 21: “Semitonium, ut dicit Bernardus, est dulcedo et condimentum totius cantus, et sine ipso cantus esset corrosus, transformatus et dilaceratus (The semitone, as St. Bernard says, is the sweetness and condiment of all song, and without it the song would be gnawing [harsh, corrosive], changed, and dismembered).” Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine. An electronic version of this text is available in TML as VITARNO TEXT. For a nineteenth-century edition, see Scriptorium de musica medii aevi nova series a Gerbertina altera, 4 vols., ed. Edmond de Coussemaker (Paris: Durand, 1864–76; reprint ed., Hildesheim: Olms, 1963; henceforth CS), 3: 13–22; this statement appears on p. 18. The phrase was used again in Johannes Szydlow’s Musica, for which see Waclaw Gieburowski, Die “Musica Magistri Szydlovite:” ein polnischer
way sixteenth-century French writer Montaigne likened himself to one when penning his Essays as a book “concocted according to a clever recipe . . .”, with “the elements of style . . . measured out as in a sauce,” and with the tale itself “containing a variety of ingredients, like a stew.”

Others still regarded consonances and medicines as analogous, for in their opinion music theory and pharmacy shared a number of methods for measuring and mixing ingredients that produced a final, stable, and efficient compound.

The association of auditory, olfactory, and palatal sensations, an Aristotelian stance coming from the De anima and De sensu et sensibilibus (of which more, later) appears to be a common locus in fourteenth-century treatises, or in works by Renaissance theorists who were familiar with classical Greek.

Yet I propose that complex theoretical discourse on music was occasionally sprinkled with references to palatal and odoriferous stimuli as described in more mundane works: medieval cookbooks, herbal drugs, antidotaries, gardening treatises, and household accounts classified spices, herbs, and medicines in “simple” and “compound,” and prescribed rubbing, grinding, shredding, and mixing as primary methods; this in turn can shed further light on the nature and “making” of intervals as sound mixtures.

1. The spices

The fourth book of Jacques of Liège’s Speculum musice, possibly begun in Paris –

---

1 See Michel Jeanneret, A Feast of Words: Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance, transl. Jeremy Whiteley and Emma Hughes (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 132; the passage (and Jeanneret’s book) were first brought to my attention by Susan F. Weiss’s “Medieval and Renaissance Wedding Banquets and Other Feasts,” Food and Eating in Medieval Europe, 159–174, at 164, n. 15.

2 Page (“Reading and Reminiscence,” 18) notes that musicians from the generation of Tinctoris (but also some of his predecessors) “were following Aristotle’s thinking” when positing a direct relation between the senses of hearing and sight, and that associating hearing with smell was much less common.

3 The modern edition is Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musice, Liber quartus, ed. Roger Bragard, Corpus scriptorum de musica 3/4 ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1965), 1–126. An electronic version of the text is available in TML as JACSP4 TEXT. The treatise has been preserved in three manuscripts, of which only one is complete: thus MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7207 has the complete text of the seven books; MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7207A includes books I–V; and MS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurentiana has a small number of chapters from books I, II, V, VI, and VII, respectively; see Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musiceae, ed. Roger Bragard, 7 vols. (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1955-73), 1: v. A full description of these manuscripts is in ibid., 1: ix–xix, as well as in Roger Bragard, “Le Speculum musiceae du compilateur Jacques de Liège I,” Musica disciplina 7 (1953): 60–104, at 65–79. For catalogue descriptions, see The Theory of Music from the Carolingian Era up to 1400: Italy, ed.
where he had been a student\(^1\) (and perhaps a professor as well)\(^2\) – and concluded in his
native town around 1330 is a monumental discussion of musical consonances. In the
late-1990s Sarah Fuller published a study including, among other things, a discussion of
the music theorist’s views on the sense of hearing as expounded in this book; Fuller
concluded that “this hearing is relatively divorced from actual phenomena… and is
configured in close conformity to an established Boethian tradition that privileges the
intellect over sensory perception.”\(^3\) This small niche of relativity is, indeed, intriguing,
and I propose to take it as the point of departure of my exploration of Jacques’s take on
the senses of taste and smell.

Jacques opened his fifty-chapter analysis with a prologue (titled Chapter 1)
advocating the value of repeating information from previous books: such reiteration, he
said, should not be seen as superfluous; rather, repetition increases the knowledge of the
subject and improves the memorization of it. To further strengthen his argument,
Jacques compared the repetitiveness of intellectual operations – more specifically, those
he wanted applied to musical concepts – with the repetitiveness necessary in the
recognition and comprehension of sensory signals. In doing so, he stressed the senses of
taste and smell. His thesis was that the ability to differentiate among the tastes of
different courses of the same meal enables one to gain a better knowledge of one flavour
through full understanding of another. The multitude of distinct palatal sensations, he
maintained, as well as the gradual accumulation of these within the context of a multi-
course meal would lead to superior gastronomic satisfaction. “Who or what,” inquired
Jacques, “can prevent the intellect from working the same way?”

“The species aromatice (aromatic spices),” the writer went on to say, “release
greater scent the more they are minced (or rubbed).”\(^4\) In similar fashion, Jacques argued,

\(^1\) See Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History*, 5 vols., rev. ed. Leo Treitler (New York:
Norton, 1998), 2: 269. A few excerpts from Book VII (pp. 5–7 and 86–95, respectively, in Bragard’s
edition) were translated by Strunk and revised by James McKinnon; they are printed in ibid., 2: 269–
278; as they bear little relevance to the present discussion, they will not be examined in this article.

\(^2\) For further discussion of Jacques’ identity, see Roger Bragard, “Le *Speculum musicae* du
and Oliver B. Ellsworth, “Jacobus of Liège [Iacobus Leodiensis, ?Iacobus de Montibus, ?Iacobus de
Oudenaerde, Jacques of Liège],” *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (accessed 22 October 2007),
<http://www.grovemusic.com> and the bibliography there cited; and, very importantly, Karen
Desmond, “New Light on Jacobus, Author of *Speculum musicae*,” *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 9
Montibus, canon at the collegiate church of St. Paul in Liège; she adduces hitherto unknown
evidence documenting this Jacobus as a recipient of payments in goods from the church as well as a
land owner, and she hypothesizes that he died sometime between 1337 and 1343.

\(^3\) Sarah Fuller, “*Delectabatur in hoc auris*: Some Fourteenth-Century Perspectives on Aural
Perception,” *Musical Quarterly* 82, Special Issue: “Music as Heard” (Autumn 1998): 466–481,
especially 469–473.

cibariis fercula distincta parantur gustui, ut quod sapit uno modo magis sapiat et altero, et sic
... consonances will be compared to each other with respect to their general similarities (or conformities) and specific differences; their height and depth (intentio and remissio); their order; their quality of being simple or composite; their being whole or part; they will be compared with respect to intervals, species, perfection and imperfection; and they will be compared with respect to some other proportions, as the [following] chapters show.¹

This prologue encapsulates the general medieval fascination with analogies. As such, it could in itself call for further exploration; even more interesting, however, is the specific analogy Jacques chose: I propose that the bringing together of consonances, food, and spices was not gratuitous, and that Jacques believed this particular combination was the most appropriate in the given context.

First, and before delving into gastronomy, one notices that, after Boethius,² Aristotle is by far the most frequently quoted authority throughout Book IV. Jacques’s sources are the De anima and De sensu et sensibilibus, closely followed by the Metaphysica. Given the subject matter of the book itself; the availability, since the thirteenth century, of Latin translations of these and other works of Aristotle;³ and the exhibition by Jacques of unquestionable erudition, these are precisely the references one expects. In his De anima the Philosopher posited that “the species of flavor are, as in the case of color, simple, i.e. the two contraries, the sweet and the bitter, secondary, viz. the succulent and the saline; between these come the pungent, the harsh, the astringent, and

¹ Ibid.: “Comparabuntur autem hic ad invicem consonantiae quantum ad convenientias ipsarum generales et differentias, quantum ad intentionem et remissionem, quantum ad totum et partem, quantum ad intervalla, quantum ad species, quantum ad perfectionem et imperfectionem, et quantum ad aliquas alias proportiones prout occurrent et ostendent capitula.”
² From Boethius’s De musica Jacques quotes and discusses only Books I and II; see Braggard, “Le Speculum musicae II,” 14. For a complete list of texts that have been identified as Jacques’s sources, see id., “Le Speculum musicae I,” 97; and id., “Le Speculum musicae II,” 2–3.
the acid; these pretty well exhaust the varieties of flavor.”¹ The Stagirite viewed sweet
and bitter as the most fundamental “simples” belonging in the reign of flavor, but further
asserted the supremacy of the sweet within the eight species of flavor by noting, in De
sensu, that “nourishment is effected by the sweet.”² In fact, Hippocrates had already
asserted this much by including the category of sweet among nutriments.³

To return to music theory: what is, therefore, a consonance described from this
perspective? First, it must be pointed out that “consonance” is Jacques’s word for
“interval” in a most general sense;⁴ consequently, I shall use “interval” for Jacques’s
“consonance,” and “concord” for the modern “consonance.”⁵ Intervals, whether
successively or simultaneously produced, belong in one general class, where they share
one or more commonalities: in effect, Jacques takes them to be a genus proximum
separated from other genera through possession of a set of common attributes that
makes them distinct and identifiable as what they are. This is Aristotelian in both spirit
and letter. The prime attribute of intervals, however, consists in the ability of any of
them, as sound mixtures, to be expressed in a numerical ratio;⁶ to this, another factor
should be adjoined: all intervals belong in the realm of sensory perception – specifically,
the sense of hearing (and, at this point in Jacques’s discourse, not the sense of sight,
smell, taste, or touch).⁷ This exclusive definition, though, should be taken with a grain of
salt, for over the subsequent fifty chapters the theorist will cast upon it a variety of
interpretive shades.

¹ Translation from the Greek; see Aristotle, De anima (“On the Soul”) 422b, transl. J. A. Smith,
² Translation from the Greek; see Aristotle, De sensu et sensibilibus (“Sense and sensibilia”)
442a; transl. J. I. Beare, The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation, 2:
693–713, at 701.
³ Hippocrates, Nutriment 27; for an English translation from the Greek see Hippocrates,
the original Greek is on p. 352.
⁴ This view is independently expressed in Fuller, “Delectabatur,” 480, n. 23.
⁵ For a magisterial analysis of Jacques’s “consonance” division and hierarchy, as well as the
criteria applied by the theorist in his manifold classification of “consonances,” “conords,” and
“discords,” see Frank Hentschel, Sinnlichkeit und Vernunft in der Mittelalterlichen Musiktheorie:
Strategien der Konsonanzwertung und der Gegenstand der musica sonora um 1300 (Stuttgart:
Franz Steiner, 2000), 44–65. I would like to extend my thanks to the author for kindly bringing
this work to my attention and sharing his erudition with me.
⁶ See Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musicæ, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 6: “Item in hoc omnes
conveniunt consonantiae quia sonorum cuiuslibet mixtio ad aliquam certam in numeris reducibilis
est proportionem.” See also Hentschel’s discussion of the Aristotelian foundation of this and all
sections on numerical ratios, Sinnlichkeit und Vernunft, 45–46.
⁷ See Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musicæ, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 6: “Et ideo, cum ad
consonantiam requiratur vox vel sonus non solum unus sed plures et ipsorum mixtio et
respondens in numeris proportio, generaliter in his consonantiae conveniunt et in hoc etiam
quod determinatum respicient sensum, scilicet audittum;” and further (ibid., 7): “Item in hoc
omnes conveniunt consonantiae quia sic auditum respiciunt, quod non alium sensum. Sunt enim
objectum non visus, non olfactus, non gustus, non tactus, sed, quantum ad sensus exteriores,
solius auditus.”
Yet not all intervals are pleasing to the ear, the writer says; some are more so, some much less, and some only in a mediocre degree: music is made with “consonances” both pleasing and unpleasing (to the sense of hearing). Every degree in between two extremes (for the sound of some “consonances” is “suave and sweet,” [these are the perfect concords, see below] while that of others is “rough” [perfect discords]) is, indeed, a “consonance,” provided that it can be expressed in a clear ratio or it involves some proportion. Thus the “consonances” of the Ancients become Jacques’s “concrds;” and ancient “dissonances” become “discords,” with each category further subdivided into three classes whose arrangement is continuous from perfect (or pure) to imperfect and median concords, to median, imperfect, and perfect discords; these, one could argue, are the six degrees of sonorous gratification corresponding to Aristotle’s eight species of flavour: the latter, too, are gratifying to the sense of taste in a range of intensities.

According to Aristotle, numerical ratios play an important role as far as savours and flavours are concerned; from the perspective of the present topic, such a statement strengthens the alliance of musical intervals and palatable and odoriferous mixtures; by extension, the alliance of intervals and colours is strengthened as well, for the Philosopher asserts:

As the intermediate colors arise from the mixture of white and black, so the intermediate savors arise from sweet and bitter; and these savors, too, severally involve either a definite ratio or else an indefinite relation of degree between their components, either having certain numbers at the basis of their mixture and motion, or else being mixed in proportions not arithmetically expressible. The flavors which give pleasure in their combination are those which have their components joined in a definite ratio. [emphasis mine]

* * *

Jacques bases his definition of “simple” and “composite” not on Aristotle, but on Euclid and on one of the period’s widely applauded etymological encyclopaedias: the

---

1 Ibid., 6: “Omnis igitur consonantia in hoc convenit cum alia ut ad minus suam ad consistantiam duos distinctos requirat sonos, simul vel successive prolatos, miscibiles ad invicem vel mixtos, sive mixtio illa suavis sit et placeat auditui, sive non;” and further (ibid., 16): “Unde fit, ut generaliter sumendo consonantias, quaedam auditui placeant, quaedam ipsum offendant, et, inter has et illas, quaedam plus, quaedam minus, quaedam mediocrer.”

2 Ibid., 12: “Item, quarundam consonantiarum voces sunt suaves et dulces et aliquarum rudes, et harum et illarum quaedam plus, quaedam minus.”

3 Ibid., 93–105. Jacques himself tells us that when Boethius referred to “dissonance” he meant “discord” (ibid., 102): “Dissonantia, inquit, est duorum sonorum sibi permixtorum ad aurem veniens aspera atque iniucunda percussio (Dissonance, he says, is a stroke of two reciprocally mixed sounds, coming to the ear in a harsh and infelicitous way);” by the same token, Boethius’s “consonance” can be equated with Jacques’s “concord” (ibid., 94): “Intendit enim Boethius solas illas describere consonantias quarum concordant voces (Boethius intends to describe only those consonances whose sounds are in agreement [form a concord] with each other).”

4 De sensu et sensibilibus 442a, transl. Beare, 702.
Derivationes of Uguccione da Pisa (Ugutio Pisanus), Bishop of Ferrara (d. 1210) – a work that, besides being a gigantic accumulation of Classical and medieval knowledge, was also Dante’s dictionary. In addition to such illustrious philological parentage, Jacques’s phraseology evokes more down-to-earth formulas employed in contemporary botanical and pharmaceutical lore: both herbs (taken as herbs-and-spices) and medicines were classified as either “simple” (individual plants described and illustrated in herbals and pharmaceutical books) or “compound.” As described by Matthaeus Platearius (d. 1161) in his enormously popular De simplici medicina (or Circa instans) – a summa of Salernitan botanical-medical knowledge translated into French around 1300 as Le livre des simples medicines,

A simple medicine is that which remains in the state it is produced by nature, like the clove, the nutmeg, or other, similar ones; or one that, although changed by virtue of some artificial preparation, is not mixed with another medicine, like tamarinds which, once the skin is removed, are artificially crushed ...  

1 Also identified in Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musicae, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 23; and in Bragard, “Le Speculum musicae II,” 2–3. For a facsimile reproduction of the original Latin manuscript of 1236, now MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Lat. 14056, see Uguccione da Pisa, Derivationes, with a presentation by Giovanni Nencioni (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 2000). The first critical edition of the Derivationes – a work to whose writing Uguccione dedicated four years of his life (1197–1201, while at the Abbey of Nonantula) – is in Uguccione da Pisa, Derivationes, 2 vols., ed. Enzo Cecchini and Guido Arbizzoni, Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini 11/6 (Florence: SISMEL edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004). Apart from the original writing, the work borrows heavily from Osbern of Gloucester, Isidore, Nonius, and Gellius. Uguccione, teacher of Pope Innocent III and noted jurist (he is the author of the celebrated Summa in Decretum Gratiani) had “a passion for ‘etymologizing’ and ‘deriving’ that far outstrips in its fantasies all his creditors;” see Jean Holzworth, “Hugutio’s Derivationes and Arnulfus’ Commentary on Ovid’s Fasti,” Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 73 (1942): 259–276, at 259.

2 See Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musice, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 23: “Simplex dicitur uno modo quod est indivisibile, partes carens, quomodo punctus simplex dicitur, quia punctus est, cuius pars non est, secundum Euclidem … Et distinguitur, secundum Hugutionem, simplex a simplo, quia simplex caret parte, simpulum vero partes habet, non qualescumque, sed eiusdem generis … (Simple is said about something that is indivisible, for it lacks parts – like the dot is said to be simple for it has no parts, according to Euclid … And, according to Hugutio, simplex should be distinguished from simpulum, for simpulum lacks parts, yet simpulum has parts, not just any parts, but of the same kind.)”

3 The edition used in this article is Matthaeus Platearius, “Liber de simplici medicina,” in Practica Io. Serapionis dicta breuiarium. Liber Serapionis de simplici medicina. Liber de simplici medicina, dictus circa instans. Practica Platearius (Impressum Venetijis; Mandato [et] expensis nobilis viri domini Octauiani Scoti, per Bonetum Locatellum, 17 kal. Januarias 1497), ff. 186ra-211vb; this definition appears on f. 186ra: “… Simplex autem medicina est: que talis est indivisible, for it lacks parts – like the dot is said to be simple for it has no parts, according to Euclid … And, according to Hugutio, simplex should be distinguished from simpulum, for simpulum lacks parts, yet simpulum has parts, not just any parts, but of the same kind.)”
According to Jacques, however, intervals are never simple, strictly speaking, for any interval results from the compounding of two pitches apt to trigger aesthetically positive or negative judgments. One might say that intervals are mixtures of “simples,” just like compound medicines, such as unguents, waters, and mixtures are. The latter involved more than one ingredient, and were used in instances when simples were either not efficient enough, or, on the contrary, had violent effects that needed to be moderated through blending; lastly, compounds possessed dissimilar qualities coming from dissimilar simples – which in turn could address dissimilar symptoms manifesting simultaneously, or cure different parts of the body affected at the same time by different ailments.

The *Compendium de musica*, another theoretical work of the fourteenth century attributed to Jacques of Liège, touches upon the sense of hearing “rejoicing” in sound mixtures, or compounds, and likens this to the way an epicurean cook retained – from a variety of *aromata*, and by dismissing some of the flavours – just a few that he deemed most delicate to the palate.

Again, the *aromata* here are taken in a collective sense, meaning a gathering of herbs or spices denoting pleasant flavour and implying pleasant odour. The focus is not on the pharmaceutical or medical connotations of the *species aromatice*, but on the culinary ones; within the latter taste reigns supreme, with smell a close second. The palette of associated senses widens, as sight, too, will experience satisfaction through perception of good mixtures of simple elements: for, the text continues, “undoubtedly, the ear delights in mixtures of sounds just like the eye delights in mixtures of colours and the palate in mixtures of flavours.” We are about to luxuriate in a sensory feast at this point – and we are reminded, too, of yet another Hippocratic adage: “Sweetness, in varying degrees, can appeal to the sense of sight, being aroused by colors and other
Philosophically, of course, the association of sound, flavour or savour, and odour in this passage is in line with yet another Aristotelian dictum – to wit, that concord of several units is better or more effectual than each of these units taken singly: “... the objects of sense are pleasant when e.g. acid or sweet or salt, being pure and unmixed, are brought into the proper ratio; then they are pleasant: and in general what is blended – a concord – is more pleasant than the sharp or the flat alone.”\(^3\) Such general alliance and cross-correspondence of senses is once more emphasized in Book Four of the *Speculum musice*, where Jacques writes: “The sense of hearing, with respect to sounds, is like the sense of sight with respect to colours, the sense of smell with respect to odours, the sense of taste with respect to flavours, and the sense of touch with respect to primary qualities.”\(^4\)

Furthermore, a remarkable metaphor had already been used by the author or authors of the thirteenth-century *Summa musice* (long attributed to Johannes de Muris and, as such, dated to the earlier part of the next century) to associate aural perception and taste. Here the writers included a line said in reference to a wife in the Sixth Satire of Juvenal\(^5\) and subsequently widely used in medieval Christian literature: “Thus when the song is neglected it shall be harsh, inept//It is perceived by the ear as having more aloe than honey.”\(^6\) Placing aloe and honey in such close position was originally meant to denote the sharp contrast between their respective flavours: while aloe is bitter, honey is sweet; when used by the authors of the *Summa musice*, the phrase becomes, in fact: while cultured sound is palatable and nourishing in the highest degree (for “sweetness” is, in Aristotelian terms, the highest ranked flavour and the source of nourishment), uncultivated sound-emission is not.

At the core of this metaphor the sense of smell is involved on equal terms with that of taste: the juice of a certain type of aloe (*caballinum*) was known to be not only

---


\(^3\) Aristotle, *De anima*, 426a–426b, transl. Smith, 678.

\(^4\) Jacobus Leodiensis, *Speculum musice, Liber quartus*, ed. Bragard, 15: “Proportionaliter enim sic auditus ad sonos se habet, ut visus ad colores, olfactus ad odores, gustus ad sapores, tactus ad qualitates primas.” Page (“Reading and Reminiscence,” 20) refers to this passage in a context including a similar remark by Englebert of Admont.


bitter-tasting, but also foul-smelling – an attribute duly recorded in all classical and medieval herbals and pharmaceutical formularies – for instance, in the late-thirteenth-century *Herbal* of Rufinus. Thus long before Tinctoris’s time, when late thirteenth-century writers chose to manipulate music – or particular aspects of it – as part of a rhetorical vocabulary, they performed a “movement across boundaries of sense, or synaesthesia.” In this case, they spoke of sound coming to the ear not only as an aural entity, but as an already metamorphosed compound involving additional palatal and olfactory stimuli. The high degree of similitude of the latter two had, in fact, been alleged by Aristotle, who in *De sensu et sensibilibus* remarked that “odor and savor … are… almost the same physical affection.”

Yet between the two senses that perceive odour and flavour, respectively, the latter (i.e., taste, which in turn is simply touch transformed) comes first, for … savors, as a class, display their nature more clearly to us than odors, the cause of which is that the olfactory sense of man is inferior in acuteness to that of the animals, and is, when compared with our other sense, the least perfect of all. Man’s sense of touch, on the contrary, excels that of all other animals in fitness, and taste is a modification of touch.

What kinds of spices did Jacques have in mind when he wrote his passages on *aromata*? According to Dioscorides’s *De materia medica* – a text composed ca. 47 A.D., translated into Latin (perhaps in incomplete versions) by the third century, widely consulted by medieval physicians, herbalists, and pharmacists alike, and frequently quoted in works of medicine and pharmacy of the period – *aromata* were herbs originally from India or the Arab lands or “some other part of the world.” The main quality of these exotic products resided in their capacity to give out fragrant odour transmitted through the air. Dioscorides does not appear to have considered the flavour of *aromata*; his description as quoted in the *Herbal* of Rufinus was concerned with the role of these incense-generating bodies in the context of religious rituals of the ancient world – in other words, his focus was on olfactory rather than palatal sensation.

---

1 See *The Herbal of Rufinus*, ed. Lynn Thorndike and Francis S. Benjamin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), 15: “Dyascorides: Aloes herba est amarissimi suci … Circa instans: Aloes ex suco herbe fit cuius tria sunt genera: cicotrinum, epaticum et caballinum … Caballinum autem nigrum obscurum est et fetulentam habet substantiam; amarissimum et orribilem pretendit saporem vel odorem.” Rufinus’s sources (ibid., xvi, xxi, and xxvii-xxxi) include Dioscorides’s *Herbal*, Mattheus Platearius’s *Circa instans*, Macer (identified by Thorndike as Odo of Meung or “some other post-Carolingian poet”), Alexander “the philosopher” (of unknown identity, “Alexander” might have been the author of a commentary on the *Antidotarium* of Nicholaus), the masters of Salerno, Isaac, *Synonyms*, Rufus, and Galen.

2 As described in Page, “Reading and Reminiscence,” 21.

3 *De sensu et sensibilibus* 440b, transl. Beare, 700.

4 Ibid.

5 For the transmission of this text to the Latin West, as well as for extant illustrated copies of it and its derivative texts, see Minta Collins, *Medieval Herbals: The Illustrative Traditions* ([London and Toronto]: The British Library and University of Toronto Press, 2000), 148–238.

6 See *The Herbal of Rufinus*, ed. Thorndike, 44. “Aromata: Dioscorides: sunt que flagrant odore que India vel Arabia mittit vel alie regiones. Nomen autem aromatum traxisse videtur, sive quod
Classical botany and pharmacy aside, the most complete repertory of aromatic spices used in culinary masterpieces by Jacques of Liège’s contemporaries is found in the Viandier of Guillaume Taillevent (ca. 1310–95), master cook to the Valois kings. Written in the first half of the fourteenth century¹ and most likely incorporating the work of at least one unknown French predecessor,² this cookbook is highly relevant for the haute cuisine of the period under examination. The oldest preserved manuscript of the text includes the following list of fines espices (or bones especes): “ginger, cinnamon, cloves, grain of Paradise, long pepper, mace, powdered spices, cinnamon flour [?], saffron, galingale, and nutmeg.”³ An early fifteenth-century version of the text adds “laurel leaves, lores [unidentified], cumin, sugar, almonds, garlic, onions, chives, and shallots” to the preceding enumeration.⁴

Furthermore, gastronomy, medicine, and pharmacy in the Middle Ages were perceived as close allies: the widely read Epidemics of Hippocrates included the following recommendation: “As to diseases, make a habit of two things – to help, or at least to do no harm;”⁵ Galen’s translation of it as “Primum non nocere” continued with “let food be your medicine and medicine be your food,” and this was a precept well-known to the medical profession. In the early fourteenth century Henri de Mondeville, physician to Philip the Fair of France stated as a matter of fact that bringing patients to a state of equilibrium (with respect to balancing out the four humours of the body) was more easily achieved through administration of appropriate diet than through administration of medicines.⁶

² See Taillevent, Le Viandier, 229; and ibid., 231–252 for a facsimile reproduction of the late-thirteenth-century manuscript containing the text of the cookbook in question.
³ “Gingembre, cannelle, giroffe, graine de paradis, poivre lonc, maceis, especies en poudre, fleur de cannelle, saffran, galingale, noys mugaies ;” this list appears before the explicit of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 19791, and is printed in Taillevent, Le Viandier, 73–136.
⁴ “Feuilles de laurier, lores, commin, succre, amandes, aulx, ongnons, ciboules, escalognes ;” the list belongs in MS Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Christine of Sweden fund 776 (olim 233 and 2159), and is printed in Taillevant, Le Viandier, 73–136.
⁵ Hippocrates, Epidimion 1.11.11–12; for an English translation, see Hippocrates, “Epidemics I and III,” in Hippocrates: The Complete Works, 1: 139–288, at 165.
In a joint gastronomic and medico-pharmaceutical context the *species aromatice* in combination with herbs and other natural products were used in treating various physical ailments. In classical times Pliny the Elder had noted in his *Naturalis historia* that “the true nature of each plant can only be fully understood by studying its medical effect;”¹ he specified that anise and dill were “for the kitchen and for doctors,” that “sacopenium, employed for adulterating lasermth, was also grown as a garden plant, but only for medicinal purposes,”² and praised the curative virtues of mustard – a ubiquitous condiment.³

In the *Herbal* of Rufinus pulverized *sal gemma*, common salt, and *species aromatice* sprinkled on some dish as a *mixtum compositum* were recommended in the treatment of arthritis sufferers;⁴ a cataplasm (poultice) made of equal parts of powdered *bistorta* (a herb with roots similar to galangal or galingale) and *species aromatice* aided in childbirth.⁵ Furthermore, Rufinus had unsuccessfully experimented on himself the effect of one of these compound medicines involving crushed leaves of laurel – yet another ingredient commonly listed among the spices of medieval cooking recipes. ⁶

That the same spices were regarded as both medical and culinary articles was a theory further disseminated through the *Circa instans* of Matthaeus Platearius, a work that enjoyed formidable popularity throughout the Middle Ages in both its Latin and French versions: modern scholarship has noted that “its manuscripts are legion,” and that “there were few medieval libraries which did not possess at least one copy.”⁷ The French version, *Le Livre des simples medicines* recommends that boiled cabbage seasoned with coriander, pepper, cumin, and garlic be administered to the sick.⁸

Finally, modern historians of pharmacy have stressed that spices such as “galangal, grains of paradise, and saffron [all of which abound in medieval cooking recipes – the latter, used mostly for colouring] were used in medicine either for their

---

¹ The edition used in this article is Pliny, *Natural History. With an English Translation in Ten Volumes, 5: Libri XVII–XIX*, transl. H. Rackham, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961); this reference is to *Naturalis historia* 19.52 (for the Latin text, see p. 540: “… verum autem cuiusque natura non nisi medico effectu pernosci potest;” for Rackham’s translation, see p. 541).
² *Naturalis historia* 19.52 (for the Latin text, see p. 526: “… anesum et anetum culinis et medicis nascuntur, sacopenium, quo laser adulteratur, et ipsum in hortis quidem, sed medicinae tantum;” for Rackham’s translation, see p. 527).
³ Ibid., 19.54 (for the Latin text, see p. 528: “… et acerrimum sapore igneique effectus ac saluberrimum corpori sinapi;” for Rackham’s translation, see p. 529: “… and mustard, which with its pungent taste and fiery effect is extremely beneficial for the health”).
⁴ See *The Herbal of Rufinus*, ed. Thorndike, 281: “[Alexander]: *Sal gemma* calidus est et siccum … Pulvis salis gemme et salis communis et aromaticarum specierum super cibos aspersus multum conferit arteticis, id est, qui patiuntur in articulis.”
⁵ Ibid., 59: “*Bistorta*: Ad conceptum adiuuvandum fiat emplastrum ex pulvere bistorte in quantitate libris et specierum aromaticarum in eadem quantitate.”
⁶ Ibid., 17: “Ego Rufinus pistavi septem folia laureole cum mastice et vino et expressi succum per petiam et bibi illud (I, Rufinus have crushed seven leaves of laurel with mastix and wine; and I squeezed the juice through a cloth and drank it);” see also the editor’s discussion of this particular occurrence (ibid., xxxv).
⁷ See *Livre des simples medecines; Codex Bruxellensis IV.1024*, 1: 11 and 13.
⁸ Ibid., 1: 124.
supposed therapeutic effect or to mask an ingredient too bitter for the ordinary palate.”

In addition, spices were effective in the preservation of other simples: for instance, after having been marinated in sweet wine, *passuli* (raisins) were sprinkled with ground cumin and other *species aromatice* and bound in *ficus* leaves; in this manner they could be kept for two years.

All cookbooks of the period make it clear that spices and herbs were crucial in late medieval gastronomy: in the late thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman cookbook that is now MS British Library, Additional 32085, all recipes but one call for spices. Similar examples are found in the early fourteenth-century cookbook preserved in MS British Library, Royal 12.C.xii. In fact, the use (some modern historians call it the “riot”) of spices and herbs was so widespread that the writer of the first book included a recipe expressly describing how to cook *without* them: he or she did so by penning instructions on “Making broth without herbs.”

Most of the spices used in medieval cookery and pharmacy were imported from distant lands [see Figure 1, Figure 2], and were very expensive; they were accordingly described in medieval travel accounts. Among modern historians, Alan S. Weber has shown that the keeping of spices in fourteenth-century French royal and aristocratic households was entrusted to the master cook, and their transfer – together with the “transfer and safekeeping of large sums of money and goods” – was the job of

---

1 See Leslie G. Matthews, *A History of Pharmacy in Britain* (Edinburgh and London: Livingston, 1962), 24. See also Marie-Thérèse Lorcin, “Les ‘meschantes herbes des jardins,” in id., *Pour l’aïse du corps: Confort et plaisirs, médications et rites*, Medievialia 22 (Orléans: Paradigme, 1998): 61–74; Lorcin shows that even medical recipes collected in 1362 by a physician from Strassbourg from his woman-servant incorporated exotic spices, albeit in small quantities; by contrast, in recipes written by physicians or apothecaries at approximately the same time, these same spices made up 31.5% of the ingredients.


4 “A fere bruet sanz herbes;” see Hieatt and Jones, “Culinary Collections,” 63–64 (for the Anglo-Norman text) and 875 (for the modern English translation).

5 Desborough-Cooley (“On the Regio Cinnamomifera,” 181–182) refers to a fourteenth-century Arabic description of the coast of Ceylon “covered with trunks of the cinnamon tree,” and to the writings of Marco Polo, Jordan de Severa, and Juan de Hese showing cinnamon “among the chief productions of Malabar.” He goes on to quote from mid-fourteenth-century author Marino Sanuto, whose description includes specific references to spices as “articles of moderate weight and great price or value – as cubebes, cloves, nutmeg, mace …” or “of greater weight and less price – as pepper, ginger, frankincense, canella, and the like” that “come to Alexandria by way of Aden …,” alternate routes for the importation of spices were from Bagdad and Tabriz through the Mediterranean; or through Chaldea and Persia.
Figure 1. Ambroise Paré, LES OEUVRES D’AMBROISE PARÉ ... AUEC LES FIGURES ET PORTRAICTS, TANT DE L’ANATOMIE QUE DES INSTRUMENTS DE CHIRURGIE, ET DE PLUSIEURS MONSTRES (Paris, 1579): Indigenous people gathering cinnamon bark. Wellcome Library, London. (Reproduced by permission.)
the provisioner;¹ and Leslie G. Matthews perused English well-to-do household accounts (contemporaneous with documents examined by Weber) revealing that large quantities of spices were inventoried alongside other valuable possessions kept in the wardrobe – such as the one of Thomas Button, Bishop of Exeter (d. 1307), which contained “many pounds weight of almonds, rice, sugar, ginger, cassia, galangal, pepper, grains of paradise, saffron, cloves, cubebs, aniseed, and liquorice.”²

¹ See Weber, “Queu du Roi, Roi des Queux,” 150–151, and ibid., n. 21, for a quote from the original French of eighteenth-century French historian Le Grand d’Aussy’s description of the master cook’s duties under the Valois.
² See Matthews, History of Pharmacy, 23.
If not ground but served in their original, pristine condition as superior treats at the end of a meal, spices were placed on special plates, which were subsequently stored in some well-protected space, such as the counting house or even the jewel house.\(^1\) Larger and better equipped monasteries, too, had a room (*drinarium pigmentorum*) for the safekeeping of drugs made from precious spices.\(^2\) Furthermore, in his commentary on *Le Livre des simples medicines*, Pierre Leutaghi stressed that preserving such costly articles as well as extending their potency was made possible by keeping them in airtight leather bags and silver containers – objects not without a value of their own.\(^3\)

Early twentieth-century historian William Mead noted that “during the early Middle Ages spices were prized like jewels,”\(^4\) and although in the high Middle Ages prices of *aromata* came down as a result of commercial growth and enterprise, “they were never cheap.”\(^5\) In fact, their cost was prohibitive for anyone but royalty, nobility, the well-to-do bourgeoisie, and the higher clergy – that is, the socially and economically privileged.\(^6\) On account of both cost and scarceness, spices accompanied rich and noble travellers on their journeys: in the early summer of 1378 Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March, and his suite went from London to Scotland: they took with them three pounds of saffron, sixteen pounds of powdered ginger, and eight pounds of ground pepper.\(^7\)

From the anonymous *Le Menagier de Paris*,\(^8\) composed by a Paris bourgeois around 1394 and incorporating a formidable body of instructions for his young bride on how to run a household,\(^9\) we know how much the *épiciers* of that city charged for the most frequently used spices; their prices are shown in Table 1, below:

---

1. See Henisch, *Fast and Feast*, 172, for Edward IV’s spice dishes, stored in such a place; and ibid., 104, for the locked box “which may be seen beside the cook on a misericord in St. George’s Chapel, Windsor.”
5. Ibid.
6. For this, as well as the concept of “class feeding” in the Middle Ages, see Stephen Mennell, *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 46 and 53.
Table 1. *Le Menagier de Paris*: Cost of Imported Spices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>almonds</td>
<td>1 livre (pound)</td>
<td>14 deniers (pennies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powdered “colombin” ginger</td>
<td>1 livre</td>
<td>11 sols (shillings) = 132 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ground cinnamon</td>
<td>1 livre</td>
<td>5 sols = 60 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“mesche” ginger</td>
<td>1 quarteron</td>
<td>5 sols = 60 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long pepper</td>
<td>1 half-quarteron</td>
<td>4 sols = 48 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galingale</td>
<td>1 half-quarteron</td>
<td>5 sols = 60 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mace</td>
<td>1 half-quarteron</td>
<td>3 sols 4 deniers = 40 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green laurel leaves</td>
<td>1 half-quarteron</td>
<td>6 deniers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>1 ounce</td>
<td>3 sols = 36 deniers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closer to Jacques’s own time, all these spices and many others were already included in the ordinances of February 1349 (50) and May 1351 regarding taxes on commodities entering the city of Paris.4

Exorbitant prices also triggered the widespread counterfeiting of pharmaceutical concoctions, a practice that prompted thirteenth-century writer John of Garland to pen an angry diatribe against apothecaries who “for the sake of gain, mingle or adulterate confections with electuaries, roots with herbs, zedoary5 with ginger, pepper with cumin, cloves with cinnamon, aniseed with maratro, wax with tallow, and sugar with liquorice.”6 In the same vein, Platearius’s articles on individual spices frequently include a word of caution against pharmaceutical fraudulence.

How much did the spices used for sumptuous dinners cost? Judging by the one probably given in 1379 by the Abbé de Lagny for *Monseigneur* de Paris, the President

---

1. *Le Menagier de Paris*, ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 186. Reckoning money in fourteenth-century England, France, and the Low Countries was based on the following system: 1 livre (£; pound) = 20 sous ([sols] s.; shillings); 1 sou = 12 deniers (d.; pennies); to this, the mark was added on the English side.
2. I.e., imported from Quilon, on the Malabar coast; ibid., 319. n. 7 to p. 186.
3. I.e., imported from Mecca; ibid.
4. See *Le Menagier de Paris*, ed. Pichon, 112, n. 31: “Toutes ces épices figurent dans les ordonnances de février 1349(50) et 3 mai 1351, relatives à des droits supportés par certaines denrées à l’entrée de Paris. On y voit que le poivre, le sucre, le gingembre, la cannelle, le ris, l’anis, le safran et le girofle venoient à Paris par balles, et que le cubète (employé aussi quelquefois dans la cuisine), le macis, la graine de paradis, le poivre long, les noix muguettes, l’espic (nard), le garingal, le citoual, les dattes, les pignons, etc., venoient sans doute par plus petites quantités, puisqu’ils sont taxés par livre (4 deniers en 1350, et 6 en 1351) (All these spices were listed in the ordinances of February 1349[50] and 3 May 1351 concerning taxes on certain commodities entering Paris. One sees there that pepper, sugar, ginger, cinnamon, rice, aniseed, saffron and clove came to Paris in bales, and that cubeb pepper [sometimes also employed in the kitchen], mace, grains of paradise, long pepper, nutmeg, spikenard, galingale, zedoary, dates, pine kernels, etc. came, no doubt, in smaller quantities – since they are taxed by the pound [4 deniers in 1350, and 6 in 1351]).”
5. A cheaper spice – the French citoual.
of the Parlement, the attorney general (procureur), the king’s lawyers (avocats du roy),
and his other counsel, the grand total paid for the almond, ginger, saffron, and cinnamon used in the cooking of potages² alone amounted to 534 deniers (pennies),³ or 44 sols (shillings) and 6 deniers (pennies) – and this, without even considering the cost of unnamed spices incorporated into the wine served at the end of the meal.

These are, indeed, very high prices: by comparison, the daily pay of a watchman in Paris between 1299 and 1305 as reported by Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse from French royal accounts was 1 sol (sou; shilling);⁴ and Peter Spufford reports that the daily pay of a building worker in England in the 1350s was 3 deniers (pennies).⁵ If multiplied by six (to account for the total wages accumulated in a six-day work week) the first amount, 6 s. (shillings) would have been almost sufficient to pay for one quarteron (quarter-pound) of ginger from Mecca or one half-quarteron of galingale; and the second, 18 deniers (pennies) would have sufficed to buy a little more than one livre (pound-weight) of almonds and about the seventh part of one livre of powdered ginger in a Parisian spice shop towards the close of the century.

Prices commanded by books in the thirteenth and fourteenth century in Paris offer yet another excellent term of comparison – for these would have been familiar to the theorist from Liège. The University of Paris was in absolute control of the book trade in that city, so much so that “beginning with an ordonnance of Philip the Fair in 1307, the sworn libraires of the university were exempted from paying the taille, and later kings reaffirmed this exemption and added to it.”⁶ Table 2 below shows a comparison of book and spice prices:

---

¹ For the probable date of this event, as well as the identification of the characters partaking in this diner, see Le Menagier de Paris, ed. Pichon, 104, n. 6.
² Potage is any meal cooked in a pot – in this case, a whole course comprised of fish dishes that were served with spiced sauces.
³ My calculation of the final cost is based on the specific quantities of spices used: six pounds-weight of almonds, one half-pound of powdered ginger, one half-ounce of saffron, two ounces of menus espices (a mixture of cloves and cardamom; see Le Menagier de Paris, ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 320, n. 186), one quarter-pound of powdered cinnamon, and one half-pound of dragee (a white or ruby colored, powdered spice believed to aid in digestion and usually served with desert; see ibid., 183 and 317).
⁵ See Peter Spufford, Money and Its Use in Medieval Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 235. In a related work (Peter Spufford, Handbook of Medieval Exchange [London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1986], xxiv), the author shows that “in France the system of livre, sou, and denier parisis, based on the denier parisis until it ceased to be struck in 1365, continued in use for at least another century and a half.” Maps of medieval currencies are printed in ibid., xxii, and in Money and Its Use, 294. By 1390, the daily pay of skilled building workers in southern England had increased to 5 d.; see Carlin, “Provisions for the Poor,” 45, n. 47.
⁶ See Rouse and Rouse, Illiterati et uxorati, 1: 75.
Table 2. Prices of Books in Paris Compared to Spice Prices, 13th–14th centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book and date copied or sold</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Spice quantity and date priced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pecia(^1) rented from a sworn <em>libraire</em> associated with the University, 1286</td>
<td>1 <em>denier</em> (penny) or 1 half-<em>denier</em>(^2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pecia copied by professional scribe, ca. 1300</td>
<td>12 <em>deniers</em>(^3)</td>
<td>1 <em>quarteron</em> of green laurel leaves; or 1/3 of 1 ounce of saffron, ca. 1379-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themistius, <em>Commentary on Aristotle’s De anima</em>, ca. 1300</td>
<td>6 <em>deniers</em>(^4)</td>
<td>1 half-<em>quarteron</em> of green laurel leaves; or 1/6 of 1 ounce of saffron, ca. 1379-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, <em>Commentary on Aristotle’s Meteorology and Physiognomy</em>, ca. 1300</td>
<td>9 <em>deniers</em>(^5)</td>
<td>¼ of a half-<em>quarteron</em> of green laurel leaves; or ¼ of 1 ounce of saffron, ca. 1379-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus Lombardus, <em>Summa</em>, ca. 1300</td>
<td>3 <em>sous</em>(^6) (sols) = 18 <em>deniers</em></td>
<td>1 ½ <em>quarterons</em> of green laurel leaves; or 1 ounce of saffron, ca. 1379-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus Comestor, <em>Historiayclastica</em>, ca. 1300</td>
<td>3 <em>sous</em>(^7) = 18 <em>deniers</em></td>
<td>same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratian, <em>Decretum</em>, 1289</td>
<td>40 <em>livres parisis</em>(^8) (Parisian pounds) = 800 s. = 10600 d.</td>
<td>twice the price paid for spices used for <em>potages</em> only for Abbé de Lagny’s dinner, 1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent of Beauvais, <em>Speculum historiale</em>, 1334</td>
<td>40 <em>livres parisis</em>(^9) = 800 s. = 10600 d.</td>
<td>same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Section of a standard text that was rented from the *libraire*, copied, and then returned.
3 In this late-thirteenth or early-fourteenth-century instance, the scribe was paid for copying Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa contra gentiles* for Pierre de Limoges, a Parisian master who died in 1306; see Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et uxorati*, 1: 87 and 350, n. 122. Later fourteenth-century examples involving payment for the writing and copying of liturgical books containing music include one Master Pierre, who, sometime between 1388 and 1399 received 60 francs for “notating and writing three Antiphonaries” for the Charterhouse at Champmol, near Dijon; one “Master Pierre Dame Dieu, scribe,” who in 1398 was paid the same amount for writing and notating two Antiphonaries for the same Charterhouse; and one Jehan de Moulin was paid 4 francs to complete yet another Antiphony that had been started by some other scribe; see Frances Caroline Steyn, *Three Unknown Carthusian Liturgical Manuscripts with Music of the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Centuries in the Grey Collection, South African Library, Cape Town*, 2 vols., Analecta cartusiana 167 (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik Universität Salzburg, 2000), 1: 17–18. Steyn quotes information from the 1388–1398 accounts kept by the head/administrator of the library at Champmol. According to these accounts (ibid., 17), payments for other book-related operations were as follows: 2 francs 7 *gros* for the illumination of the first three antiphonaries on this list, and 18 *gros* for the binding of them; and 20 francs for the “illuminating and floriating in blue and vermillions, for sewing, treating, and binding” of the antiphonaries copied by Pierre Dame Dieu.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Sold in 1289 by the Parisian illuminator Honoré d’Amiens; see ibid.
9 Sold in 1334 by the Parisian *libraire* Geoffroy de St.-Léger the Younger to Gérard de Montaigy, “advocate of the lord king in parlament;” see ibid., 2: 194.
From all of this one might surmise that Jacques of Liège’s comparison of musical intervals and spices involved an implicit appraisal: as far as their sensory potency was concerned, intervals were of a calibre that warranted their inclusion in similes involving things so dear, rare, sought after, and jealously kept as species aromata. Furthermore, from an intellectual standpoint categorizing and analyzing the structure of intervals could be easily likened to the meticulous classification of spices and their uses – and this was precisely the point the writer made in the Prologue to Book Four of his Speculum.

Additionally, the very recourse to this specific comparison might be a hint at Jacques’s own social – perhaps even economic – position: he might well have been someone familiar with the culinary habits of those who could afford the cost of aromata; beyond realizing the mere literary strength of such a figure of speech, he must have been aware of its socio-economic connotations as well. If at the end of a professorial carrier at the University of Paris the music theorist retired to Liège, he might have witnessed first-hand the financial plenty in which the prince bishop there basked throughout the 1330’s: it was then that, in preparation for the opening of military hostilities, both Edward III of England and Philip VI of France sought to purchase alliances with gold; the Bishop of Liège (at the time, Adolph de la Marck [1288–1344]) was one of Philip’s payees, and the subsidy came “largely in the form of golden écus.”

Furthermore, Pope Clement V’s 1313 appointment of the twenty-five-year old Aldoph as Bishop had been based on Philip the Fair’s personal initiative and express recommendation: the position itself was regarded as vital in forging and maintaining political and economic alliances involving the Papacy, the kingdom of France, and the Empire. The Bishopric of Liège was “important, rich, of great repute,” and the bishop had remarkable control over the economic life in the territory under his jurisdiction. La Marck’s wardrobe, like the one of his English homologue, the Bishop of Exeter, must have contained, in addition to substantial stocks of wine, wheat, and meat, quantities of costly spices as well. Again, if, as suggested by Karen Desmond, the author of the Speculum musice can be equated with Magister Jacobus de Montibus, then this man was not only “well-established in Liège by 1334, a well-regarded member of the community, a significant landowner, and an important figure in the chapter of St. Paul,” but was also one designated in that church’s account books as the recipient of payments of goods involving imported spices such as pepper and almonds.

---

1 Confirmed, consecrated, and vested 1313; see Alain Marchandisse, La fonction épiscopale à Liège aux XIIe et XIVe siècles: Étude de politologie historique, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l’Université de Liège 272 (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1998), 491.
2 See Spufford, Money and Its Use, 277-8, for this and other subsidies paid by the French king to the Count of Flanders and to John the Blind, Count of Luxemburg and King of Bohemia.
3 Marchandisse, La fonction épiscopale à Liège, 177, 202, and 212.
4 Ibid., 205.
5 For details, see ibid., 429–430.
7 Ibid., 29 and especially 37 (for a transcription from the 1336 account: that year Jacobus received important quantities of pepper, almonds, wax, as well as capons and hens, wheat, barley, oats, peas or beans, and beech-wood). Many spices, however (and herbs that were used to spice up the flavor of some dish) did not have to come from abroad; instead, they were grown in European gardens.
2. Mortar, Pestle, and Monochord

Let us now return to Jacques of Liège’s statement on the direct relation between rubbing and releasing scent: in a wider philosophical sense mincing, rubbing, or wiping would arguably cause larger bodies, sharing attributes or being similar to each other in a general way (\textit{genus proximum}) to be broken down and reduced to their simplest components; performing such an operation would most probably aid in identifying the specific difference (\textit{differentia specifica}) setting these components apart from each other. On the one hand, such a take would involve once again thoughts of Aristotelian natural philosophy. On the other hand, the very fact that Jacques was so intent on bringing in gastronomy must cause us to resort again to the art of cooking:

Had spices and herbs been used in the Anglo-Norman “herbless” recipe introduced earlier in this article, they would have been either shredded or ground (in a mortar) or both; in this particular case the meat itself was to be ground. In fact, there is no recipe in this collection that would not involve shredding, pounding, grinding, rubbing, wiping, crushing, crumbling, or some other form of reducing herbs and spices as well as meat, boiled eggs, bread, fruit, flower petals, or other ingredients to their smallest parts or to a homogenous powder:

Spices made the medieval heart beat faster, the medieval palate quiver with delight, and the medieval kitchen boy shudder with distaste. If bought in their natural state, much tedious pounding with pestle and mortar was needed to reduce them to precious, pungent dust.\footnote{Henisch, \textit{Fast and Feast}, 74-5; Henisch goes on to show that some shopkeepers did grind and pack the spices in sheepskins before they were sent to clients. If such was not the case, then it was}

Medieval monasteries reserved a plot for the herb garden, and experts drew the plans and cultivated the gardens of noble establishments: a case in point is Master John Gardener, an Englishman whose vast experience, related in a book titled \textit{Feat of Gardening}, spanned the first half of the fourteenth century (see John H. Harvey, “Vegetables in the Middle Ages,” \textit{Garden History} 12 [Autumn 1984]: 89–99, at 91). Lavender, sage, coriander, mint, mustard, thyme, hyssop, savory, calamint, dill, and others were listed by Master John among the herbs that had to be planted or sown each April so that they could be ready for a September harvest (ibid., 92). The fact that both the man and his book belong in the history of English gardening should not rule out Continental handling of the same herb-and-spice repertory: comparison of the \textit{Feat of Gardening} to its nearly-contemporary French counterparts (such as the \textit{Viandier} of Taillevant or \textit{Le Menagier de Paris}) makes it clear that the basic herbs and condiments were mostly the same on both sides of the Channel. Harvey (ibid., 93) notes that \textit{Le Menagier} included a list of plants “closely similar” to the one found in the \textit{Feat of Gardening}. On this account Mead (\textit{The English Medieval Feast}, 73) has rightly noted that “the French were as addicted to spices as the English, if not more so,” while Constance B. Hieatt (“Making Sense of Medieval Culinary Records: Much Done, But Much More to Do,” \textit{Food and Eating in Medieval Europe}, 101–115, at 105) stated that “the \textit{haute cuisine}” of Western Europe was an international one. Both in England and on the Continent herbs must have paled in comparison with exotic spices for the very reason that the former could be grown locally, were too readily available, and thus were too cheap (Henisch, \textit{Fast and Feast}, 109). From time to time, however, an indigenous species such as the “English herb” (\textit{herba britannica}) was considered so unique and indispensable in the treatment of maladies and infections of the mouth that its keeping required no less than a silver vase (see Platearius, \textit{Le livre des simples medicines, d’après le manuscrit français 12322}, 297: “La poudre de l’Herbe britannique, précieuse contre les maux et les pourritures de la bouche, mérite l’abri d’une vase d’argent [bien qu’il s’agisse d’une plante indigène].”)
The shredding of herbs and the grinding of *aromata* before consumption would enhance their taste and smell – an effect obviously known to the music theorist; ingestion and digestion would also be facilitated. Even herb seeds could be pounded in a mortar before being sown in the ground: this was done to improve the palatable quality of the future plant, as noted by Pliny the Elder long before Jacques’s time.1 Rubbing was recommended by Platearius in the detection of counterfeit medicines: if a dishonest apothecary would use the species of aloe known as *aloen aculabin* (i.e., *caballinum*) instead of the hepatic or the *cicotrin* (which were the varieties of choice), the impropriety could be detected thus: “when [*aloen aculabin*] is torn and rubbed between the fingers, it releases a most foul smell, which is not found in the hepatic or *cicotrin* varieties.”2 This must be the variety to which Juvenal had referred, and which became part of the gastronomic metaphor used by the authors of the *Summa musice*.3

From Jacques’s own perspective as a music theorist, the breaking down of intervals into their smallest components is clearly akin to tearing, grinding, shredding, and rubbing, for “tearing” these musical entities apart would reveal their inner core and intensify their authentic “flavour.” Additionally, and from an intellectual standpoint, it would certainly make them easier to analyze and comprehend – in other words, it would make them “palatable” in a cerebral sense so that they could be used in the making of a perfect, rationally satisfying musico-speculative dish.

In retrospect, Jacques’s culinary metaphors for rational thinking seem pale in comparison to the bold similes used in Renaissance literature, where the trend became so prominent that, according to Michel Jeanneret, “food for the mind and food for the body were expressed in the same terminology.”4 Like the shredding, pounding, and grinding of herbs and spices, the carving of meat as described, for instance, in Vincenzo Cervio’s *Il Trinciante* (The Carver) of 1581 invites reflection on food being “divorced from any gastronomic intentions,” and used as “an illustration of technical dexterity, and of a science [emphasis mine] which is both anatomical and botanical.”5 Carving,

---

1 *Naturalis historia* 19.158 (for the Latin text, see Pliny, *Natural history*, 5: 522: “Ab aequinoctio verno seritur apium semine paulum in pila pulsato: crispius sic putant fieri aut si satum calcetur cylindro pedibusve;” for Rackham’s translation, see ibid., 523: “Parsley [celery] sowing begins at the vernal equinox. The seed being first gently pounded in a mortar: it is thought that the parsley is made crisper by this process, or if the seed is rolled or trodden into the earth after being sown”).


3 Taillevant went so far as to include recipes of meals for the sick in his *Viandier*: one of these required incorporation of ground chicken bones and powdered sugar into the prescribed concoction; see Taillevent, *Le Viandier*, 24: “Pour malades. Couleis d’un poulet. Cuisé en eau tant qu’il soit bien pourri de cuire; et broiés à tous les os en un mortier … et qui veult poudre de sucre par dessus … (Cook the chicken in water until well boiled; and grind it together with all its bones in a mortar … and if you wish, [add] powdered sugar on top …).”


5 Ibid., 59–61.
therefore, with its intricate subtleties of finger-and-arm movement coupled with a high level of precision in tool manipulation (knife and fork, in this case) can and does serve as a muscular simile for equally complex intellectual processes, where “art triumphs unreservedly over nature.”

Grinding was necessary not only for the sake of squeezing out essential flavours and savours, but for more practical reasons as well: medieval dishes were eaten with spoons, not forks. Potages, spiced sauces, and all manners of mushy concoctions were, therefore, the only way to ingest food besides using one’s fingers (or one’s knife for the carving of the meat). In fact, the presence of semi-liquid foods – bread-based soups among them – was so widespread at medieval tables that, in addition to spoons, “fingers” of bread were readily available to “sop up sauces and gravies.”

The role of the mortar and pestle in medieval food preparation can hardly be over-emphasized: the solicitous and detail-oriented husband who authored the *Menagier de Paris* advised his wife to “first pound the spices and use the mortar,” and subsequently listed both objects in his inventory of kitchen utensils, alongside a variety of pots, pans, and plates, big and small. In modern times, William Mead’s study of countless recipes concluded that “probably the most important aids to the medieval cook after the great cauldrons that hung over the open fire were his mortar and pestle.”

---

1 Ibid., 61.
2 Mead, *The English Medieval Feast*, 149.
3 Mennell, *All Manners of Food*, 48, remarks that soups were the basis of French medieval diet. And while Mennell quotes Louis Stouff (*Ravitaillement et alimentation en Provence aux 14e et 15e siècles* [Paris: Mouton, 1970]) to show that the specific ingredients of such dishes can only be inferred, there is evidence more recently collected from contemporary recipes that most, if not all soups incorporated crumbled or crushed bread alongside crushed or powdered spices and herbs: for instance, Recipe 15: “Hawthorn pottage,” Recipe 16: “Rose pottage,” Recipe 17: “Strawberry pottage,” Recipe 18: “Blackberry pottage,” in MS London, British Library, Add. 32085; see Hieatt and Jones, “Two Anglo-Norman Culinary Collections,” 864-865 (for the Anglo-Norman text) and 875–876 (for the modern English translation).
5 *Le Menagier de Paris*, ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 172: “Primo que en toutes saulses et potages lyans en quoy on broye espices et pain, l’en doit premierement broyer les espices et oster du mortier. Car le pain que l’en broue après requet ce qui des espices est demouré; ainsi on ne pert rien, ce que on perdroit qui feroit autrement (First, that in all sauces and thick pottages for which spices and bread are ground, one must first grind the spices, and use a mortar. For the bread that is ground afterwards requires the [flavor] left over from the spices; this way, nothing is lost of what could be lost if this were done otherwise).”
6 Ibid., 187: “Ausquelles couvient deux granz poz de cuivre pour .xx. escuelles, deux chaudieres, .iii. couloueres, ung mortier et ung pestail …” (For these [i.e., for the preparation and serving of food at one of the banquets described in this section] one needs two large copper pots for twenty escuelles [i.e., small, deep plates from which food was normally shared by two people], two cauldrons, four couloueres [i.e., small containers used in the drawing of the wine from the barrel], a mortar and a pestle …). An example from Bruges, penned ca. 1338–1344, comes in the form of marginal decorations for the *Romance of Alexander* showing two kitchen boys deeply engaged in pounding and grinding. The manuscript, a *Romance of Alexander*, is now Oxford, Bodleian Library 264, and the illustration appears on f. 170v; it is reproduced in Henisch, *Fast and Feast*, 132.
7 Mead, *The English Medieval Feast*, 44.
Bridget Ann Henisch’s examination of medieval methods of cooking and menus also emphasizes the omnipresent mortar and its uses in grinding both spices and herbs.¹

Decomposing substances into their minutest components was a matter of course in a pharmaceutical context as well: the medieval druggist or his underlings used mortar (pila,-ae) and pestle (pistillum,-i) to crush, grind, pound, and re-mix medicaments – many of which included plants, herbs, and aromata. Representations of physicians, apothecaries, or their assistants and apprentices actively engaged in using both objects abound in illuminated manuscripts and incunabula. [see Figure 3] Ss. Cosmas and Damian, patrons of physicians and surgeons in the Western world, were sometimes represented holding pestles and mortars. In fact, the heraldic sign of the pharmacists’ trade was and still is the mortar and pestle.

Figure 3. HERBARIUS ZU TEUTSCH (HORTUS SANITATIS; Augsburg, 1496), fol. Aiii verso: Apothecary's shop with apprentice pounding medicines. Wellcome Library, London. (Reproduced by permission.)

¹ Henisch, Fast and Feast, 138–139.
Leslie G. Matthews brings in ample evidence from the British Isles, where twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts based on the medical works of Roger of Salerno, or a Leechbook from the mid-fifteenth century depict “massive mortars” used for grinding spices and “stamping herbs.” Still from England, the 1390/91 accounts of Henry, Earl of Derby, suggest a kitchen that was formidably well equipped with all sorts of accoutrements, including a variety of pestles and mortars. Whether made of stone or bronze, these mortars were considered very valuable items and were thus recorded in contemporary household inventories.

Although not an exact replica, with respect to aspect or function, of either mortar and pestle or the carving knife, the monochord (of which more, later) assumes the role of a dissecting, grinding, and re-mixing tool of surgical precision. On it intervals are meticulously generated, distributed, counted, analyzed, and classified, or “sifted” – to use yet another utensil-based metaphor coined by the author of the fourteenth-century Quatuor principia musice; through it numerical ratios can be understood and compared to each other. As a mental model, the monochord is both a detailed list of intervals and an instrument for the intellectual investigation of these; it is also the one man-made device – a tangible object, a sound-emitting instrument – facilitating interval memorization on a systematic basis. In the context of a predominantly oral culture, where knowledge “is still associated with an act of sensory perception,” the monochord as a concept and a tool feeds and supports a memory that, like the Renaissance memory described by Jeanneret, is “full of words heard, spoken and recited; … a muscular and acoustic memory which feels sounds, chews them and stores them like organic matter.”

As a visual icon the monochord can be adjoined to the impressive repertoire of memory aids recently assembled and discussed by Anna Maria Busse Berger. Its ubiquitous presence in medieval and Renaissance music theory treatises is a fact needing

---

1 Matthews, History of Pharmacy, 12–13.
2 Henisch, Fast and Feast, 139.
3 Matthews, History of Pharmacy, 16–17; see Plate V for a reproduction of a two-handle English bronze mortar made around 1300.
6 Jeanneret, A Feast of Words, 130.
7 Ibid.
8 See Anna Maria Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the Art of Memory (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), especially chapters 2 and 3.
no extensive discussion, for it is a matter of common knowledge that diagrams of the
utensil abound. Some, like the ones found in MSS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 90¹
and Bodley 842² (both of the fourteenth century) amount to very complex drawings
showing complete collections of intervals and corresponding numerical ratios. Text-
wise, entire chapters (and, sometimes, whole sections) of theoretical works are devoted
to this topic. Book Four alone of Jacques’s Speculum musice includes two staggeringly
detailed chapters on a variety of methods and criteria for generating and grouping
intervals on the monochord – a subject to which I shall return below.³

3. The order of courses
Another thing we learn from the Prologue to Book Four is that intervals, like ingredients
in a tasteful dish or like several courses that are part of the same meal, must be
introduced in a certain, significant order: thus cognition of one interval will ensure
identification of the next one, just like separate culinary concoctions served in a
prescribed sequence at one table become known to the palate individually and
progressively.

Nor is the use of such an image a singular occurrence, for the order of courses
became a much-used metaphor for the arrangement of the parts of speech in
Renaissance literature; there, Jeanneret noted,

The affinity between food and words can also relate to the order of
consumption: the menu and works of literature are both laid out and are there to
be experienced, according to a similar rhythm: in a meal, there are to be as
many courses as there are acts in a play and parts in a rhetorical discourse,
namely five …⁴

In order to gain a better comprehension of Jacques of Liège’s concept and
method of interval arrangement, we need to revisit the menus prepared for the tables and
banquets of the nobles – for it is clearly to these that the writer’s invocation of multi-
course meals points. The rest of the population, when not in a state of semi-starvation,
had to content itself with a rather limited number of meals and, within each of those,
with a drastically limited number of courses: in France, for example, following a
sumptuary ordinance issued in 1294 by Philip the Fair, the maximum number of dishes
that could be served for the “grand mangier” by any subject of the crown was two plus a
“potage au lard” (pot-cooked meal incorporating fat); for the “petit mangier” the number

¹ See, for instance, ff. 16r and 18r.
² See, for instance, ff. 3 v and 10 r, which belong in Theinred of Dover’s De legitimis ordinibus
pentachordorum et tetrachordorum. Part of this manuscript (not Theinred’s treatise, though) is
edited as the Breviarium regulare musicae, MS Oxford Bodley 842, ed. André Gilles and Gilbert
Reaney ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1966). For a catalogue description, see
RISM BIII/4, 110–115. A complete, digitized facsimile of the manuscript is found at Early
Manuscripts at Oxford University.
³ Chapters 10 and 49; see Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musice, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 18–
20 and 119–122, respectively.
⁴ Jeanneret, A Feast of Words, 180, in reference to Erasmus’s Colloquies.
of courses was to be limited to one dish and one side dish.\footnote{1} A similar limit was imposed upon the English in a 1336 statute of Edward III.\footnote{2}

Fauvel, the corrupt horse and protagonist of the Roman de Fauvel, in his debauchery sat at a banquet table adorned with “good and fine meats, roosters and jellied birds, swans, peacocks, partridges, pheasants, herons”\footnote{3} and an astounding variety

\footnote{1}{The complete text of Philip’s ordinance against luxury is printed in Paul Lacroix, ed., Recueil curieux de pièces originales, rares ou inédites, en prose et en vers, sur le costume et les révolutions de la mode en France (Paris: Administration de librairie, 185?), 3–6: “Nuls ne donra au grand mangier, que deux més, et un potage au lard, sans fraude. Et, au petit mangier, un més et un entremés. Et, si il est jeûne, il pourra donner deux potages aux harens, et deux més, ou trois més, et un potage. Et ne mettra en une escuille, que une manière de char, une pièce tant seulement, ou une manière de poisson, ne ne sera autre fraude. Et sera comptée toute grosse char pour més, et n’entendons pas que fromage soit més, si il n’est en paste, ou cuit en yaue (No one will give for the grand mangier more than two meals and a pot-cooked meal with fat – and let there be no fraudulence. And, for the petit mangier, one meal and one entremets. And, if it is a fasting day, he can give two pot-cooked meals of herring, and two meals or three, and one potage. And he will not put on a plate but one kind of meat – one piece only –, or one kind of fish, nor will there be any other fraudulence. And any large piece of meat shall count as a meal – one piece only; and let us not take cheese as a meal if it is not a cream, or if it is boiled in water).” See also Weber, “Queu du Roi, Roi des Queux,” 154, for a similar quote from Le Grand d’Aussy’s Histoire de la vie privée. The author of Le Menagier de Paris (ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 135) advises his wife about feeding the servants, thus: “Toutesvoyes, belle seur, aux heures pertinentes faictes les seoir a la table, et les faictes repaistre d’une espece de viandes largement et seulement, et non pas de plusieurs delitables ou delicatives ; et leur ordonnez ung seul beuvage nourrissant et non entestant, soit vin ou autre, et non de plusieurs (Anyway, fair sister, at the appropriate times make them seat at the table and make them eat one kind of meat only, and not several delectable or delicate things; and assign them a single drink, nourishing but not inebriating, either wine or something else – and not several).”}

\footnote{2}{Since “evils, grievances, and mischeifs” (among which general impoverishment topped the list) had happened to both the “great men” and the “lesser People … through the excessive and overmany sorts of costly Meats,” the king “… ordained and established that no man, of what estate or condition soever he be, shall cause himself to be served in his house or elsewhere, at dinner, meal, or supper, or at any other time, with more than two courses, and each mess of two sorts of victuals at the utmost, be it of Flesh or Fish, with the common sorts of pottage, without sawce or any other sort of victuals … except on the principal Feasts of the Year … on which Days and Feasts every man may be served with three courses at the utmost, after the manner aforesaid.” 10 Edward III, Statute 3 (A. D. 1336); see Great Britain, Statutes of the Realm. Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, in Pursuance of an Address of the House of Commons of Great Britain from Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts, eds. T. E. Tomlins, W. P. Taunton, J. Raithby et al., 11 vols. ([London: The Record Commission], 1810-28), 1: 278–279. The feast days allowing for three-course meals were established as follows: Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, St. Stephen’s Day, New Year’s Day, the Days of the Epiphany and of the Purification of Our Lady, Easter Eve and Easter Day, Whitsunday and the morrow, Trinity Day, the Nativity of St. John, St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s Day, the Days of the Assumption and the Nativity of Our Lady, and All Saints Day (ibid., 279).}

\footnote{3}{See Le premier et le secont livre de fauvel in the Version Preserved in B. N. f. fr. 146, ed. Paul Helmer (Ottawa: The Institute of Medieval Music, 1997), 282: “Et alerent aus tables seoir//Grant foison poirot on veoir//De viandes bonnes et fines//Chapons y ot oisons gelines//Cignes paons perdriz fesanz//Hairons butors qui sont plaisanz//Et venoison de maintes guises ...” A facsimile edition of the manuscript is in Le Roman de Fauvel in the Edition of Mestre Chaillou de Pestain:}
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of venison and fish – all served with spiced sauces such as “sausse vert” and “cameline.”1 The accompanying wines were not only delicious, but also expensive2 – presumably from having had their taste improved through addition of costly spices (such as the ginger from Alexandria and India, and other “bonnes” and “fors [strong] espieces,” all sweet, that graced the end of the meal3). Their quality – or at least the quality of the ideal “good wine” – is the theme of “Bon vin doit,” a three-voice motet copied on f. 45r of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, f. fr. 146.4

Obviously, the banquet in Fauvel is allegorical – but one of the best sources for authentic fourteenth-century ostentatious menus is, again, Le Menagier de Paris, whose author devotes a long chapter to “some dinners and suppers of the great seigneurs and others.”5 These “disners” and “souppers” were divided into meat and fish meals; most importantly, of the twenty-four menus described in the text most were comprised of anywhere from three to six lavish, elaborate courses, and only one involved less than three.6

---

1 “Green sauce” might refer to vertjus, i.e., verjus, an uncooked sauce made from green grapes (or any other acid fruit) and salt; for a recipe of verjus made from sorrel, see Le Ménagier de Paris, ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 258. At least two different recipes were used for “sauce vert:” one, for fish, was made with parsley or rosemary; the other involved several ground spices and herbs, such as ginger, cloves, and marjoram; see ibid., 259. Cameline, i.e., sauce cameline, is a spiced sauce very popular in France and England; it is made with poudre cameline (cameline powder) comprised of ginger, cinnamon, saffron and almonds ground in a mortar, soaked in wine, then mixed with ground bread, boiled in water, and sprinkled with sugar; for the complete recipe, as well as the winter and summer varieties of it, see ibid., 258.

2 Le premier et le secont livre de fauvel, ed. Helmer, 282–283 : “Vins y ot bons et precieus//A boire mout delicius//Citouaudez rosez florez//Vn de gascoigne coulorez//De montpellier et de rochele//Et de garnache et de castelc//Vin de beaune et de saint pourcain//Que riche gent tientent pour sain … (There were wines, good and costly//Very delicious to drink//[Spiced up with] zedoary, rosé wine, blue//Colored wine from Gascony//Wine from Montpellier and La Rochelle//And from Garnache and Castille//Wine from Beaune and St. Pourcain//That is considered healthy by the rich).” Two thirteenth-century French motets from Codex Wolfenbüttel mention “good clarified wine,” Rhine and Auxerrois wines, and rosé wines; the text and historical context are discussed in Mary E. Wolinski, “Drinking Motets in Medieval Artois and Flanders,” Yearbook of the Alamire Foundation 6, ed. Bruno Bouckaert, Eugeen Schreurs, and Ivan Asselman (Leuven: Neerpelt, 2008), 9–20 at 11–15.

3 Ibid., 285–288 : “Et donnerent espices bonnes//Douces a trestoutes personnes//Gingimbrax dalixandre et dynde …”


6 Ibid., 178, menu no. 36.
An assortment of courses and, within these, an assortment of dishes of skillfully combined savours, odours, and colours make up a well-appointed table. Jacques explains that thirty-six intervals and, within these, a variety of concords and discords make up a well-appointed monochord.\(^1\) Medieval cookbooks show how, after discriminating selection of ingredients as codified in recipes, menus can be created and tables can be set. The *Speculum musice* shows how, following exhaustive examination of intervals, the monochord can be laid out – somewhat in the manner of a musical “table.” Once again the theory of one art mirrors the theory of another, and the monochord itself doubles as a mirror reflecting at once intellectual speculation on music and physical reality of sound.\(^2\)

The object, as represented in medieval iconography, was made of a large plank, probably two to three feet long, with two bridges erected upon it to support a stretched string.\(^3\) the icon drawn on f. 47r of MS Oxford, Bodleian Library 842 renders it to perfection, and includes, traced on the body of the instrument, floral ornaments that may be replicas of the original decorative carvings. In similar fashion, most fourteenth-century tables – such as the ones drawn on ff. 32v and 33r, respectively, of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 146\(^4\) in exemplification of Fauvel’s culinary excesses – were no more than wooden planks balanced upon two wooden legs; they, like the monochord, were portable utensils, able to be moved around, dismantled, and reassembled.\(^5\)

In the diatonic version of the monochord described by Jacques, the tool itself extends from *Gammant* to *ela*.\(^6\) On this space, like dishes of various consistencies, sizes,

---

2. On the significance of the term *speculum* in medieval philosophy in general, and Jacques’s treatise in particular, see F. J. Smith, “The Division and Meaning of the *Speculum Musicae*,” *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 21/1 (1968): 5–24, especially 14–18.
3. See Cecil Adkins, “The Technique of the Monochord,” *Acta musicologica* 39 (January 1967): 34–43, at 34–35. For an illustration of the tool reproduced from Athanasius Kircher’s *Musurgia universalis*, see ibid., 35. The variant described in the fourteenth-century *Quatuor principalia* is built from (or on the model of) a musical instrument, as follows: “Accipiat aliquo instrumentum sonum emittens; ut pote vielle cistolle et huiusmodi; super quod corda diligenter extendatur; et in capite et circa finem duo semiferia ponantur cordam portancia; quas greeci magadas vocantur (Let one take some sound-emitting instrument, such as *vielles* and *cistolles* and such similar ones; on this instrument, let one diligently stretch a string; and let one place at both ends two bridges bearing the string – which bridges are called *magadas* by the Greeks);” see MS Oxford, Bodleian Library 90, f. 11v; CS4: 208; and Florea-Aluas, “The *Quatuor principalia*,” 224. Indeed, the shape of the monochord in this manuscript resembles that of a musical instrument similar to those mentioned in the text.
4. See *Le Roman de Fauvel in the Edition of Mesire Chaillou de Pesstain*, introd. Roesner, Avril, and Freeman, ff. 32v and 33r: the tables are covered with tablecloths and set with wine goblets, cups, plates, and knives.
5. See *Le Menagier de Paris*, ed. Brereton and Ferrier, 187: “tables, trestreaulx [i.e., wooden planks supported on four legs], fourmes [i.e., benches] et similia” could be rented and transported to one’s house – in this particular case, for the sum of 5 francs; see also ibid., 321, n. to p. 187.
flavours, and savours on a dinner table, a number of intervals (some of them concords and some discords, both of pure as well as intermediate degrees) are artfully arranged and mixed. Each interval has an assigned place at this “table;” and some intervals appear more than once: for instance, the octave (diapason) can be found in fourteen locations; the diesis occurs seven times; other intervals may be found twice, or three times, or four, and so on. Furthermore, this mixing follows an intelligently devised plan. In a conceptual sense, the monochord is a comprehensive enumeration – just like a menu is one; as a real object, however, it is a flat surface prepared for a methodical arrangement of ingredients, simple or composite. The process itself of arranging these ingredients transcends mere mechanical ordering and assumes both aesthetic and moral attributes, for a concord – albeit an “imperfect” one, such as the tone – will occupy a place of equilibrium and honour between two discords “that are not used, just like virtue holds the midpoint among vices.” Should we convert this statement into a visual scheme, we could, in fact, understand it as a deliberate attempt by Jacques to concoct an arrangement based on symmetry – a pattern that is both cerebrally and sensually gratifying.

Nor is this an isolated occurrence of the concept: later in the same chapter we are told that, preceded by seven concords and followed by another seven, the octave “is placed in the middle of all concords, like the sun [is placed] in the middle of planets and the king in the middle of his people” – both similes not unlike those used by the Italian physician Pietro Torrigiano de’ Torrigiani (d. ca. 1320) with respect to the placement and importance of the heart within the human body. Furthermore, if the unison and double octave – the intervals positioned at both ends of the series demonstrated on this monochord – are to be counted as part of the series itself, then eight “consonances” precede and eight follow the octave; thus, again, the octave occupies a central position, equidistant from both extremes – with which it shares the distinction of being a most perfect concord. The octave, therefore, may be seen as the mouth-watering, fragrant, showy center-piece strategically placed in the middle of a festive table; and unison, octave, and double-octave are objects of perfection treasured like the silver salt-cellars used at elaborate banquets and situated in equally privileged positions.

1 Ibid., 119.
2 Ibid., 18: “Diapason ibi in 14 locis reperitur, diesis in 7 locis.”
3 Ibid., 120: “Situatur autem hic tonus inter duas consonantias perfecte discordantes et quorum usus non est, sicut virtus inter vitia medium tenet.”
4 Ibid., 121: “…Et potest ex dictis esse manifestum quod, sicut 7 concordiae praecedunt diapason, sic 7 concordiae mediant inter ipsam diapason et bis diapason quae, secundum Antiquos est ultima et maxima consonantia et concordia. Secundum hoc igitur diapason ponitur in medio concordiarum, ut sol in medio planetarum, et rex in medio gentis suis.”
6 Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musicæ, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 121.: “Item, computando tam unisonum quam bis diapason quae sunt extremae, octo consonantiae praecedunt diapason, et octo sequuntur eandem, et sic in medio per aequalem distantiam ab extremis illis consonantiiis perfecte discordantibus situat, et, illarum trium concordiarum quae sunt unisonus, diapason et bis diapason, duae extremae, et directius medians inter illas, perfectissimae sunt inter omnes.”
In fact, diagrams of the monochord show that a symmetrical arrangement of visual ingredients was deliberately sought by their scriptor (or pictor): the icon drawn on f. 13r of MS Digby 90 is divided along a vertical axis separating left from right; within the space reserved for the octave (which occupies the whole of the left-hand side of the scheme) horizontal cross-symmetry is achieved among the four semicircles representing the fifth and the fourth (two on each side of the divide), and semicircles for the octave mirror each other with respect to an horizontal axis. [see Figure 4]

Figure 4. The Quatuor principalia musice, 1351. Division of the monochord.¹

In the same vein, and showing a similar fascination with symmetrical arrangements, a figure in Chapter 15 in Book IV of the Speculum musice, copied on f. 177r of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7207 is turned into a visual summa of ten intervals, from diesis (semitone) to diapente (fifth), that can be generated on the monochord.² Symmetrical manipulation of space in this instance results in multiple semicircles signifying lesser intervals (semitone, tones, minor and major thirds, and perfect fourths), gradually raising from and falling back upon a horizontal base, while a gigantic semicircle standing for the fifth embraces and subsumes them all.

“This,” Jacques concludes in what might be called a comparative apotheosis with a morale, “is the way concords are mixed with discords, the imperfect ones with the perfect, just like in this world good things [are mixed] with the bad, virtues with vices.”³

4. A Renaissance Epilogue

Earlier in this article I referred to spices as medicaments – thus briefly introducing medieval medicine as an art sister to cooking and, by extension, a cousin to music theory

---

¹ Florea-Aluas, “The Quatuor principalia,” 228 (reproduced by permission); also transcribed in CS4: 210.
² “Collatio consonantiarum quantum ad intervalla;” see Jacobus Leodiensis, Speculum musice, Liber quartus, ed. Bragard, 33–37 for this section; the diagram is printed on p. 35: in addition to the semicircle for the fifth, it includes four semicircles for the two versions of the second (semitone and tone, respectively), three semicircles for the two versions of the third, and two semicircles for the fourth.
as well. In doing so, I was implying that medicine and music might have been seen as sharing some common territory other than “the music of pulse,” sound-based therapy, or the transfer of anatomical concepts onto music theory (all topics already scrutinized\(^1\)). I furthermore submit that this is an idea echoed as late as the earlier part of the sixteenth century:

In Book IV of *De harmonia instrumentorum opus*, published in 1518, Franchino Gaffurio quoted freely a rather large excerpt from Aristides Quintilianus’s *De musica*,\(^2\) a work he had translated for him into Latin in 1494.\(^3\) The passage delved into the notion that the two, insofar as scientific disciplines, were related through numbers, more specifically, through application of numerical ratios in both cases. In music such ratios were clearly apparent in consonant intervals; in medicine (better, perhaps: in pharmacy) “the qualities of medicaments are effective in no other way but by virtue of size.”\(^4\) In other words, Quintilianus’s stance – wholeheartedly adopted by Gaffurio – was that potency in music resulted from correct dosage of intervals (which, in turn, could be expressed through mathematical ratios), just like the potency of medicaments resulted from correct dosage of their primary ingredients, or simples. The first part of the sentence clearly holds on to the Pythagorean doctrine of music as an art of number, and is preceded by extensive references – again, closely based on Quintilianus – to the role numbers and proportions play in both medical and musical terminology.\(^5\)

---


4 “Rursus medicamentorum qualitates non alio modo quam per qualitatum dimensiones efficiuntur;” see Franchino Gaffurio, *Franchini Gaffurii Laudensis Regii Musici publice profitentis: Delubrique Mediolanensis Phonasci: de Harmonia Musicorum Instrumentorum Opus* (Milan: Gotardus Pontanus, 1518; reprint eds., Bologna: Forni, 1972; New York: Broude Bros., [1979]), f. LXXXIVv. An electronic version of Book Four is found in TML as GAFHAR4 TEXT. An English translation is available in Franchinus Gaffurius, *De Harmonia Musicorum Instrumentorum Opus*, trans. Clement A. Miller, Musicological Studies and Documents 33 ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1977); this particular phrase was not translated, therefore I am giving it in Mathiesen’s translation of Quintilianus’s text: “Medicine skillfully executes the qualities and powers of drugs in no other way than through symmetries by quantities” (Quintilianus, *On Music* 3.8.2, transl. Mathiesen, 172).

5 “Medicine itself presents everything through numbers, both the perception of palpitations and the proportions of periodic fevers. Of which, those analogous to the consonant ratios – to the duple, such as the daily; to the sesquialteran, such as those appearing as a symptom every third day; and to the sesquiterian, such as those appearing as a symptom every fourth day – in no wise
Elsewhere in Quintilianus we read yet another comparison involving, on the one hand, compound medicines, and on the other hand, quantitative musical entities—in fact, a version of the passage referred to above:

For just as in the case of healing drugs, no one certain substance is naturally disposed to heal the sufferings of the body, but a substance commingled from many does good perfectly, so also here, the melody does little for right action, but perfect self-sufficiency is made up complete from every one of the parts.¹

Gaffurio the Humanist might have based massive portions of his music theory treatises on Classical authorities, but he must have been aware of the realities of daily life in Italian cities as well: while music was being sung, played, and written about by the healthy, recipes were written and medicaments were concocted for the sick; and we do have, for instance, accounts from the years 1491-1493 showing the exact quantities of simples that were used to produce compounds, as well as the corresponding amounts of money charged by apothecaries in Rome.² Medicines (like spices) were minutely weighted articles, and intervals were equally mensurable entities. Incidentally, in the increase the hazard…” (Quintilianus, On Music 3.8.2, transl. Mathiesen, 172). Miller’s translation of this passage from Gaffurio (De Harmonia Musicorum Instrumentorum, 205) runs as follows: “It is well known that medicine in all its aspects establishes through numbers the detection of seizures and the proportions of intermittent fevers. Some of these are similar to consonant proportions, as an alternate fever to duple, tertian fever to hemiolia, and quartan fever to a fourth; these do not completely bring the danger of death.”

¹ Quintilianus, On Music 1.12.3, transl. Mathiesen, 93. Other passages relating music and medicine are in ibid., 2.16.4 (see transl. Mathiesen, 150–151) and 2.4.1 (transl. Mathiesen, 118), respectively; they run as follows: “For even the wise men of the Children of Asclepius do not present on every side the voracious types of drugs, shrinking before the weakness of their underlying nature. We must make the mixture not through bare opposites (for this is unsuitable and repellent) but rather through harmoniously arranging the means with the extremes;” and “For just as one and the same drug applied equally to one passion in many bodies would not be similarly efficacious and would heal according to the moderation or severity of the wounds – the former more quickly, the latter more slowly – so also melos moves the more adaptable child immediately, while it captivates the less adaptable child after a long time.” On the close relationship in Greek thought between music and medicaments, see ibid., 118, n. 23 and the bibliography there cited.

² For instance: “Siroppi violati oncie 1, siroppi de bisantis, melis rosati colati ana oncia ½, aquae feniculi, endiviae et capillorum veneris ana oncia 1, misce;” see Ivana Ait, Tra scienza e mercato: gli speziali a Roma nel tardo Medioevo, Fonti e studi per la storia economica e sociale di Roma e dello Stato pontificio 7 (Rome: Istituto nazionale di studi romani, 1996), 287–291: this is a medicament account issued by the Collegio dei Notai Capitolini (CNC), now kept in the Archivio di Stato di Roma, showing the medicaments that were administered between 1491 and 1493 to Giovanni Gueri and his family (ibid, 83). Other medicaments involving the compounding of simples, as well as the amounts charged by the apothecary in the same document are as follows: “Al di 14 ditto (i.e., the month of February 1491) per lui portò lo figlio una medicina fatta con agarici eletti dracma 1, salis giemme scrupolo 1, diacassie dracme 6, diafinicon dracme 2 ½, elettuario de psilio dracme 1 ½ distemperata cum decotione (sic) pectoralis fiat potus; bol. 30;” and “Al di ditto (i.e., 4 September 1491) per lo ditto una medicina fatta cum floriurn trium cordialium, foliculum sene ana dracme 1, polipodii contusi dracme 2, passularum oncie 1, cinamonii dracme 1, aqua bugolosse, melisse, endivie, aqua quantum sufficit in qua dissolve dicaptoliconis dracme 8, fiat potus.”
early modern period apothecaries in Rome and other large Italian cities were often pastry cooks as well: thus the pharmacist “Giacomo de Vallatis, for the famous lunch offered by Pope Paul II to the French ambassadors, was charged not only with providing a variety of specialities for the banquet, but downright with adorning and applying gold-leaf on every single thing, including the poultry and meat.”

Both mortar and pestle in many an apothecary’s shop continued to perform double duty, just like they used to do in the Middle Ages: they pounded the spices for the making of both medicines and food.

Later in the sixteenth century Francesco Salinas who, according to Claude V. Palisca “aimed to navigate between these extremes [i.e., Pythagorean and Aristoxenian] and profit by both the senses and mathematics” expressed his conviction that discriminating among sensory qualities pertains to senses themselves. His plea was phrased in terms involving a comparison of sensory acuteness manifest among musicians, painters, and cooks as practitioners of their respective arts:

… consonances and the remaining musical intervals have been recalled from the uncertain arbitration of the ears [and given] to the certain judgment of reason, as it already has been often said. But the sense was always the best judge of all things obeying [sensory] gifts: for how could anyone be a good cook if his taste is not exquisitely delicate? Nor can anyone be an excellent painter if he does not have cultured eyes, so to speak. Why really, nor will anyone be able to practice music optimally if his ears are not cleaned.

Twenty years ago Edward E. Lowinsky was supporting a view of medieval music where sensory matters were discreetly but firmly allied with intellectual ones. Medieval thinking about conceptual entities (in this case, intervals) as can be grasped from Jacques’s verbal formulations of such thinking was not completely bereft of sensual undertones. As seen, Jacques does speak of mental processes such as analysis, classification, and ranking in analogical terms involving concrete bodies possessing taste and aroma and connoting sensuous pleasure. Concurrently a thinker and a man of flesh and blood, he no doubt knew the effects (culinary and medical) of aromatic spices, and, most probably, their relative monetary value as well. Parallels employed by him, as well as those traced by Gaffurio between ingredients and processes common to music analysis and the arts of cooking, medicine, and pharmacy were believed to be effective tools in explicating notions of music theory. The association of sensory experiences involving hearing, smelling, tasting, and seeing ensured a better understanding of music, both theoretical and practical.

1 Ibid., 91.
3 “…consonantias, et reliqua Musica interualla ab incerto aurium arbitrio ad certum rationis iudicium reuocaret, vt saepe iam dictum est. Sensus tamen ad omnia munia obeunda semper fuit optimus iudex: nam quo facto bonus poterit esse cocus, qui gusto non sit praeditus delicato? neque eximius poterit esse pictor, qui eruditos (vt ita loquar) non habeat oculos. Quare nec etiam Musicam quisquam opime poterit exercere, cui purgatae non sint aures;” see Salinas, De Musica libri septem, Liber quartus, 227, and n. 3 supra.
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The book collections of ancient libraries had been dispersed and vanished during the 3rd and 4th centuries due to the collapse of the Western Roman state and the instability caused by the invasions of the first migrating peoples in the Mediterranean. During this period important book collections disappeared, thus masterpieces of ancient literature would be forgotten for a considerable period of time. The regress of the libraries was not homogeneous throughout European territories. Western ones disappeared almost completely, while Eastern Mediterranean ones, in the Eastern Roman Empire regions, survived for longer. It was no coincidence that it was here that major changes regarding the technology of manufacturing the support of the written text and implicitly book binding took place at the end of the Antiquity: the volumen (the scroll) was replaced by the codex,1 while the papyrus was replaced by the parchment.2 These were now offering
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1 Codex: rectangular parchment files bound together, a forerunner of the modern book; it originates in ancient Rome, in this case the sheets were waxed tablets.
2 Parchment: the skin of an animal (sheep, goat, calf or rabbit) especially processed for writing; the word originates in the name of the city of Pergamon, the most important production centre during late Antiquity.
a more suitable surface for calligraphy and drawing, books became more expressive, more compact, and much more enduring in time, when manoeuvred or stored.

Paradoxically the rebirth of European libraries at the beginning of the Middle Ages is due to Christianity, the very factor that had a substantial contribution to the disappearance of the ancient ones. Their origin can be traced to the first Christian monasteries (1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries), where the most enthusiastic believers found refuge, unsatisfied with the luxury of the life in the cities alongside the African and Syrian coasts. The increasing number of these primitive monasteries generated in time a community which functioned according to a set of rules, prefiguring the monastic life from later on. Their leaders realized that without offering books of sacred texts, the life of these communities would lose its dogmatic support, therefore they sanctioned the necessity of establishing book collections. As an example we have ‘the rule’ of St. Pachomius (292–345), whose monastery was situated in Upper Egypt, close to Tabennisi Denderah. A kind of wardrobe is mentioned here, a *fenestra*, placed within the wall where the books of the monastery were kept and any monk could borrow a book for as long as a week.¹

As monastic life was spreading throughout Europe, it borrowed the design of Christian monasteries from the Eastern Mediterranean, including the existence of a collection of sacred texts. The establishment of the first monasteries in Italy (Monte Cassino in 529 and Vivarium in 530) corresponds with the issuing of the Rule of St. Benedict, which required the monks to read at least two hours per day during summers. They had at their disposal the books stored in the *wardrobe of books.*² Similar to the first monasteries, the ones established later on were required to possess a collection of books in a variety of spaces. This fact was confirmed by the general opinion shared throughout the monastic circles and synthesized by Geoffrey of Ste Barbe-en-Ange’s, who stated that a monastery without a wardrobe of books is like a fortress without an armoury.³

Until the 14th century books could be stored in the choir of the church, but the most common place was a niche in the western wall of the eastern gallery, close to the transept. This place was called the *armarium* and it was the first design of a space exclusively dedicated to monastic libraries, a rather modest one considering the number of books it sheltered. The most powerful monastery in the Western world, the Benedictine Abbey of Cluny, possessed in the mid-12th century about 500 volumes.⁴

During the first stages, when there were fewer books, the *armarium* was rather modest in size, a simple niche in a wall. It grew in time, receiving shelves and doors that enclosed this space (Fig. 1). When the quantity of books increased, exceeding its capacity, the niche was multiplied, as was the case of the *armarium* consisting of three joined niches of the Cistercian monastery, L’Escale-Dieu⁵, in Southern France.
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³ Ibid., 92.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
The armarium-niche became insufficient for the continuous growth of the book collections and it was replaced by a small vaulted cylindrical room, placed more or less in the same area. This change was more consistent with the Cistercian monasteries, as it can be seen in ‘The ideal plan of a Cistercian Monastery’ (Fig. 2). Placing the armarium-room on the southern end of the transept, close to the sacristy and the chapter house, became a scheme used on a large scale with all Cistercian monasteries and later on by almost all Catholic monasteries.

From an architectural point of view, naming these ‘book depositories’ libraries is improper, regardless if they were built-in wardrobes or small rooms. In my opinion this term can only be used in the case of a proper space especially designed for storing and reading books. Early monastic libraries separated these two functions, the reading area consisted of some working niches where monks read and wrote. These could be placed within the actual walls of the church or, outside, throughout the galleries of the cloister,1 as was the case of the English monasteries of Canterbury and Durham, in Gloucester.2

The monasteries during this period became reading centres, assuming the role of keeping and producing books.3 Specialized monks multiplied books by manually copying them, they worked in a space naturally lit, in the vicinity of the library, which was called the scriptorium. The most explicit information about the functional design of the scriptorium–library duo can be found in the parchment of the layout for the Benedictine Abbey of Saint-Gall4 in Switzerland, drawn in 820 at the request of the Abbot Gozberg. He intended to reconstruct and expand the monastery to a surface up to 3.8ha.5 The drawing remained an ideal layout but it has the merit of having preserved a precise image of the functional design of a Benedictine monastery from the Carolingian Renaissance. This was in fact the first recording of a proper library structure. It consisted of a two-level building placed east to the western wall of the transept and north to the choir, symmetrical to the sacristy. Its size was much larger when compared to other abbeys, its width was almost as large as that of the choir, stressing upon the increasing importance of books in monastic life.

The inscription ‘infra sedes scribentum, supra bibliotheca’ is explicit in placing the scriptorium underneath the library. Placing the library on the upper floor and keeping the access through the scriptorium was due to security reasons, thus avoiding unauthorized access. In many monasteries the access in the library was restricted to a handful of monks, as an exception some outsiders were allowed, but only with a special authorization issued by the prior.

The expansion of the library space due to the increased number of books and to the fact that it was now being associated with the copying workshop claimed a new position in the layout of an abbey. Thus an important shift was noted in the space of the

1 The study niches in the galleries of the cloister could only be used when the weather permitted it.
2 Nikolaus Pevsner, A history of building types, 91.
4 Originally it measured 113 by 78 cm and it can be found at Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Gallen. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plan_of_Saint_Gall
5 Ovidiu Drimbă, Istoria civilizației și culturii (The History of Civilization and Culture), vol. 2 (Bucharest: Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1987), 398.
monastic library, which implied creating several larger rooms, with good natural light, and which were used for storing books and ensuring reading seats.

During the first stage, the chosen design comprised a space for the library partly above the cloister’s gallery. It resulted through the elevation of several spans close to the church, as was the case of the Benedict monastery of Chaise-Dieu, in Central France. The new building was erected at the turn of the 14th and 15th century. A rectangular room was thus obtained, 24.6m by 4.8m, topped by a rib vault whose keystone reached as high as 4m. Later on, when libraries required an even larger space, a separate cloister was erected, called ‘the cloister of the copiers and the library’; such was the example of the abbeys of Clairvaux and Citeaux. Probably the most extreme example is the one of La Bayeux, where a building erected especially for the library in 1436, was actually placed in the middle of the cloister, thus creating two much smaller courtyards. The building was built out of ashlars and consisted of a hall for the library, 13m by 7m, lit from the eastern and western sidewalls through five tall and narrow windows.

Another space designed for books, which also emerged during the Middle Ages, was the chapter library, situated in the vicinity of the cathedrals of those days. Their main purpose was to shelter book collections primarily used by the cathedral’s canons. It was the equivalent of the monastic library in urban space, its functional-spatial configuration as well as its development in time was very similar to the former.

If in the case of the monastic library structure one can sense its private character, the access being restricted to monks; in the case of chapter and collegiate libraries usually situated in urban, more populated environments, the access was also granted to the pupils belonging to the cathedral’s school, to the students and teachers, as well as to some resident readers. The necessity of ensuring an easier access to books was due to the increased educational level of individuals and also to the tendency of secularizing the education and adapting the book heritage to this need. From an architectural point of view this was the moment when the library rediscovered, in an incipient phase, one of its fundamental attributes – its public character – renewing the tradition of the great ancient libraries. As a consequence their space grew, while the furnishing was adapted to the new needs, ensuring book storage and reading facilities.

One of the most interesting chapter libraries, which can still be seen, was erected in France, for the Notre-Dame Cathedral, in Noyon, in 1507 (Fig. 6). The library itself occupied the upper floor of an isolated building in the immediate vicinity of the northern transept. The prismatic volume topped by a roof with two slopes rests upon a middle stone wall and on two rows of wooden pillars which support the exterior longitudinal walls. Thus an amazing ‘aerial figure’ was created, impressing a floating image. Throughout time two hypotheses emerged regarding the ground floor: the first, inspired by local legends, suggests that the ground floor was deliberately left unoccupied
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2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 The term cathedral is used denoting the headquarters of an eparchy/diocese which hosts the bishop’s throne.
so that it could be used by vendors as a market area, while the second, articulated by Clark, supposes that the ground floor was never intended to be left vacant, on the contrary, it was used for redirecting books. A very similar layout can be found in the library of the Lichfield Cathedral (Fig. 5) erected between 1489–1493 and demolished in 1757. In this case the hall was also rectangular, of 18.3m by 4.6m, somewhat smaller than the one in Noyon (21.9m by 5.2m) and it is believed to have been built on pillars. Similarities can also be found in the position of the two libraries, both situated in the vicinity of the transept: in Lichfield close to the southern one, while in Noyon the library was placed close to the northern one, thus their layout was reversed relative to the main axis of the cathedral.

Another important difference between the two regards the way in which natural light was used in the interior space. If in the case of Lichfield the library hall was well lit through 8 windows on both sides, in the case of Noyon, the hall seemed to be darker because it had only 9 windows on the eastern side. This fact makes me think that even the furnishing layout was different, taking into account the custom of those days of associating a carrel with a window. So the layout in Lichfield could have consisted of two rows of lecterns with a middle aisle, while the one in Noyon had only one row.

The building system, as well as the materials which were used, were completely different: in Lichfield it seems that a brick structure was used, while in Noyon they used a wooden one. The latter is the only surviving library that was built entirely out of wood, thus allowing us to understand the structural system used during the late Middle Ages (Fig. 7).

The pillars of the ground floor rested on a stone base and supported a network of beams under the slab, on top of which the walls and the roof structure were mounted. At some point a median stone wall was erected on the ground floor in order to reinforce the library’s structure. The upper floor framework consisted of a network of wooden beams slightly separated, the space between them being filled by unburnt brick, accordingly to the wooden structures techniques of those days.

During the 18th century, the chapter library of Noyon underwent some major changes so that the original furnishing layout was replaced by wall mounted shelves in addition to which some light partitioning was also added, it can still be seen today. One can only suppose that the initial layout was similar to the lecterns library design, placing study niches in front of the windows with a furniture design similar to the one of the Hereford Cathedral library (Fig. 8).

An important moment in the development of the library structure was the establishment of universities, during the 12th and 13th centuries. This implied relocating the secular education system outside monasteries and cathedrals, alongside the development of cities and commerce. Together with the newly established colleges, it was considered to be necessary to organize several libraries which would later be
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1 André Masson, *La «librairie» du chapitre de Noyon...*, 95–110.
2 Ibid., 95–110.
3 John Willis Clark, *The Care of books...*, 123.
4 Clark mentions that in 1489 Thomas Heywood, the dean in Lichfield, “payed 40 pounds for erecting a brick library” - Ibid., 123.
referred to by specialists as *collegiate libraries*. Even though the university educational system was established outside the monastic environment, their library structure was influenced by the monastic and chapter designs. This was due to the fact that it was the only available inspiration and also because most colleges were under the patronage of a monastery. Moreover most of the students were monks and the first book collections belonging to the collegiate libraries were donated by the monasteries they belonged to. Thus we should not be surprised by the obvious similarities between the layout of the collegiate libraries and the one of the monastic or chapter libraries. Clark states that two thirds of the libraries belonging to universities built during the 15th century are the same as monastic ones.¹

In England most colleges reused the general layout of the courtyard of monastic cloisters. Thus a central enclosed courtyard was obtained, usually a square one, on whose sides buildings hosting educational spaces, students’ and teachers’ quarters, the chapel, the library etc. were erected. The library of Queens College in Cambridge was typical among the 15th century university libraries built in England. It was built in 1448. On the first floor, on the northern side, it comprised a rectangular hall of 13.4m by 6.1m. This hall was furnished with lecterns and was lit through 11 windows.²

It seems that the most important colleges in France did not adopt the design of the monastic nor the one of chapter libraries. These were hosted in separate buildings, within the university’s campus, as was the case of the ones in Paris: the College of Sorbonne and the College of Navarre. The former was established in 1254 by Robert de Sorbonne, chaplain of Louis IX³, while the latter was established by Joan I of Navarre in 1305.

The library hall in Sorbonne had 36.6m by 10.9m and sheltered two distinct book collections: the former comprised the most frequently studied books, called ‘magna libraria’, while the latter was called ‘parva libraria’ and comprised the most valuable books. The former, also known as the great library or the common library, gave access to all readers, while the latter, the small library, could be accessed only by the carefully chosen ones.⁴ The interior space was lit by 19 windows dividing the interior space and placed on the eastern and western sidewalls. Thus they imposed a furnishing layout of 28 lecterns, marked by letters, which were positioned perpendicular to the longitudinal walls, generating in front of each window a carrel with reading desks placed in the middle.⁵ The library of Navarra College was very much alike, it was erected in 1506 and demolished in 1867 (Fig. 9). It sheltered on the upper floor a hall of 32.9m by 9.2m⁶ in which light penetrated through 19 narrow windows placed on both longitudinal walls.

The lectern library formula was also used in Italy, a good example is the Malatestiana Library in Cesena, built between 1447 and 1452.⁷ It is a very well known example because it was the first European public library opened to the residents of
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¹ John Willis Clark, *The care of books...*, 143.
² Ibid., 151–152.
³ Pevsner, *A history of building types*, 93.
⁴ John Willis Clark, *The care of books...*, 165.
⁵ Pevsner, *A history of building types*, 93.
⁶ John Willis Clark, *The care of books...*, 166.
Cesena, but also the first humanistic-monastic library. It was named after the Malatesta family, a family which governed the city during the 15th century, more precisely Domenico Malatesta Novello the founder and sponsor of the building. It was built according to a design by Matteo Nuzio de Fano, a disciple of Leon Battista Alberti.

The building sheltering the library was placed on the eastern side of St. Francis Monastery, whose monks overlooked the administration. It had an elongated rectangular shape (40.5m by 10.4m) with two rows of 11 marble columns which divided the hall into three naves, according to the ‘tre navate con volta’ formula (Fig. 10 and 11). This design focused on the way in which the space was roofed: the shorter side naves were roofed by groin vaults, while the taller central one had a barrel vault. The side naves were the only one furnished, with two rows of 28 lecterns each, alongside the longitudinal walls. Light penetrated through 44 Venetian windows, enhancing the spectacular interior space roofed by vaults but at the same time of an austere simplicity given by the white limestone. The architect used the white stone in order to increase the light in a hall of such dimensions, its size being imposed by its public character, a hall designed to serve an entire urban community.

The three naves formula used in Cesena was a real success, thus, together with the San Marco library in Florence, it became a prototype used later on for the monastic libraries of Santa Maria della Grazie in Milan (1469), San Domenico in Perugia (1474) and San Giovanni in Parma (1523). The three naves layout was used until the first decades of the 16th century, when the architectural principles of the Renaissance imposed a layout which favoured spatial unity, abandoning any partitions.

No matter how succinct this overview of the library space is, one cannot leave out the birth of the Vatican library, established by Pope Nicholas V (1447–1455), a great bibliophile who inaugurated the tradition of collecting books by the Pontiffs of Rome. The initiative of building a library belonged to Sixtus IV who intended to built an independent building during the year of the inauguration of his papacy, a project which was soon abandoned and replaced by a conversion of a ground floor space belonging to a building within the complex of the pope’s palace, which was used as a warehouse under Nicholas V. Designing a space especially for the library became imperative if we take into account the fact that at that time the collection comprised 2,527 volumes, out of which 770 in Greek and 1757 in Latin. They were stored in improper conditions and even accessing them was difficult. The ground floor of the given building was rectangular in shape, neighbouring to the south Cortille del Papagallo, through which the main access was granted, and to the north the vacant site of the future to be Cortille del Belvedere, on which the windows of the library overlooked.

The layout was simple (Fig. 12) and consisted of four halls sheltering different collections: the first one (17.9m by 10.7m) was the largest and it hosted Latin texts, the second one (8.5m by 10.7m) hosted Greek literature, the third was designed for the most
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1 John Willis Clark, *The care of books...*, 199.
2 Ibid., 201.
4 John Willis Clark, *The care of books...*, 208.
5 Ibid., 209.
6 Ibid., 209.
valuable texts, while the last one built between 1480–1481 comprised the papal archives and it was called the ‘pontiff library’. The first two had a somewhat public character and were known as ‘the public library’ or as ‘the common library’, they could be accessed from the south through the Cortille del Papagallo. The other two were restricted to the public, being accessed only by the library and the archive personnel through the eastern Cortille S. Damaso.

The interior layout was not remarkable from an architectural point of view, due to the fact that it was a modified space and not one especially designed for its purpose. The farthest hall to the west seems to have been the most spectacular one, the Latin library, which due to its size required a central rectangular pillar, which bore the groin vault.

The library was housed by this space for a century, until 1587, when pope Sixtus V commissioned the architect Domenico Fontana to design a new library, which is still being used today.

The development of the spatial configuration of libraries during the Middle Ages was decisively influenced by the perception of those days reflected in the way in which the functional distribution was organized: the community it served, collecting and sheltering books and the access of the reader. This matter seems to be even more important as we are talking about a time when the library was being ‘rediscovered’, after the loss of the ancient one. The architectural building type of libraries reached its final shape only during the 14th and 15th centuries when it was understood that its space is a meeting point between books and readers. The way in which architects ‘responded’ to this basic requirement was reflected in the interior spatial configurations, in the way in which they were furnished and implicitly in the furniture ergonomics.

One of the most important discoveries during the late Middle Ages was the lecterns library design, also known as the chained library, which became the most common design for most buildings until the Renaissance. It is a space furnished with simple or double lecterns with benches, generating study niches placed perpendicular to the longitudinal walls. The lectern system used up a lot of space, but this flaw was overcome by using a layout with up to 3 shelves placed one on top of the other, thus amplifying the storage area, a need of the ever increasing amount of books, due to the invention of printing. For a long time the lecterns of the libraries were associated with chains securing the books, which made manipulating and reading them more difficult. They disappeared throughout the 18th century when the large number of books, the need of a mobility specific to the reading process and the improvement of the multiplying processes, decreased their costs, thus their vulnerability to theft.

A very special moment in the history of medieval libraries was acknowledging the fact that the space between the axes of the lecterns, about 2.5m, could be used as a guideline for establishing a span, thus modulating the building. The libraries erected at the end of the 15th century and at the beginning of the 16th century can exemplify this (Noyon, Lichfield, Cesena etc.). In other words the size of the studying and storing stations became the fundamental unit in determining the spatial dimensions, creating a simple ‘network’ in designing and building libraries from this moment onward.
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1 Ibid., 211.
fig. 1 – Armarium, a niche with shelves and doors.

fig. 2 – Ideal plan of a Cistercian monastery (after W. Braunfelds):

fig. 3 – The plan of the Benedictine monastery of Saint Gall (fragment) 820:

fig. 4 – Scriptorium, monks at work.
fig. 5 – Lichfield (England), chapter library, 1489–1493 (demolished in 1757):
    A - south transept, B - library (after Clark).

fig. 6 – Noyon (France), the wooden chapter library, 1507 (author’s reconstitution):
    A - north transept, B - library
fig. 7 – Noyon (France), the wooden chapter library.

fig. 8 – Hereford, chapter library - lecterns system.
fig. 9 – Paris, Library of the College de Navarre, 1506, now destroyed.

fig. 10 – Cesena, Malatestiana Library, 1447-1452, arch. Matteo Nuti da Fano - general view.
fig. 11 – Cesena, Malatestiana Library, ground-plan.

fig. 12 – Rome, Vatican library, 1471-1481, ground-plan: 
A. Latin library, B. Greek library, C. secret library, D. pontifical library.
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PREFACE

The Apor Codex Renewed

The preservation, restoration, and exhibition of the five hundred-years-old codex was accomplished as a result of serious efforts of diplomacy and expertise.

The middle-sized, octavo book is the fourth earliest Hungarian coherent narrative linguistic record, considered to be of literary importance. It is part of the earliest preserved Bible translation in Hungarian, the so-called Hussite Bible. The codex comprises the psalms of the mentioned Bible translation, completed with hymns, canticles, and two additional texts of Premonstratensian origin. Its binding was made at Buda, commissioned by the Premonstratensian nuns of the Nyulak island monastery, in the early 16th century.

The codex, which bears the name of its former owner, Baron Péter Apor, was discovered in 1877, when, due to a descendent of the Apor family, it got into the possession of the Cseréy family. The widow of János Cseréy placed it in the Szekler Museum founded by her at Imecsfalva, so the highly damaged codex arrived at its final resting place, the Szekler National Museum, meanwhile relocated to Sfântu Gheorghe (Sepsiszentgyörgy), in 1880.
The most valuable piece of this institution arrived to Budapest at the beginning of the 1940s, a facsimile edition was published with the introduction of Dénes Szabó in 1942 (series Codices Hungarici II). It has been long unknown that, despite its facsimile edition published in Cluj (Kolozsvár), the codex – formed as a colligate of three independent manuscripts – survived WWII in the capital of Hungary. It is probably because of this that it has been considered lost even by experts for quite a long time, since the transport rescuing book rarities and other valuable works of art from northern Transylvania to the West during WWII was bombed, therefore it was assumed that the Apor Codex was among the books and other valuables perished. The codex was finally returned to Transylvania in 1953, but it has been guarded in a safe ever since, and rarely removed from it, understandably, during the communist regime. All this while, the condition of this piece of heritage was continuously decaying, the already degraded codex, which was not written on parchment, but on paper, had probably been soaked on repeated occasions, even its intact pages fissured because of the high acid content of the ink, and, since the surroundings of the letters were rapidly destroyed, the letters themselves simply began to fall out.

In order to avoid its complete destruction, the codex’ restoration has become imperative; nevertheless, it has not been at all an easy process! The preserving museum tried to organize its restoration repeatedly in post-communist Romania, but it has never been possible to start the actual work. At the same time, the institution has always supported the idea of the codex’ restoration in Hungary, as it was its basic interest not to let this highly appraised piece of art be destroyed. In response to the failures of the Transylvanian efforts, the National Széchényi Library has repeatedly offered its assistance, but unfortunately it has always met with obstacles. Beginning with the second half of the 1990s, the Romanian Ministry of Culture responsible for issuing the permissions for the restoration has come up with diplomatic excuses guised as professional against the restoration abroad.

In the beginning of 2008, following a several-years-long period of preparations, the National Széchényi Library embarked on a singular enterprise, setting out the preliminary works for the comprehensive exhibition of Hungarian linguistic records entitled “Látjátok feleim...” Magyar nyelvemlékek a kezdetektől a 16. század elejéig (Hungarian linguistic relics from the beginnings to the early 16th century). The idea of the preservation and restoration of the codex, jointly with its loan for the exhibition, has been formulated again during the preparations for the exhibition. From that moment on, the professional and diplomatic efforts on the part of the National Széchényi Library were conducted by the writer of these lines; recognizing the positively changing relations and possibilities with Romania’s adherence to the European Union, these efforts also envisaged the enlargement of professional institutional cooperation. Drawing also the Romanian National Library into the loan project, a three-sided agreement and exhibition loan contract was elaborated (the owner institution together with the two national libraries), serving as a framework for the lengthy process of acquiring the necessary permissions, which eventually ended with the lending of the codex for one year and a half, in return for its complete restoration and digitization!1

---
1 Let us also mention here the names of former Director General István Monok (NSzL), Director General Elena Târziman (RNL), Director Mihály Vargha, and Library Manager Hunor Boér (SzNM), former Director General Éva Lauter (Balassi Institute), and Attila Cseke, state secretary
During this while the experts of the Hungarian National Library and the museum in Sfântu Gheorghe began the assessment of the condition of the codex, and prepared the restoration works. The codex arrived at the National Széchényi Library in the autumn of 2008, and with regard to its poor condition, the delicate and lengthy restoration process – with the expertise of restoration expert Zsuzsanna Tóth – started already the next day, financially supported by the Balassi Institute.

As it was revealed, the manuscript of the Apor Codex consisted of three distinct unknown handwritings and three kinds of ink, therefore one of the basic difficulties in the course of restoration was the variable acid content of the inks. At any rate, when the successful exhibition “Látjátok feleim…” Magyar nyelvemlékek a kezdetektől a 16. század elejéig opened in October 2009, the codex restored over a year could be admired not only by experts, but by the public at large as well! As a major spectacle and curiosity of the event, all the three codices containing parts of the Hussite Bible were exhibited together for the first time in their history. The Codex of Vienna, the earliest of the three, is in the possession of the National Széchényi Library, the Codex of Munich, containing the Gospels of the New Testament, was loaned from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and the Apor Codex, now saved from destruction, worthily presented the psalm fragments of the Hussite Bible.

In December 2009, the Hungarian Ministry of Education and Culture awarded the Magyar Nyelv Emlékérem prize to our institution for the organization of the exhibition and the exemplary restoration of the codex. The reincarnated codex was delivered back to the Szekler National Museum in Sfântu Gheorghe in the spring of 2010, where it was received with a special exhibition and scholarly session organized in its honour. The exhibition version is preserved in a copy in the National Széchényi Library, while the restoration and digitization has laid the foundations for the publication of the awaited critical edition, possibly as a result of institutional cooperation, possibly by the end of 2012. This version, completed by a transcription, will be published in the Magyar Kódexek (Hungarian Codices) series.
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Introduction
The codex was named after its first known early modern owner, Baron Péter Apor, and at the time (Romanian Government, Governmental Chief Secretariate), who all played a part in furthering the matter.

1 The earliest possessor note in the codex, “Petrus Apor,” belongs in all probability to Baron Péter Apor, although it may also refer to his great grandchild by the same name (Honor Boér, “Adatok az Apor-kódex és a Csereyné-kódex kutatástörténetéhez” [Completions to the research history of Apor and Mrs Cserey codices], in Erdély reneszánsza [Transylvanian Renaissance] [Cluj: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyestület, 2009], vol. 2, 267–285.) The generally accepted owner is however Baron Péter Apor, born in Altorja in 1676, and died at the same place in 1752. He lost his father in the year he was born, his first guardian was Farkas Apor, the second one his uncle, István Apor. He was educated at the convent of Cluj-Mănăștur (Kolozsmonostor) since 1686, then by the Jesuits at the university of Trnava (Nagyszombat), where he acquired a degree in philosophy and law. He
it contains one of the earliest Hungarian linguistic records. Several attempts have been made for its restoration, the first in 1942–43, when the volume was taken to Budapest for a facsimile edition. It was already recognized at that time that the pages were damaged by ink corrosion. Despite the continuous negotiations, the restoration was eventually hindered by WWII. The good-quality copies of the pages, which were published in a facsimile edition with the introduction of Dénes Szabó, were also made in Budapest on that occasion. A long break followed afterwards, then, after 1989, the issue of the codex’s restoration was again repeatedly raised until it was eventually finalized as a joint project of the National Széchényi Library, the Szekler National Museum, and the Romanian National Library in 2009–2010.

1. Information and description of the codex

The codex is kept in the collections of the Szekler National Museum, its shelfmark is A. 1330.

1.1. The Apor Codex

The manuscript collection was copied in the late 15th or early 16th century, its binding was probably made in the workshop of the Dominicans from Buda around 1520. The codex probably belonged to, and was used by Premonstratensian nuns. The volume currently contains fragments of three works, the psalm book of the Hussite Bible, comprising the translations of psalms 56–150 with hymns and canticles and the liturgy of Marian feasts; a part entitled Három jeles szolgáltatás (Three noted services); and the translation of the passion-dialogue of Saint Anselm. The Hussite connections of the codex have been questioned lately on repeated occasions. Besides these three works, was a memoir writer, poet, family history writer. His major work is entitled Metamorphosis Transylvániae, azaz Erdélynek régi együgyű alázatos idejében való gazdagságából e mostani kevély, cifra, felfordult állapotjában köldusságra való változása (Metamorphosis Transylvaniae, that is, Transylvania’s change from its richness in its old, simple, humble times to begging in its proud, gaudy, overturned state today) is an important source of the history of culture and mentalities (Baron Péter Apor entry in: Magyar Művelődéstörténeti Lexikon (Lexicon of Hungarian cultural history) (Budapest: Balassi, 2003), vol. 1, 125–126. More on Péter Apor: see the afterword by Gyula Tóth in Péter Apor, Metamorphosis Transylvániae, azaz Erdélynek változása (1736) (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1972), 97–107.


2 Based on the oral communication and the recorded handwritten elenchus of Hunor Boér, librarian (Szekler National Museum).


the codex contained one additional part, which however was removed, probably because of reasons connected to its content.

On the basis of the notes on the pastedown, it is possible to follow the owners of the volume, probably ever since it got into private possession. Arguably, the first known owner of the volume was (later Baron) Péter Apor, the writer. He probably acquired the volume from the Vienna court library in 1699, on the occasion of his marriage, taking it to be a “Corvina” codex, from among the books surviving the Turkish occupation of Hungary, and transported to Vienna from Buda after its recapture from the Turks in 1686. The codex got into the possession of the Szekler National Museum, at that time located at Imeni (Imecsfalva, Covasna county, Romania), as a gift of Mrs Gergely Pünkőstí Baroness Zsuzsánná Apor, great granddaughter of Baron Péter Apor, the writer. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences asked for its loan for the purpose of publication in 1878, and it was returned in 1880 to the Museum, relocated in the meantime to Sfântu Gheorghe, where it is also kept today.¹

1.2. Description of the binding

The codex is not very large in size, well readable, its leaves are easy to turn, the size of the boards is 219 mm x 144 mm. The wooden boards are between 5 and 6 mm thick. The thickness of the spine cannot be assessed with great precision due to the warping of the wooden board and the many missing leaves, but it probably was around 33 mm.

In accordance with Renaissance board decoration, the boards of the Lányi and Apor codices were decorated by narrowing frames with stamps filling the frames.

The book is covered in reddish-brown, blind stamped, full leather binding. Of the Renaissance-type bindings made in Buda, the binding of this volume, based on the stamps decorating it, belongs to the group of the Lányi codices.¹ Many of the stamps decorating the leather binding is identical with those decorating the Lányi Codex (impressed contoured palmette, grid pattern with heart, small blossom, floral pattern).

The binding was made of goatskin. The stamps on the front and back covers are identical. The panels are formed by gradually narrowing frames in a central organization. The outmost frame is stamped with blossoms with five petals. The second frame from the sides is filled with palmette decoration. The curiosity of the frame decoration is that the palmettes of the header and footer sections differ from the palmettes decorating the side sections. The identical pattern is found in two distinct designs, the palmettes in the header and footer sections are in relief stamps, and were made by rolls, while the vertical side sections are intaglio stamps. These latter palmette rows were made by two, alternately used single stamps. The next, narrower frame was undecorated, but the corners of the bordering frames are connected by line pallets. The innermost frame in the centre of the board delimits a rectangular field. The central field is also divided into three parts by line pallets and double line pallets. The two extreme fields of the three are decorated by a
couple of outward oriented floral patterns. The central field, in the middle of the cover, is stamped with a large, gothic rosette. The line pallets forming the frames consist of a threefold line, a thick one and two narrow ones on the sides of the first.

Not only the boards, but the spine of the volume is also blind stamped. The leather bands and the endband supports are emphasized by transverse line pallets, which do not run over the boards. The line pallets are identical with those used on the boards. The fields between the leather bands were decorated by transversal floral patterns similar to those in the central fields of the boards. The fields below and beneath the leather bands are stamped with grid pattern. Within the grids of this pattern one may find hearts facing each other.

The caps of the volume are missing, therefore their form and height can no longer be assessed, but it was clearly visible on the edge of the remaining spine leather that the endbands were also emphasized by line pallets.

The turn-ins of the leather cover were folded in at the corners and the overlapping strata were cut with one incision, then the cut-off and unnecessary parts were removed. The edges of the turn-ins joined thus in angle on the corners. The trace of the incision of the tool and the overrun of the cut is well perceivable on the inner side of the wooden board. The split seen today between the edges of the turn-ins is due to the drying out and shrinkage of the leather.

There were no line pallets applied to the turn-ins of the book. The turn-ins were cut round after leather covering, but not with a ruler. The trace of the cut and the torn edge of the leather was also preserved on the wooden boards.

There is a dark stripe perceivable on the turn-ins which raises the question, very difficult to answer, whether the binding leather was dyed or not. The use of both kinds of leathers – dyed and not dyed – was customary. The reason was that vegetal tanning already coloured the leather and dyeing was only used to change the colour of tanning. If the leather used for binding was dyed, then it was usually done on the almost finished book, after the leather covering of the boards. In this case the turn-ins are only partly covered with dye. Such a darker stripe can be seen on one of the turn-ins. However, what makes the decision on whether or not it was dyed difficult is the fact that the leather
turned darker anyway on the wooden boards and the repeated damage by water could have made clear contoured traces similar to dyeing.

The sewing of the codex was made on two double leather bands made of white leather, with link stitch. The endband supports, made also of white leather, were attached to the sheets in the same instance of sewing. The sheets were sewn across, the leather bands on the spine were completed to reach the thickness of the sheets by repeatedly coiling the sewing thread. During sewing, leaving one sheet at the link-stitch, they looped under the sheet beneath it, then forming a chain-stitch, they returned to the upper sheet, and continuing the sewing, they went round the endband support. The endband support, similarly to the leather bands, was thickened by repeated coiling, then they moved to the next sheet by looping the leaving thread. The knot on the loop of the endband support falls to the edge.

Uncommonly, sewing was made with a double thread; the reason could have been that the sewing thread was found too thin. The two threads were loosely twisted during the sewing. The twist of the sewing thread is S shaped, as well as the twist of the two threads.
The sewn bookblock, due to the sewing technique (since the endband support fixed during the sewing raised above the fore edge), could no longer be cut round, therefore the sheets were cut to size after the composition of the colligate, but before the sewing.

The endbands were sewn on the prepared supports once the bookblock was already sewn. Two colours of endbands were used on the codex. This type of endband was sewn with two colours and two needles, in this case with four threads for each. The embroidering threads are reddish-brown and raw coloured.

Once the bookblock and the endbands were sewn, the ends of the leather bands and endbands longer than the spine were fixed with a wooden nail to a specially made recess on the outer side of the boards.
The spine of the book was not, or only slightly, rounded, thus when the book was ready, the spine was already straight. This straight spine is typical for this kind of binding.

The spine was lined with narrow strips of parchment between the leather bands, the ends of the strips longer than the spine were pasted to the inner side of the boards. The parchment strips lining the spine contained no writing.

The wooden boards were made of beech, their inner side was bevelled along the edges, and left straight on the spine side. The outer side of the boards was steeply bevelled on the spine side through the entire thickness of the boards, therefore its edges are sharp. The boards are not only bevelled on the inside, but also on the outside at the head and tail. The bevelling is hardly visible on the outside, it is irregular, and seen almost exclusively in side illumination.
The bevelling of the boards at the head and tail, both inside and outside, was made by a coarse file. The bevelling of the front side and the spine side is much smoother, it can be stated for sure that it was not made by the same tool.

On the edge of the front board a special recess was shaped for the clasp, and on the edge of the back board for the turn of the strap. The recess on the edge of the front board is significantly wider than the clasp, and in the middle of this recess there is another, narrower recess, which serves for the fastening of the clasp on the strap to the catch plate on the board. This design of the board edge is typical for this kind of clasp.
A recess was made on the board for the end of the straps with the clasp, thus the straps were levelled with the board. The end of the leather bands and the endbands were also recessed into the boards. Under the leather bands the bevelling was made at a smaller angle, which raised the bands and probably served to make them more elaborate. No such raising is seen under the straps of the endbands; moreover, at the points where the straps mount the boards, although observation is made difficult by the boards being worn, one can see the rounding of the corners and a slight, arched recess.

The straps were folded, the turned-in edges of the strap were matched in angle on the back of the strap. The strap was decorated with three blind-stamped line pallets, identical with the framed stamps of the boards. No enforcement was inserted in the strap.
The pastedowns of the volume were made of white handmade paper, but only pieces of these pasted on the inner side of the boards were preserved. The structure of the pastedown cannot be established due to its fragmentariness. There was no watermark on the pastedown fragments.

The clasps of the codex were made of brass plate, and belong to the typical form of arched clasps prevalent after 1500. The hooks attached to the board are bent at the fore, undecorated. The clasps on the strap have been lost. The plates fixing the straps, again matching the type, are simple rectangular shaped. The hook and the strap fixing plates were attached to the boards by brass nails with almost no head.

1.3. Sheet distribution of the codex

After disbinding the codex, I had the opportunity to establish the distribution of sheets and compare it with the literature on this subject. The sheet distribution found, taking into account the fragments large enough to be adequately evaluated, corresponded to that defined by Dénes Szabó.

At the beginning of the codex I found the fragments of, demonstrably, two pairs of leaves of two sheets, rolled over a stitching thread; moreover, at least one more thread was also visible in the opening, but it was impossible to decide whether it belonged to a sheet, or fixed the pastedown. It was difficult to assess the number of the missing sheets because the sheets were stitched with double thread, while the missing leaves were followed by a large number of fragmentary leaves. This assessment was made even more difficult by the fact that the paper fragments of the mutilated first sheets were rolled over the also damaged pieces of stitching thread.

During the restoration works, the decision was made that the pages missing from proven places in the book will be replaced. The reason was not only the fact that the
completed pages were better indicators of the amount of missing pages, but also because this way the volume could be restored in its original thickness.

To mark the pages, I used the book’s original page numbering written in pencil for a better identification. However, this page numbering did not observe the leaf fragments at the beginning of the book, nor the missing pages. This renders more difficult both the page references to the volume, and the understanding of sheet distribution.

Therefore, in order for a better manageability, I used a T(töredék [fragment]) and numbering for the triangle-shaped fragments, and also numbered the completed pages in case of multiple missing leaves, in continuation of the page numbering of the last preserved page. This temporary marking facilitated the composition of the sheets. Since I did not want to mark the originally numbered pages with new numbering, I only wrote the continuous numbering in the sheet distribution list presented below. Within the list the “original page numbering” of the volume written in pencil is formatted in bold letters, my own numbering of the page fragments in regular letters, and the reconstructed page numbers of the missing pages in italics. However, probably this continuous numbering in italics still does not accurately reconstruct the original page numbers of the codex. This imprecision derives from the fact that only the attested missing pages were replaced. Based on the extant fragments, the sheet distribution reconstructed below makes up a volume of 356 pages, however, only 186 numbered pages can be found today in more or less complete form, plus 42 unnumbered, triangle-shaped page fragments with writing. If we also take into consideration that only two pages of the last two sheets contained writing (while 26 did not), the losses of the codex still amount to 122 written pages…

The page numbering of the codex reconstructed this way counts 60 pages, that is, 15 pairs of leaves (14 pairs at the beginning, and 1 pair at the end of the volume) less than Dénes Szabó’s sheet reconstruction.

The existence of these leaves is highly presumable on the basis of the range of sheets, but it cannot be proved based on the fragments alone.

Below I shall describe the pairs of leaves and sheets reconstructed as presented above, marking also the sheet distribution described by Dénes Szabó. I list the pairs of leaves one by one, with page numbering, according to their place in the sheet. (The last line within a sheet is the middle of the sheet).

**Sheets of the Apor Codex:**

Szabó Dénes: -3 VI (three missing sheets consisting of 6 pairs of leaves)

*Only two sheets were replaced:*

**Sheet 1.**

1-2 empty leaf — empty leaf 7-8 with small fragments in the line of the spine
3-4 empty leaf — empty leaf 5-6 with small fragments in the line of the spine

**Sheet 2.**

9-10 empty leaf — empty leaf 15-16 with small fragments in the line of the spine
11-12 empty leaf — empty leaf 13-14 with small fragments in the line of the spine

Szabó Dénes: +VI (-1-11-12)

**Sheet 3.**

17-18 empty leaf — empty leaf 39-40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>T1 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>T3 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>T4 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>T5 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>bishop’s mitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>bishop’s mitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td></td>
<td>bishop’s mitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td></td>
<td>bishop’s mitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-46</td>
<td>T10 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 65-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>T11 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>T12 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>T13 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>T14 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 55-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VII (-1-2-13)
Sheet 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41-42</td>
<td></td>
<td>empty leaf T20 67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>empty leaf 65-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(narrow paper fragment at mid-sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-46</td>
<td>T10 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 63-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>T11 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>T12 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>T13 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>T14 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 55-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VI
Sheet 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>T21 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 91-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-72</td>
<td>1-2 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 89-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-74</td>
<td>3-4 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 87-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-76</td>
<td>5-6 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 85-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-78</td>
<td>7-8 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 83-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>9-10 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 81-82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VI (-9-10-11-12)
Sheet 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>23-24 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 115-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>25-26 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 113-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>27-28 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 111-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-100</td>
<td>29-30 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 109-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-102</td>
<td>31-32 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 107-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-104</td>
<td>33-34 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 105-106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VI
Sheet 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117-118</td>
<td>39-40 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 139-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-120</td>
<td>41-42 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 137-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>43-44 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 135-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-124</td>
<td>45-46 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 133-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-126</td>
<td>47-48 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 131-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-128</td>
<td>49-50 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 129-130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VI
Sheet 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Txx — Tyy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141-142</td>
<td>63-64 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 163-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-144</td>
<td>65-66 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 161-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-146</td>
<td>67-68 —</td>
<td>empty leaf 159-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szabó Dénes: +VI
Sheet 8.
Szabó Dénes: +VI (-1-2-3-10-11)
Sheet 9.

165-166 empty leaf — empty leaf 187-188
167-168 empty leaf — empty leaf 185-186
169-170 empty leaf — 99-100 183-184 balance-shaped watermark fragment
171-172 87-88 — 97-98 181-182 balance-shaped watermark
173-174 89-90 — 95-96 179-180 balance-shaped watermark
175-176 91-92 — 93-94 177-178 no watermark

Szabó Dénes: +VI (-12)
Sheet 10.

189-190 101-102 — empty page 211-212 balance-shaped watermark fragment
191-192 103-104 — 121-122 209-210 no watermark
193-194 105-106 — 119-120 207-208 no watermark
197-198 109-110 — 115-116 203-204 balance-shaped watermark
199-200 111-112 — 113-114 201-202 no watermark

Szabó Dénes: +VI
Sheet 11.

215-216 125-126 — 143-144 233-234 no watermark
217-218 127-128 — 141-142 231-232 no watermark
219-220 129-130 — 139-140 229-230 balance-shaped watermark
221-222 131-132 — 137-138 227-228 balance-shaped watermark
223-224 133-134 — 135-136 225-226 no watermark

Szabó Dénes: -3IV

3 unnumbered sheets, four pairs of leaves per sheet pawed animal watermark
The leaves were cut out from the volume in such a way that the fragment of each pair of leaves is still preserved in the stitching

Sheet 12.

237-238 empty leaf — empty leaf 251-252
239-240 empty leaf — empty leaf 249-250
241-242 empty leaf — empty leaf 247-248
243-244 empty leaf — empty leaf 245-246

Sheet 13.

253-254 empty leaf — empty leaf 267-268
255-256 empty leaf — empty leaf 265-266
257-258 empty leaf — empty leaf 263-264
259-260 empty leaf — empty leaf 261-262

Sheet 14.
In describing the sheet distribution, I marked the “original” page numbering of the volume, written in pencil, in bold letters, my own page numbering of the fragments in regular letters and the reconstructed page numbers in italics. In the followings, for a better collation, I refer to the volume’s “original,” well visible page numbering.

The first work of the book, containing the psalms, ends at the bottom of page 146, end of sheet. Next in the volume are the strips of the removed sheet 3, with four pairs of leaves per sheet, and unknown content. The ensuing work begins on page 147 with the initial words “Jesus maria.” Conspicuously, this second work does not start at the beginning of a sheet, but a leaf “later.” This leaf, however, similar to the previous
ones, was removed, leaving only a strip behind. From the point of view of production technique, that is, at the composition of the sheets and the works, the removed, 50-pages-long text and the “Jesus maria” part belonged together. It might be the case that these parts were not, or hardly connected in their content, but their text was written continuously on the leaves. The second part ends with two missing leaves, following page 156. The third opus, the passion-dialogue of Saint Anselm, starts on a separate sheet, on page 157, and the text ends on page 186, although the traces of two more sheet fragments, including the sheet containing page 186, are still also visible. In Dénes Szabó’s opinion these pages were probably left empty. Summarizing: the codex probably consisted of three parts, but the second part might have contained two works, one of which was removed.

1.4. Watermarks of the codex

The sheets were made of paper displaying the variations of three distinct watermarks: one represents a bishop’s mitre, the second an encircled balance with a star, while the third was only partly preserved, showing the fragment of a pawed animal, possibly dragon.
There is a very slight difference in quality between the three papers, hardly visible to the naked eye: the bishop’s mitre-marked paper is whiter and thinner, harder than the balance-shaped watermarked one, and the third kind of paper was only preserved in strips, which seem to be similar to the paper with the balance-shaped watermark. The accurate definition of the watermarks has remained unsuccessful as yet, but by the oral communication of Jenő Pelbárt all three motifs were used first by the paper mill of Fabriano, and they only became widely used after the 1520s. This information hints to the Italian origin of the papers, possibly from Fabriano. The bishop’s mitre watermarks are only found on the fragments of the removed leaves at the beginning of the codex, and the final leaves. Variations of the balance-shaped watermark appear on most leaves of the book, while the pawed animal watermark only on the pages almost completely destroyed. Against my expectations, the incidence of the watermarks in the codex cannot be related to the probably independently written individual works contained therein.

Several types of encircled star and balance watermarks can be found both in the Lányi and Apor codices. However, it seems that the watermark variations are not identical, although it is possible that they come from the same paper mills, but were made by different screens and watermarks applied by different hands.

1.5. Forming and size of the sheets

A corner of one of the leaves, on page 37–38, was accidentally left turned in, and it preserved the sheet size before the bookblock was cut round. Distinctly from printing, where the entire paper sheets were printed, then folded, and the sheets were only cut after sewing, which made sewing easier, paper sheets were prepared differently for writing. In this case the sheets were cut to the size of pairs of leaves, and the sheets were formed by inserting the pairs of leaves one within the other, either before, or after the writing, adjusting to it. Since the work was done relatively systematically, it can be assessed how many pairs of leaves were cut out of one sheet. In the case of the Apor Codex, one sheet of handmade paper was first cut in half, then both half-sheets were folded in two, and one inserted into the other, that is, one sheet was used for creating two pairs of leaves. This procedure can be assumed by the rhythmic occurrence of watermarks and on the basis of the framing, since one pair of leaves of the sheet cut in half contains watermark, the other does not. For the largest part of the codex, the watermarked pair of leaves alternates with a non-watermarked one.

Naturally, since the number of pairs of leaves is partly adjusted to the length of the writing, and since the empty pages could get mixed up before writing on them, this

---

Fig. 32. The pawed animal watermark

---

1 Jenő Pelbárt filigranologist, president of MAPAVIT – Society of Hungarian Researchers of Paper and Watermarks, Budapest, Hungary.
repetition is not perfect. The relatively regular screen size of the different types and differently watermarked paper sheets made it possible to join independent works, since the similarly formed pairs of leaves of similarly sized paper sheets created pages of approximately identical size.

The traces of preparation for writing appear on several pages of the codex. In some cases the pages were ruled and most times the text areas were also delineated.

On the edge of several pages vertical rows of tiny holes are visible. Such rows of holes are present in other codices as well (e.g., the Lányi Codex), they facilitated the ruling of the pages, the delimitation of line spacing; however, in the Apor Codex the rows of holes do not correspond to line spacing. The reason may be that the sheets punched possibly for the writing of other works were eventually used, with other line spacing, for the Apor Codex.
The codex was undoubtedly written by multiple hands, possibly in various places; not much is known about the scribes, but the fingerprint of one of them was preserved on a page.

1.5. **Microscopic analysis of the paper fibres**

After the disbinding of the volume I had the opportunity for a microscopic morphological analysis of the paper of the codex. From the perspective of analysis, I divided the paper material in two, the paper of the bookblock and the paper of the pastedown; the reason is that the pastedowns are almost always applied on the volume at the time of binding, and therefore their paper usually differs from the paper of the leaves. This means that the pastedown belongs to the binding and the time of binding, and not to the work. In the case of the Apor Codex, the pastedowns were mostly destroyed, only fragments of them survive pasted over the wooden boards. I found no watermarks on the pastedown fragments that could have enriched the history of the codex with some more details. The sample taken from the pastedown of the disbound codex revealed a mixture of several kinds of fibres. The majority of the fibres contained in the sample were flax and hemp, but there also were some remains of cotton. The fibres in the sample were in a highly fibrillated and mechanically less revealed state, small smashed fibre fragments mixed with the longer, almost intact fibres.
The sample taken from the leaves came from the folded sheets attached to the parchment lining of the spine, and it looked more uniform than the pastedown under the microscope. Mechanically revealed, fibrillated flax fibres were visible in the sample. The fibres are longer and there less smashed fibre fragments between them than in the pastedown sample.

2. **Condition of the book**

The binding of the codex was primarily worn and damaged by usage in the course of centuries. In time, the leather cover turned darker, wore out, and got completely detached from the boards and the spine. The detached leather shrank at the edges, causing the distortion of even the stamped frames. The caps were destroyed together with part of the leather cover of the spine. The grain of the spine leather cracked, the printing on it is hardly visible. In the middle of the front board the leather was torn. The leather wore off at the edges of the boards even before the leather cover became detached, therefore the preserved turn-ins, except for the fore edge of the front board, got also detached from the leather cover of the boards. Likewise the turn-ins of the front board, except for the head edge. The turn-ins were missing from the back cover, only their trace was visible.

Fig. 39. The detached, fragmentary, and cracked binding leather
The sewing disintegrated at the beginning and end of the codex because of the mutilations and mould, the sheets went loose. The leather bands remained intact, although fragile, but the endband supports broke in the opening. The stitches fixing the leather endband supports were also undone together with the sewing, since they were made in the same work process.

The wooden boards twisted, warped, the back board cracked. The boards considerably shrank in their width, therefore the bookblock protruded from the binding at the front.

The spine went hollow with much use, because the leaves were removed and the clasps were lost.

The parchment strips lining the spine were for their most part detached, and broke at the opening of the book. The ends of the strips, pasted to the inner side of the boards, were preserved, partly hidden under the pastedown fragments.
The clasp was only preserved at the tail end of the front board, at the head only the fixing nails and the impression of the catch plate can be seen. The straps fixing the plates were torn at the edge of the board, their almost only parts preserved were those hidden under the binding leather. The hooks were also lost with the straps. The
pastedowns were almost completely destroyed, only the torn-out fragments of the pastedowns pasted onto the boards were preserved.

The leaves bear the yellowish-brownish water stains of repeated water damage. Due to the humidity of the paper, the leaves were infested with mould, the greyish spots can be seen all over the paper edges. It also points to mould infection that some pages dampened unevenly, with stains when placed in water. The effects of mould infection were only visible on the edges of the leaves, but the text area was not affected. However, probably it was again humidity and mould which caused on several pages the decay of the binding medium of the ink, causing ink corrosion. In the corroded places a brown halo appeared adjacent to the ink and the writing became paler. The high level of ink loss had also been mentioned by Dénes Szabó in his book.
Luckily, at the same time, the repeated water damage did not dissolve the ink of the manuscript, nor the red-coloured highlights. The surface of the thickly applied red paint often cracked.

Water and mechanical damage were a lesser cause of the codex’s paper destruction; the greatest reason of paper damage, except mutilation, was the ink used when writing the codex. Several mixtures of ink were used in this process. Presumably, in the process of ink preparation the right proportion of the ingredients was not observed, and this caused the modification of ink composition, and as a result, the various amount of damage done to the pages written in ink. On the text areas the paper turned brown and fragile around the letters. Primarily on the leaves written on both sides the paper cracked and split, the letters fell out some places, and the leaves split open through several centimetres along the ligatures of handwriting.
The actual state of the leaves, due to the strict conservation and careful manipulation of the book, was only revealed during the restoration. It has become apparent that even on the seemingly intact areas the paper underneath the letters cracked and the text was lost or split open even at the slightest movement.

However, the volume’s destruction was first of all due to mutilation(s), causing the loss of almost a third of the book. The first and middle part of the codex was seriously mutilated, but several other pages were missing as well throughout the whole book. The amount of missing pages can be assumed partly by content analysis, partly by the page fragments preserved in the binding.
3. Restoration of the codex

The codex was photographed, described, and limned before the restoration process began.

3.1. Removing the bookblock from the binding

Before disbinding, the pastedowns had to be steeped off the boards, therefore I made a solubility test for the notes on the pastedowns. The gift note of Zsuzsánna Apor dissolved in water, and did not dissolve in alcohol, therefore it could be fixed with an alcohol solution of Regnál.¹

¹ Regnál S1 (polyvynil butyral acetal): “a condensation product of polyvynil alcohol and butyraldehyde. Not all OH-groups can be acetalized, the viscosity of the solution of products acetalized in various proportions increases in direct proportion with the degree of acetalization. In restoration we use the polyvynil butyral produced by the Hoechst company under the name Mowital B, the way described by the Czech patent Regnál S1. The flexibility of polyvynil butyral is exceptional, and it dissolves well in several kinds of (polar and non-polar) organic solvents (alcohols, acetone, amine, ethyl, and butyl acetate, chloroform, toluene). It is insoluble in water, benzene, or gasoline... It is highly light resistant. It is resistant to animal and vegetal fats and oils, to acids, alkali, hydrogen-peroxide. The dried film melts well at 90–100°C, adheres well on smooth surfaces. In practice, most often its ethyl alcohol solution is used in various concentrations.” Cf. Kastaly Beatrix, Ragasztóanyagok a könyvkötésben és a papírrestaurálásban. A könyv-és papírrestaurátor tanfolyam jegyzetei (Adhesive materials used in bookbinding and paper restoration. Notes of the course of book and paper restoration) (Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1991).
Then the removal of pastedowns was made by local wetting, by wet blotting-paper. The removed fragments were washed in clean, lukewarm water, without the use of surfactants. Surfactants were not necessary because the paper wetted and cleaned well, while also I wished to keep the time of wet treatment at a minimum in order to protect the handwriting. Repeated rinsing necessary after the use of surfactants would have increased the water treatment time. After drying and surfacing, the cleaned fragments were put aside.

The parchment linings resting under the pastedown fragments were removed dry as they were if the paste material was weak, and by wetting if the paste material was still holding well. On its side facing the wooden board, the parchment lining contained bright reddish-pinkish stains of paint. The fragments thus removed were preserved for further research.

After removing the wooden nails fixing the back board, the board could be taken off.

The leather cover of the front board, left dry, was only raised on the level of the leather bands to have access to the fixing nails. Afterwards I removed the wooden nails attaching the leather bands to the front board, and I took off the front board as well.

### 3.2. Disassembling the bookblock

I removed the sheets from the bookblock one by one, I separated the individual pairs of opened leaves, divided by blank pages, and I put them into envelopes. I noted on the envelope the pairs of leaves contained in them, using the leaf numbering of the codex. Next to the pairs of leaves I noted the state of the leaf and the existence and type of the watermark, if there was any.

Then any kind of working process applied to that particular leaf was also noted on the envelope. Thus every treatment of the leaf could be easily followed.

The first sheets of the book were almost entirely torn out; their existence can be deduced from the missing contents and the fragments rolled over the sewing threads. The small preserved fragments were also deposited in separate envelopes, “sheet by sheet”.

![Fig. 51. Fixation protected water soluble ink from moisture](image-url)
Also at the beginning of the book, there are sheets which were not numbered; I noted with them with a mark consisting of the letter T (‘töredék’ – ‘fragment’ in Hungarian) and a number.

3.3. The wet treatment of the leaves

The book was written in ink made of several mixtures and red and green paint as emphasis. The various types of ink caused different levels of corrosion on the leaves. The repeated water damage was not only a catalyst of the destructive effect of the inks, but it also started another kind of damage. The wet pages were an appropriate medium for mould fungi, their harmful effect manifested not only in the paper’s turning darker and fragile, but also in the decay of the binding material of the inks. However, ink loss could have been caused by other factors as well, such as iron gall ink corrosion. This latter cause is proved by the fact that if there was no ink corrosion on the page, there was no ink loss either. However, in places affected both by ink corrosion and mould, the ink loss was even more serious. Having lost their binding material, the grains of ink fell off the written surface, leaving only a slight trace of the letters on the paper. The particles formed a brown halo on the paper around the letters, diminishing even further the sharpness of writing. Therefore it was a vital goal of the restoration to stop not only ink corrosion, but also the loss of ink.

All stages of ink corrosion could be observed on the codex, but some parts of the text were not affected at all. The first and longest first part containing the psalms and canticles was damaged by ink corrosion to various degrees, but the two subsequent parts of the colligate were not affected. The damage was also influenced by the Bastarda type script of the codex, because these letter types are thick, thus the ink was applied in a thick layer, causing ink corrosion on a relatively large surface.

The treatment of the leaves affected by ink corrosion and the measurements before treatment were made after the bookblock was disassembled. Based on the results of solubility tests, neither the inks nor the paints needed any fixation before washing. The further ink loss could be avoided during treatment by careful manipulation and the elimination of rubbing effects. The fixation of the ink would have prevented the leaves to be adequately cleaned, would have decreased the efficiency of the substances used to stop ink corrosion, therefore I probably had better results applying it at the end. Orsolya Koppán measured the pH value and made tests to detect free iron ions on the detached leaves of the sheets, of variable states. The values of the measurements were a good
reference on the condition of the paper in written and unwritten areas, while they also proved the differences between visibly different levels of ink corrosion. On places with heavy ink corrosion, the values obtained by iron tests were extremely high. The measurement values can be found in a table attached to the end of this presentation. The further treatment of the leaves happened then in the knowledge of these results. The solutions used for treatment were also made by Orsolya Koppán.¹

The processes going on during the preparation of iron gall ink account for the colour of the ink and the possible causes of ink corrosion. The extract of oak galls, tannin, was mixed with ferrous sulphate (Fe(II)SO₄) which resulted in light brown iron(II) gallate and sulphuric acid. On writing, the iron(II) gallate was oxidated due to atmospheric oxygen, making a dark brown iron(III) gallate. The proportion of ferrous sulphate and tannin in the mixture influences the colour and durability of the ink, and the corrosion of the paper or parchment. If there is a surplus of ferrous sulphate in the solution, it triggers redox catalytic processes which lead to ink corrosion. While the ink degrades cellulose, two important reaction mechanisms are triggered: one is the acid hydrolysis of cellulose, caused by the acidity of the ink, the other is the catalytic oxidation of cellulose, caused by the so-called non-modified ink by free Fe²⁺ ions. These two processes must be stopped during restoration. According to new research, the effect of phytate ² of stopping oxidation is successful when combined with deacidification. The treatment with calcium phytate and calcium bicarbonate yields the best results. This treatment stops both degrading actions of ink corrosion.


² Phytate, myo-Inositol hexakis (dihydrogen phosphate), the salt of phytic acid. To prepare a calcium phytate solution, for 6.2 cm³ of 40% phytic acid we dose 1.2 g calcium carbonate, then add distilled water up to 2000 cm³, following which we set its pH to 5.8 with 3.2% ammonium hydroxide. Cf. also Enke Huhsmann and Ulrike Hähner, “Work standard for the treatment of 18th and 19th century iron gall ink documents with calcium phytate calcium hydrogen carbonate,” *Restaurator – International Journal for the Preservation of Library and Archival Material* 4 (2008): 274–319.

Figs. 53–54. Result of the iron test on the test strip before and after treatment
3.4. Washing the leaves and bonding of free iron ions

Experience proves that the best way to attenuate the darkish stains left by the repeated water damage is washing with water. The wet treatment of the leaves, besides aesthetic considerations, was also required by the results of the iron test.

I washed the individual pairs of leaves, placed on a screen, with clean water for 20 minutes; the washing removed the water soluble acid components deriving from the decay of ink and cellulose.

Moving the pages on top of the screen, I placed them after the water in a bath of calcium phytate, which made a complex of the free Fe(II) ions of the ink.

Fig. 55. Washing the leaves. The picture shows the elimination of water soluble decomposition products and the uneven wetting of the mould infested paper

The phytate bath was followed by a short water rinse, which removed the surplus of phytate from the leaves.
As a next step, I placed the leaves in a calcium bicarbonate bath for 20 minutes. This bath neutralized the leaves with alkaline precipitation, securing a long protection for acid catalyzed hydrolysis. After treatment, the leaves were air dried, without pressing. For a faster drying I changed blotting paper leaves under the codex leaves placed upon the screen. The last step of phytate treatment, gelatine sizing, was only applied after the leaves were repaired, because the damp treatment of the leaves was not finished with the phytate treatment.

The cleaned leaves were scanned in this phase of the restoration work because in this state the leaves were already clean but no repairs were made yet on the original parts. Later research of the codex can best be conducted on the basis of the scanned images.
3.5. Completion of damaged leaves

I planned to complete the leaves by manual leaf-casting, which also required the leaves to be wetted; therefore sizing was only worth doing after leaf-casting. Experience proved that manual casting yielded the best results on multiple coloured leaves, since in this case several colours of paper fibres could be used, making the completed pages look more uniform. The use of an intermediary shade appears as a disturbing spot both in darker and in lighter areas, while the colour specifically chosen for the spot to be completed fades into its environment. Therefore, after the scanning, I blended several colours of paper pulp, some of them matched to the colour of the writing on the paper, but after several trials of leaf-casting I still was not able to obtain satisfactory results. As hard as I tried, the paper pulp covered too much of the original text. Therefore I removed the cast. The failure could have been caused by the fact that the intertwined paper fibres formed too large and compact heaps on the surface and these heaps could no longer be ordered along the cracks. Due to the differences in colour between the letters and the paper, I could not choose the optimal colour for the paper mash, therefore the correction appeared on the surface as a spot.
However, on the edges and larger splits of the leaves the leaf-casting completion looked well.

Then I had to find a different method to complete the cracks and splits. After repeated experiments, the best results were obtained by manual repair. The small size of the splits and cracks, and the weakness of the ink-corroded paper only allowed for special repairing techniques. I started the process of manual repair by casting thin leaves, painting them in watercolour adjusted to the colour of the inks. I tore these leaves into tiny pieces and used these little “fluffs” for manual repair. The cracks and splits were well visible after placing the leaves to repair on a light table. I used two fine brushes for the repairs, first I sized the edge of the cracks and splits. Then, wetting the other brush, I chose the right piece of fibre from among the torn-up leaves, and glued the small piece stuck to the wet brush onto the split. If the split was not larger than the letter, I tried to keep the repair within the contours of the letters. This method, although very laborious, covered and changed the writing area to the least extent.

After these successful tests I repaired the leaves in two stages. The edges and the larger cracks were completed by manual leaf-casting. The paper for leaf-casting was prepared from fibres of flax of 35 °SR degree. Colouring was made by direct dyes,\(^1\) adjusted to the colour of the original leaves. The use of direct dyes is very important, because they attach to the fibres with secondary bonds, therefore the fibres dyed in separate vessels no longer discolour the original leaves.

---

\(^1\) Direct dyes: Pergasol (Manufacturer: Giba-Geigy; Distributor: Ciba-Geigy Hungária KFT, 1056 Budapest, Belgrád rakpart, Hűvösvölgyi út 83). “Direct (subtractive) dyes – similar to acid dyes – are azo compounds containing sulpho-groups mostly in the form of sodium salt. Their particular characteristic is that they are directly attached to cellulose – without fixation substances. They attach to cellulose fibres with secondary valence-forces”. See Dr. Ferenc Péter, ed., Színezék kézikönyv (Handbook of dyes) (Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó, 1968), 420.
Then I sized the leaves with a gelatine solution of 1%; gelatine sizing does not only reinforce the leaves, but also maintains the stability of the iron complex formed during phytate treatment.

The cast leaves were air-dried on the screen used for casting, then, after drying and being removed from the screen, they were re-wetted and pressed with help of felt, Bondina, and filter paper. The pressing formed the surface, thickness, and compactness of the completion.

As a second step, I proceeded to the manual repair of the ink corrosion of the leaves, which took the longest time during restoration. I used Glutofix 600 as a glue for repair. I flattened the corrected leaves by careful pressing. Finally, the loss of ink caused by the decay of the binding matter on the completed and flattened leaves was stopped by fixing the ink with a 2 % alcohol solution of Klucel M. The red paint, despite its being cracked, stuck firmly to the surface, therefore it needed no fixation.

1 Bondina. A non-woven polyester textile, most glues used in restoration (here gelatine) do not cleave to it.
2 Glutofix 600 (methylhydroxyethylcellulose). “It is commercialized in the form of a white or yellowish powder or granules. The water soluble commercial product contains approx. 25–30% -OHCH₃ –groups, which corresponds to 1.5–2 ether groups per unit. The products containing 2 ether groups can be dissolved not only in water, but also in certain solvent mixtures as well.” (Kastaly, Ragasztóanyagok..., 17.)
3 Klucel M (hydroxypropylcellulose). The various letters distinguishing the types of Klucels refer to versions of various degrees of polymerization. Klucel M can best be used for the binding of cracked, scaling dyes to their carrying surface. (Ibid., 19–20.)
Fig. 60. Tearing tiny pieces from the paper used for repairs

Fig. 61. Manual repair of the leaves

Figs. 62–63. Ink corroded letters before and after repair
3.6. Replacing the missing leaves

The restoration work was not confined to the completion of fragmentary leaves, but it also proceeded with the replacement of the documented hiatuses in the leaves. The replacement does not only demonstrate the amount of completions, but also secured the reconstruction of the body and binding of the book.

The leaves used for completion were also manually cast, their colour was adjusted to the colour of the leaves. The colouring was made by direct dyes used in paper and textile manufacture. The leaves were also sized with gelatine. Similarly to the completed papers, the leaves used for completing the pastedowns were also produced by manual leaf-casting.

I ordered the completed pair of leaves into sheets, and I completed the sheets with the leaves made for replacement. I received major help from Edit Madas in establishing the final sheet distribution and the order of the leaves.

The completions on the cast pages extending over the edges of the leaves were cut round to size first at the head and the bottom. Once the sheets were formed, I prepared the pastedowns by the size of the codex, in the generally used form of the age, also by manual casting.

Before I began sewing, I chose a white thread similar to the original sewing thread, then dyed it, using a metal-complex dye, adjusting it to the colour of the original thread.

Based on the original production technique, the sewing of the sheets was performed in parallel with the fixing of the endband support. As the original leather bands and the endband support would not support the strain of a new binding, bands and endband supports were prepared similarly to the originals from cow hide, and then stretched on the sewing press.

1 Metal-complex dye (Irgaderm; Manufacturer: Ciba-Geigy). General characteristics of Irgaderm colouring solutions: the Irgaderm fluid dyes are primarily metal-complex dyes, homogeneous, non-saline solutions, in water soluble, environment-friendly organic solvents (except Irgaderm Black N, which contains no organic solvent). Characteristics: Irgaderm fluids can be freely mixed with each other or with water, or can be diluted with adequate organic solvents. They should preferably be diluted with soft water. If there is only hard water available, the stability of the dye bath can be increased by 1-methoxy-2-propanol. Application: Irgaderm dyes can be used for ground dyeing of all kinds of leather (full grain leather, nubuck), darkening, correcting, or balancing the colour of dyed leathers, dying binding materials used in leather preparation and lacquers, or refreshing the colour of leather.
After this I sewed the sheets using the original technique of double threads.

After the sewing, it became possible to cut the leaf-castings with a greater precision, as a result of which not only the size of the original leaf was taken into consideration, but also the original leaf hanging out the most from the codex. This was needed in order not to leave the margin of the leaf hanging out unprotected on the edge.

The endbands seemingly unbound as a unity could not be fastened again to the binding, and their preservation could only be possible if the original binding technique was not reconstructed. But in this case the loosened and torn endband support could not have filled its band and fixing function, and the final binding could have become much more vulnerable. That is why the original binding technique was applied and not the reuse of the different component parts. Of course, every unbound material was attached to the codex for further examination. The endband supports were produced in two stages, according to the original method: first the support was fastened, then decorative stitches were sewn using two colors. The sewing thread was colored by using metal complex dyes and the double colored endband was sown with four threads each.
After the sewing of the endband, the spine of the codex was glued using a thin layer. The torn parchment linings were replaced by new ones and attached to the spine with animal glue.

3.7. Mending and reattaching the wooden boards

The original wooden boards considerably shrunk transversally, while the textblock stuck out of the boards. The exact measure of shrinking could not be determined before the unbinding because of the damages of the textblock. After the rebinding of the textblock, it became obvious that the boards are shrunk to such an extent that it not only hangs down to bevelled boards, but sticks out of the boards. That is why the original boards could be used only after completion. The boards not only shrunk, but also deflected and the back board is cracked in grain direction. The deflection made the measuring of the board even harder. The deflection was set back almost immediately after prolonged pressing, after the elimination of compressive force. The corners of the boards were damaged by extensive usage. The completion of the boards was possible only by cutting them along grain direction, as the corners were bevelled. The location of the cut was determined by the crack of the board and the place of the deflection. In completion, the width of the board fractured by the blade of the saw needed to be taken into consideration. For the completion a piece of beech wood was used, slightly thicker than the original wood. This was needed because the thickness of the board was not even.
Paper boards were made for the textblock, as measuring the paper boards to the wooden boards made the determination of the shrinking level of the wooden board, which was different in the case of the two boards: one was 12 mm, the other 15 mm. These wooden boards were sawn around the joint with a circular saw and the paper boards were used as a pattern in preparing the patches and in gluing. In determining the size of the patches, the loss of material caused by the sawing of the wood needed to be taken in consideration. Cutting out the insertions was also performed with a circular saw.

The completions were made using epoxy resin\(^1\) with the help of clamps, using the foiled paper board as joining elements.

After the binding of the glue the insertions were carved with a chisel to fit the original boards, and the final surface was shaped with emery paper.

---

\(^1\) Artiwood epoxi resin: A two-component material for filling cracks in wood, containing epoxy resin. It can be removed by using heat and solvents. After 24 hours of binding, it can easily be carved, later on polished, filed. Distributor: Szép Mesterségek Restaurátor Kft. (H-1082 Budapest, Baross u. 41).
The corners were completed by epoxy resin as well, and shaped with a file to the original shape of the corners. Next the boards were fixed in their place and glued to the parchment lining with glue. After drying, thongs were fastened with wooden pegs to the boards.

3.8. Replacing the missing clasps

The hook-clasp fastenings of the binding were missing, except one catch plate on the front board and one anchor plate on the back board. Due to the remaining clasp and knowing the characteristics of the types of clasps, an authentic reconstruction became possible. A reconstruction plan of the fastenings was prepared by using analogies. Based on the types of clasps, the fastenings were shaped from brass plate using Schlippe-salt for tarnishing.

---

1 Tóth Zsuzsanna: Csatok és veretek könyvtáblákon (Clasps on book boards), manuscript.
The fastenings used to be fixed with wire rivets, which can be well observed in removing old fastenings. Similar shapes can be achieved by filing factory wire nails or, applying the original technique, by using wires with the application of small shoulders. In the fixing of the fastenings of the Apor codex both methods were used to produce nails, and were put aside until the completion of the binding.

![Fig. 73. Sawing the outlines of the clasp from the board](image)

The leather of the original binding of the codex was damaged and mechanically weakened, so it was necessary to place a new binding underneath the original to ensure the further use of the codex. A goatskin with a grain pattern similar to the original was chosen and dyed with metal complex-based leather dyes.

3.9. Binding

The tinted skin was cut to the appropriate size and edge-pared. The new skin covering was then pulled on the volume.

![Fig. 74. The new covering on the codex](image)

1 Surface treatment of brass: after the cautious degreasing of the fastening boiling in a watery solution of 10% sodium-thioantimoniate (Na2SbS4x·9H2O, Schlippe-salt) turns brass into dark brown.
The broken straps of the fastenings were replaced by new straps prepared according to the original technique bent and fitted in the back side.

The stripes were decorated with line pallet, according to the stamp of the remaining fragment. The stamp was supplemented because this is a characteristic of binding that could be preserved in this way.

The next step was the thinning of the original cover leather. Because of the shrinking of the cover leather and the completion of the boards, it could only be aesthetically inserted after separating it into three parts.

The original binding was humidified, softened by oil in water emulsion¹ and adhered with rice-starch paste.

Once the covering was complete, the catch plates were fixed to the front board with the prepared nails, the straps were fixed to the back board with animal glue. After drying, they were fixed with nails, as well. The nails are prevented from breaking with the help of a clamp; one of them remained on the binding, the other was newly made.

Pastedowns were applied using rice-starch paste. After drying, the clasps were fixed to the straps. Finally, fragments of the original paste-downs were adhered to the inner mirror of the board.

¹ Oil in water emulsion: 400 cm³ distilled water; 30 g neat’s foot oil; 40g fatty alcohol sulfate; 10g lanolin; a small amount of antioxidants dissolved in alcohol.
Fig. 78. The front board of the finished codex
Fig. 79. The edge

Fig. 80. The corner of the codex with the leather covering

Fig. 81. The list of defects resolved in the codex
The restored codex and the unbound fragments were returned to the Szekler National Museum in Sepsiszentgyörgy (Sfântu Gheorghe), Romania.

Translated by Emese Czintos and Boglárka Németh

APPENDIX
TREATMENT REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper, inner margin of the leaf</th>
<th>pH value of paper Before treatment</th>
<th>pH value of paper After treatment</th>
<th>pH value of inked areas Before treatment</th>
<th>pH value of inked areas After treatment</th>
<th>Fe$^{2+}$-test*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F20 (fragment) inner marge</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On water stain</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5.58 line 3 '...setek'</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.15 line 4:’mu’</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>100-250 !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.32(at head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 25</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.66 line 3:’oda’</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>500 !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 33</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>3.5 line 3:’te most’</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>500 !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On margin with water stain</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper, inner margin of the leaf</td>
<td>pH value of paper</td>
<td>pH value of inked areas</td>
<td>Fe²⁺-test*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before treatment</td>
<td>After treatment</td>
<td>Before treatment</td>
<td>After treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 43</td>
<td>6,04</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>6,87</td>
<td>100-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line 3: 'pokolhoz'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 61</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>6,41</td>
<td>4,09</td>
<td>6,43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line 2: 'nemzetekbe'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 69</td>
<td>6,14</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>4,36</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(brown stain) line 2: 'nemzetek'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 81</td>
<td>5,83</td>
<td>6,87</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line 4: 'elvitesenek'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 97</td>
<td>5,93</td>
<td>6,71</td>
<td>a/ 3,69 (brown stain) line 4: 'te' b/ 4,61 line 6: 'beszedimet'</td>
<td>6,36</td>
<td>100-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 99</td>
<td>5,64</td>
<td>6,27</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>6,04</td>
<td>3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line 5: 'vigassaggal'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 105</td>
<td>6,24</td>
<td>6,47</td>
<td>a/ 3,63 line 4: 'neved' b/ 3,8 line 6: 'nepet'</td>
<td>6,45</td>
<td>25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 109</td>
<td>6,18</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>3,81</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line 5: 'kezedet'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper, inner margin of the leaf</th>
<th>pH value of paper Before treatment</th>
<th>pH value of inked areas Before treatment</th>
<th>pH value of inked areas After treatment</th>
<th>Fe²⁺-test* Before treatment</th>
<th>Fe²⁺-test* After treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 123</td>
<td>6,15</td>
<td>3,86 line 3: 'lelkek'</td>
<td>6,75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 139</td>
<td>6,05</td>
<td>5,7 line 3: 'mynden'</td>
<td>6,59</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 145</td>
<td>6,24</td>
<td>a/ 5,74 line 4: 'fel'</td>
<td>6,95</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b/ 5,28 (ink stain)</td>
<td>7,03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 149</td>
<td>6,01</td>
<td>6,05 line 3: 'fejedelemason'</td>
<td>6,67</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 163</td>
<td>6,04</td>
<td>5,22 line 2: 'Isten'</td>
<td>7,14</td>
<td>(0-3) 1</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 185 (last)</td>
<td>5,25</td>
<td>5,07 line 2: 'oly'</td>
<td>6,37</td>
<td>(0-3) 2</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MERCK Iron Test
a). Dipping the test strip in the sample solution for one second such a way that the reaction zone is properly wetted.
b). Removing the test strip, shaking off the excess liquid and after 10 seconds, comparing the reaction zone with the color scale.
0-500 mg/l Fe²⁺ (0: white, 3: light pink, 500: dark red)
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According to the traditional (positivist) approach, any work in the humanities is articulated in two steps, one preceding the other. In the first step we establish the text, that is, we critically compare the preserved or discovered textual variants for the purpose of creating or reconstruing a possibly final, canonical variant, and this is supposed to be the task of philology. The second step is interpretation (hermeneutics), that is, the interpretation from various perspectives of the textual variant established as a result of philological work.1 In this approach philology precedes hermeneutics and is ostensibly

---

* I am indebted to the Hungarian National Research Fund (OTKA) for supporting the research leading up to the present paper (project number: OTKA K-75840). The version published here was completed within the framework of MTA-ELTE Hermeneutics Research Group.
1 Cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, “Philosophie und Philologie. Über von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,” in Idem, Griechische Philosophie II, Gesammelte Werke, vol. 6 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1985), 271–277, 276. He says that during his university years, the following was customary on philology seminars: “Da hatte man erst den Text herzustellen (und sogar zu übersetzen), und dann hatte man
separated from it; and interpretation is built upon the results of philology. This fair (ideal-typical) scheme might work indeed in some – fortunate – cases; however, during the redaction process of (historical-critical) life-work editions of important thinkers it is often doomed to failure. For, more often than not, the establishment of the ultimate text version is itself not something happening in a laboratory environment, in a space exempt from interpretation. In Hegel’s case, for instance, it seems that the situation was exactly the opposite: according to the main streamline of present-day Hegel-research Hegel’s disciples edited and published Hegel’s texts on the basis of their image (interpretation) of Hegel. In what follows, I wish to analyze the relation of textual criticism, interpretation, and editing history by way of case studies, starting from the conclusions drawn from, of all the important life-work editions, primarily Hegel’s and Heidegger’s, but with an eye also to Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Gadamer.

I.
I.1. As the new life-work editions of the prominent figures of German idealism began to gain ever more definite shape as a research project after WWII, the discussions regarding the necessity of the new editions obviously appeared embedded into the critical reflections on edition history. In Hegel’s case, this critical view on his edition history offered approximately the following summary picture.¹

Hegel published only a small number of works in his lifetime. Apart from some lesser writings, reviews published in magazines, he only had two substantial, elaborated works published in his lifetime, which could be regarded as books in an appropriate sense: the *Phenomenology* and the *Logic*. The *Encyclopedia* and the *Philosophy of Right* are only “grounding lines”, “sketches”, which he annexed to his lectures for his students; however, he published not even similar abstracts for his other lectures (philosophy of
history, aesthetics, history of religion, history of philosophy). His works were prepared for publication in twenty-one volumes with the hard work of a group of his students between 1832 and 1845. (*Vollständige Ausgabe durch einen Verein von Freunden des Vereweigten* [Complete edition published by the Association of the Friends of the Deceased], an edition usually referred to in scholarship as *Freundesvereinsausgabe*, hence the abbreviation I shall use hereinafter: FVA). Even today, this continues to appear like a remarkable accomplishment, which has decisively determined the Hegel-image of subsequent ages; however, in the words of the eminent Hegel-scholar, Friedhelm Nicolin, the first head of the Hegel Archives founded in 1958, this edition contained neither the “complete”, nor the “real” Hegel.¹ In the words of a researcher thirty years later, “the reception history of Hegelian philosophy has been influenced by the edition policy of the editors of his works to a greater extent than that of almost every other philosopher.”² The disciples totally neglected Hegel’s evolution; they swept aside the early sketches and manuscripts preserved by the philosopher himself (part of them has been lost indeed ever since); by contrast, they published the Encyclopedia and the Philosophy of Right, representative for the Berlin period, in a considerably extended version. They compiled supplements taken from the most various places with the works published by Hegel himself, and composed the Berlin lectures preserved in his legacy as compact works, based on compilations of lecture manuscripts from various years, and of author’s and students’ notes –reference to the sources appeared only in the introduction of the individual volumes, with no further remarks made in the body of the text. By this edition technique, highly questionable from a contemporary scholarly viewpoint, which had made the differences in Hegel’s development almost unrecognizable, they wished to suggest a well-defined Hegel-image: they defended and perpetuated Hegel, in harmony with their scientific and cultural political views, as the philosopher of the system, and the system itself as a closed and undefeatable fortress.³ It is thus becoming increasingly difficult to avoid the conclusion: what we know as the Hegelian *system* is in fact the work not of Hegel himself but of his *disciples*; “a document of Hegelianism, of the Hegel-school.”⁴

After many decades of forgetting and rejection, the interest in Hegel only gained new impetus around the turn of the century; Wilhelm Dilthey formulated then the need for an *entwicklungsgeschichtlich* study of Hegelian philosophy, and Hermann Nohl published the preserved writings of the young Hegel in 1907 on Dilthey’s advice. The so-called anniversary edition published by Hermann Glockner in the 1930s contained emendations compared to the original, however, it did not eliminate its fundamental shortcomings. The new critical edition started by Georg Lasson and continued through the 1930s by Johannes Hoffmeister, after several decades of hard work and repeated changes in its conception, remained unfinished in the mid-1950s.

⁴ Nicolin, “Probleme und Stand der Hegel-Edition,” 118. (“Dokument des Hegelianismus, der Hegelschule”)
It had thus become clear that even the most respectful efforts of individual researchers were not sufficient to cope with the task of editing Hegel’s works. The German Research Foundation (DFG) established a committee in 1957 for the historical critical edition of Hegel’s works, and in 1958 the Hegel Archives were founded in Bonn for this purpose, moving to Bochum a decade later, where it has been functioning ever since as an independent institution of the Ruhr University in Bochum, under the patronage of the North Rhine–Westphalia Academy of Sciences. The new, major Hegel-edition, designed for around forty volumes started at the end of the 1960s. The first series, consisting of twenty-two volumes, containing the works published in Hegel’s lifetime and his legacy, manuscripts and sketches, approaches its end after forty years of editorial work (only three more volumes awaiting publication), but the publication of the second series, presenting Hegel’s university lectures, is repeatedly delayed; the first volume of this series was only published in 2008. (Gesammelte Werke, vol. 25, 1. Vorlesungen über die Philosophie des subjektiven Geistes. Teilband 1; vol. 25,2 follows in 2012.)

The new academic edition understands itself as a historical-critical edition, but its title is more modest: Gesammelte Werke (taking this into account, it will not be referred to with the abbreviation HKA [Historisch-kritische Ausgabe], but GW); its purpose is to present Hegel’s development on the basis of the available sources, continuously collected by the Archives, and it is intended to be done using the original sources, preceding the disciples’ edition. At any rate, the condition of the textual basis of Hegel’s lectures and the theoretical difficulties related to an adequate scholarly edition led to the decision that these lectures must be published first as a “test-edition”, in a series entitled Vorlesungen, outside of the critical edition (indeed, more than fifteen volumes were published in this series during the last twenty-five years). Then, only following the experiences gained during the preparation of this “test-edition”, and its echoes in the scholarship, would these texts be published in approximately ten volumes in the framework of the second series of the critical edition. The devious way of the “test-edition” explains the fact that the first volume of the second series was published only as late as 2008.1

Reaching behind the disciples’ Hegel edition means that the manuscripts, notes, lecture notes, etc. which stood at the basis of the compilations, as far as they can still be found, will be processed and edited independently. However, many of these sources have since been lost. The notes which the Hegel-students used to compile the volumes of the lectures not prepared for print by Hegel are no longer extant for their most part, therefore it is impossible to supervise these editions from a textual-critical point of view, or to come up with a new, alternative textual-critical edition. It is, of course, legitimate to criticize the principle of the edition – the fact of compilation –, and indeed, contemporary philology is consistently reluctant to follow it.

---

The mentioned scarcity of the original Hegelian manuscripts which once were at the basis of the FVA, and the rejection of the method of compilation resulted in a new, individual interest in the lectures of different years, the preserved Hegelian manuscripts and the students’ notes about the lectures (Mitschriften, Nachschriften). The Hegel Archives have been collecting all these documents systematically: both the Hegel-manuscripts and the lecture notes. As for these latter ones, around 130 Nachschriften were discovered in various sources before the 1990s, and the Archives managed to acquire ninety of these.1

1.2. This short summary naturally communicates the self-image, the retrospective self-interpretation of the Hegel Archives. At a distance of four decades, and considering the evolution of the Hegeledition ever since, the following remarks may be appropriate. It may indeed be true that the disciples’ Hegel-edition “contained neither the »complete« Hegel, nor the »real« Hegel”, however, it is highly doubtful whether either of the two could be a real goal to achieve at all. Apart from the “complete” Hegel, what would a “real” Hegel consist of? “What we know today as the Hegelian system” may well be “the work of the disciples […], a »document of the Hegel-school«”; still, it is questionable, after forty years of work in the Archives, whether this present age could come up with anything better, whether it could present an alternative Hegeledition. This recognition is gradually becoming conscious in the Hegel Archives, and it may not be merely incidental that the optimistic and self-assured remarks about the »complete« or the »real« Hegel no longer tend to appear these days. And as for the criticism of the disciples’ Hegel-edition: it is one thing to criticize a compilation because it is one, and it is quite another to claim to be able to put it aside and go back to the original sources; and it is again another thing to formulate the suspicion that the editors inserted their own ideas not pertaining to the compiled parts, that the preparation for printing is a highly biassed transcription.

The history, difficulties, and present state of the edition of Hegel’s life-work could be detailed and deepened in several other respects – to some of them I shall return later on – but from the perspective of this study the above considerations are a sufficient basis for some conclusions. Our initial thesis was the following: the philological work of preparation for print, the establishment of the text is not a work done in a laboratory environment as a space void of interpretation, and hopefully the summary presented above was an adequate illustration of this fact. The very expression of “edition policy” – sounding even quite astounding, or at least unusual in Hungarian – refers to preliminary interpretations, well determined preconceptions. One may conclude: it was not only the Hegel-edition that formed the Hegel-image, but also the other way round: the Hegel-edition itself was made on the basis of a particular image of Hegel; what is more, this image not only reclined on preconceptions, but it implied definite cultural political goals and expectations connected to the future. It was not only a space not at all void of interpretation where the philological work of the disciples took place, but also one not at all void of “cultural policy” either.

I. 3. The review of the historical circumstances and the particular constellation of these circumstances – still not completely revealed – would not only exceed the scope of this paper (and the competence and field of research of its author), but it would not be outstandingly relevant from the point of view of the theoretical question discussed here. However, it will not be superfluous to summarize these at least as an enumeration. Besides the disciples’ sense of mission almost reaching the level of salvation history that the sudden end of Hegel’s life should be linked with the beginning of his immortality in the realm of thoughts in order to secure (in a different, more down-to-earth formulation) Hegel’s fame and influence amongst the cultural political battles of Berlin¹ – in his funeral speech uttered at the University of Berlin the Hegel-disciple Rector Marheineke compared Hegel to Christ the Saviour, who returns as a spirit to his community after his death and who gained eternal life and resurrection by his death, while Friedrich Förster said in his speech at the grave: “To safekeep, promote, and consolidate his teachings: let this be our mission from now on”² – in addition to this, the ambition of the family and mainly Hegel’s widow, Marie Hegel, to perpetuate and secure – in an expressly conservative spirit – the fame of her deceased husband as well as (last but not least) to strengthen the family’s financial situation and support her sister-in-law, played an equally important role. Hegel’s widow took in her hands the issue of the edition without any further delay; only a few days after Hegel’s death the “Association of the Friends” was created, and less than a week later the Berlin-based Duncker Publishing House already presented a favourable offer to the widow for the publication of Hegel’s works (the contract stipulated that the royalties were all to go to the family, the disciples


preparing the volumes for print did their work as an honorary duty.)\(^3\) The family or the widow appointed the students for the preparation and edition of the individual volumes, and lent them the manuscripts from the family archives. At the same time, the widow carefully selected these manuscripts; especially in the case of miscellaneous writings, it was necessary – she wrote to her sister-in-law in those days – for her to help choose which of these writings should reach the world in Hegel’s spirit, and which not. To quickly satisfy the existing interest was said to be a primary task; the first work to appear was – not incidentally – the philosophy of religion, already the following year, in 1832, in two volumes, nearly one thousand pages; Marheineke, who edited the volume, was Rector of Berlin University at that time, he may scarcely have had appropriate leisure for a very thorough work.

That the FVA itself was edited on the basis of a well-defined Hegel-image is apparent already from the fact that the lectures making up the greatest part of the edition were edited as composing a closed system – or rather parts of a system. The manuscripts of the young Hegel were almost entirely left out, the only writings included in the edition were those which counted as parts of the way leading to the system. In contrast to these, the Berlin lectures, and especially the encyclopaedic system appeared in a strongly extended form, pumped up with various completions and amendments. The timelessness of the closed – and final – system dominated the image, but this system itself was not elaborated and published by Hegel – it was in fact the work or “document” of the Hegel-school. In any case, it was this edition which laid the basis of Hegel’s fame and the centuries-long influence of his philosophy.

In addition to the variety of editorial intentions, the various Hegel-editions also mirror the historically changing self-understanding of philosophy, Lothar Wigger writes.\(^1\) It may hardly be too risky or daring a statement that the self-understanding of Hegel’s philosophy must have been a standard in Hegel’s time and especially in the circle of his disciples. At any rate, there is an interesting example – to the best of my knowledge, previously unexploited – which shows that the disciples might have followed themselves the spirit of Hegelian philosophy when editing the FVA. In the chapter on Schelling of Hegel’s history of philosophy there are some significant judgments–opinions which are not the least unknown, but much quoted and commented on in different contexts. “Schelling made his philosophical development in front of the public. The row of his philosophical writings is also the history of his own philosophical development. […] [This row] does not contain a sequence of the elaborated partial fields of philosophy in their succession, but a sequence of its own degrees of development. If one asked for an ultimate writing which would contain the most definitive elaboration of his philosophy, there would be none to point to. […] In his later works he always started from the beginning (he never created a fully elaborated whole) […] Therefore it is not advisable to go into details about that which is called Schellingian philosophy […] Because this philosophy is not yet an organically articulated scientific whole […] This philosophy is still developing, it has not yet offered any ripe fruit […]”\(^2\)

The various interpretations usually comment on this fragment from the point of view of the Hegel–Schelling relationship, formulate questions as to whether Hegel’s statement is true and valid for Schelling or not – and if it is, then is there any argument against this accusation. These issues – whether Hegel’s description is accurate, whether Schelling can or cannot be defended¹ – are completely irrelevant for us now. No less irrelevant is the fact that these lines were formulated about Schelling. What is essential from our point of view is that Hegel presents here his own views about what a philosophy should be like. According to this requirement, a philosophy must be conclusive, definitive in its character should contain a closed system –, conversely formulated: a developing, changing philosophy is not a philosophy at all. Hegel’s own philosophical preferences are formulated here, and these prevent him from being susceptible to the values of a philosophy in change, in becoming. Such a philosophy – one that always starts from the very beginning – is none other than imperfect philosophy. One should only come out in public when this previous process of development and change has been finished, and the final system has been created. In the works to be published from now on – works which in fact should only be published at this point and not earlier – this final philosophy unfolds, spreads out, as it were, the individual elements of its organic totality are successively or simultaneously elaborated; however, the succession of elaborations, the degree of elaborateness and the increasing size of the sections to be explained no longer means an internal change of the structure itself.

Now, at a closer look, the FVA edited by Hegel’s disciples is articulated precisely along the lines of this concept. Hegel’s lecture sketches and outlines, the student notes, and various kinds of other notes, seen from here, are composed into uniform works not merely because of external or subjective reasons – for instance, cultural or political –, but because the editors are influenced by the spirit of a philosophy

¹ Hegel’s characterization of Schelling is of course true in a trivial sense; so much so that one of the most important works of 20th-century Schelling scholarship, Xavier Tilliette’s two-volume, 1200 pages long monograph formulates the very same idea on Schelling’s thought already in its title. See: Xavier Tilliette, Schelling. Une philosophie en devenir (Paris: Vrin, 1970). However, both for Tilliette and other researchers – such as, e.g., Heidegger (see: Schellings Abhandlung über das wesen der meschlichen Freiheit, ed. H. Feick [Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1971], p. 7.) – this statement establishes a fact and has no disapproving character.
which claims that *it is only the final, the ultimate, the closed whole that is valuable.* The disciples – if standing indeed on the ground of the above cited Hegelian idea – must surely have been convinced that Hegel did possess this system, only his premature death prevented him from lending it ultimate and detailed elaboration. Therefore they must have felt it to be their duty, task and responsibility – indeed, a mission in the most pregnant sense of the word – to finish, according to the best of their knowledge and conscience, what the master was not able to complete himself. On Hegelian grounds,

---

1 It should also be added: the creation of a (closed, final) system in Hegel’s sense is a fundamental ambition and distinguishing mark of German idealism starting with Kant, formulated on the ground of the initiatives of modern philosophy. Heidegger in his 1936 Schelling-lectures developed this idea with great force, embedded into a broad context of the history of philosophy. As he explains, the specific requirement of the construction of a philosophical *system* was only formulated in modernity. Before Descartes, the philosophers never claimed the need to elaborate a system in the modern sense; instead, they only offered the organization and articulation most suitable for appropriation and study in schools of an inherited and traditional mass of knowledge. The medieval *summa* itself was not a “system” in this sense either – only our modern perception makes them be viewed as such – but much rather as “handbooks” (e.g. Thomas Aquinas’s famous *Summa theologiae*, which is clearly offered as a “textbook” in the prologue). An organic philosophical system as a need to construct the conceptual system of knowledge only came into being in modernity. The particular image of modern philosophy is defined by the fact that, freeing itself from the authority of traditional knowledge – or with the demand of its critical revision – it tries to form a new, autonomous realm within knowledge: it is on this ground that the requirement of a “system” can be born. Kant particularly emphasized the architectonic nature of reason, distinguished from intellect, oriented primarily to unity, to the *system*, articulated according to various ideas. In his words, “Die Einheit aller möglichen empirischen Verstandeshandlungen systematisch zu machen, ist ein Geschäfte der Vernunft,” Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, eds. Georg Mohr and Marcus Willaschek (Berlin: Akademie 1998), A664, B692; cf. Martin Heidegger, *Schellings Abhandlung über das wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, 42ff. The fundamental requirement of reason for Kant is thus the system itself, but the Kantian philosophy failed to lead to a system, the “idea” forming the basis of criticism was left in shade: it is a dilemma which offers a nuanced explanation of how, in what specific sense has the requirement of a system in idealism become a basic problem of the development or – what is the same for Kant – professionalization of philosophy. “Das System allein verbürgt ja die innere Einheit des Wissens, seine Wissenschaftlichkeit und Wahrheit,” writes Heidegger in this interpretation. “Deshalb muß in Absicht auf die Wahrheit und das Wissen zuerst und vor allem immer wieder das System selbst in Frage gestellt, in seinem Wesen begründet und in seinem Begriff ausgebildet werden. So ist es zu verstehen, daß für den deutschen Idealismus das System der Leitruft wird und daß er nichts anderes bedeutet als wahrhafte Selbstbegründung des Ganzen des wesentlichen Wissens, der Wissenschaft schlechthin, der Philosophie.” (Heidegger, *Schellings Abhandlung*, 50). Of the extended literature on the subject, I only mention the study of Robert C. Solomon, “Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*,” in *The Age of German Idealism*, eds. Robert C. Solomon and Kathleen M. Higgins, Routledge History of Philosophy, vol. 6 (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 181–215: “The idea of a ‘system’ of philosophy comes from Kant, who aspired to provide a unified and all-encompassing ‘science’ of philosophy.” (182). I have treated this issue in somewhat more detail in one of my earlier writings; see István Fehér M., “Rendszer, szabadság, intellektuális szemlélet. Kant és a német idealizmus néhány alapproblémája” (System, freedom, intellectual concept. Kant and some fundamental problems of German idealism) *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 3 (1982): 401–414.
they may rightly have been convinced that one must not come out in front of the audience with works still changing, with nothing more than a plurality of text variants – the manuscripts and lecture notes had thus to be composed into an organic whole. Seen from here, the concept underlying the edition may legitimately be claimed to have largely been penetrated by the spirit of the philosophy to be edited: the basic principles of the edition (the philological establishment and elaboration of the texts) and the spirit of the philosophy to be edited (its preliminary understanding–interpretation, its pre-understanding, that is, hermeneutics) are connected by far-reaching Wahlverwandtschaft, a sort of common spirit. From our point of view this means that the philological work – the selection of the manuscripts and their working into a body of texts to be printed – was preceded and guided by a (perhaps not conscious) philosophical and hermeneutical awareness. In other words, if it is true that the image of Hegel (gradually developed after the philosopher’s death) was shaped, to a considerable extent, by the first edition of his printed works, it is not less true that the specific way of editing the printed works was in its turn largely motivated by the image of Hegel–i.e., the disciples’ image of Hegel, their preliminary understanding of Hegelian philosophy no less than of philosophy itself in general.

Meanwhile, it is worth noting: the new, modern Hegel-edition – the declaredly evolotional conception (entwicklungsgeschichtlich) of this edition – does not lack the spirit of the age, or in other words, the trace of the philosophical spirit or worldview of this age either. Since we live in a fragmentary, pluralistic age, which perceives itself in no way as some kind of an ultimate age like Hegel and his contemporaries may have perceived themselves – and not even as a new age, a new epoch as a time of birth and a transition to a new period – and since in such ages there is no kind of generally accepted, final philosophy, and even a requirement of the sort tends to sound quite improbable, inauthentic, therefore the question regarding a philosopher’s ultimate system – or the edition of such an ultimate system – cannot even be meaningfully formulated. The job of an edition in such an age can only be to prepare for print and edit in a chronological order, with adequate critical apparatus, the printed or manuscript works, sketches, fragments of an author. The question concerning which of these texts contains the ultimate system of thought of an author, or whether the idea of a final system of thought is plausible or not – a system that resists any further change and evolution – a modern edition has just to give up answering such questions. All it can do is to present or publish the development of a philosopher’s thinking in its various stages without conceiving of this development or rather change in a teleological way, as some kind of a movement towards perfection or completion.

I. 4. Going back to the problems around the FVA edition: the above interpretation about the “complementarity” or “concordance” of the ideas permeating the edition and the philosopher being edited can be made problematic at one point. Its discussion leads us to one of the most serious dilemmas of the new, modern Hegel-edition, so it will not be useless to briefly speak about it.

The objection that can be formulated is that the interpretation presented above takes at its basis Hegel’s judgment on Schelling, as Hegel formulated it in his lectures on the history of philosophy. It is, however, one may argue, in the text edition of the FVA that Hegel’s lectures on the history of philosophy are presently available, their critical edition is still yet to come. Since doubts were raised in the past about the authenticity of

several parts of the FVA, it may well be the case that the quotation lying at the basis of the above interpretation will also be among these. In this case the above interpretation – the claim concerning the common spirit between the basic principles of the edition (the philological establishment of the texts) and the spirit of the philosophy to be edited – will cease to hold. And it will not because the supposed common spirit can be shown not to exist, but because the very possibility of the comparison will be eliminated. The principles of the edition will not be comparable to the spirit of this philosophy because the spirit of this philosophy itself can only be reconstructed from the texts made available by the basic principles of edition. Horribile dictu, it can even be imagined – pushing the objection to its extreme – that, in order to justify their editorial principles with Hegel’s philosophy, the disciples attributed to Hegel words and phrases that he never uttered. This objection means that the textual basis of the comparison is rendered questionable, an issue I analyzed elsewhere in the context of another Hegelian locus.¹

This objection, as long as it is formulated in a general, theoretical way, cannot be countered: it can be formulated in connection with any Hegelian text which was not submitted for print by Hegel himself, or the authenticity of which cannot be undoubtedly proved from some other source. The only problem is that this objection is too relevant to hold, as it were, it reaches – so-to-say – beyond its target, and, as I shall return to it soon, one must pay a high price for it. At any rate, in the concrete situation here two kinds of considerations are possible.

The first is that it is hardly possible to conclusively disprove the originality of a text under suspicion as to its authorial authenticity.² Suspicion is one thing and disproof is another, just as difference should be made between a free-floating (unmotivated) suspicion and a seriously founded one. As long as the suspicion is not founded by a thorough justification, we have no reason to doubt the authenticity of a text. This consideration seems to be valid not only for our concrete case, but it can be generalized within certain limits.

The other consideration, referring only to the concrete case and thus much stronger, claims that the thesis at the basis of the mentioned common spirit – philosophy is only real as a closed system, it is only in this form that it is philosophy at all – appears

¹ See the philological appendix of my study entitled “»Az eszme érzéki ragyogása«: Esztétika, metafizika, hermeneutika (Gadamer és Hegel)” (»Das sinnliche Scheinen der Idee«: Aesthetics, Metaphysics, Hermeneutics [Gadamer and Hegel]), in Hermeneutika, esztétika, irodalomelmélet (Hermeneutics, Aesthetics, Literary Theory), eds. István Fehér M. and Emő Kulcsár Szabó (Budapest: Osiris, 2004), 264–332. Here: 294–326. I should add to this that rendering a textual fragment questionable as an original text (coming directly from its author) does not necessarily mean its rendering questionable as an interpretive text (although it is usually perceived to be questionable as such, too). An intelligent, clarifying interpretive text can be worth just as much – or even more – as an undoubtedly original, authorial text. One may have no expectations or requirements from an original, authorial text – that is, if its authenticity is proved, it must be accepted as it is, as it has come down to us; however, we may be entitled to raise requirements about an interpretive text, for instance, trivially speaking, the requirement to meaningfully clarify some original text.

² The argument that a textual locus cannot be regarded authentic unless it can be found in preserved manuscripts or other sources is not conclusive because most of the sources available when editing the FVA are no longer extant today.
in, and what is more, completely pervades, also the texts prepared and submitted for print by Hegel himself, texts therefore standing beyond doubt as to their authenticity. The following four characteristic quotes, outlining in a certain sense the entire programme of Hegelian philosophy, taken from the Preface of the *Phenomenology* adequately illustrate this claim:

1. “The true shape in which the truth exists can only be its scientific system.” To help to bring philosophy nearer to the form of science – that goal where it can lay aside the name of love of knowledge and be actual knowledge – that is what I have set before me.” (§ 5.)
2. “The truth is the whole. The whole, however, is merely the essential nature reaching its completeness through the process of its own development. Of the Absolute it must be said that it is essentially a result, that only at the end is it what it is in very truth; and just in that consists its nature, which is to be actual, subject, or self-becoming, self-development.” (§ 20)
3. “The living substance, further, is that being which is truly subject [...] As subject it is [...] a process of splitting up what is simple and undifferentiated, a process of duplicating and setting factors in opposition [...] True reality is merely this process of reinstating self-identity [...] It is the process of its own becoming, the circle which presupposes its end as its purpose, and has its end for its beginning; it becomes concrete and actual only by being carried out, and by the end it involves.” (§ 18)
4. “Among the many consequences that follow from what has been said, it is of importance to emphasise this, that knowledge is only real and can only be set forth fully in the form of science, in the form of system” (§ 24)

Philosophy, according to the first quote, is only real as a system; the second quote describes this system as a whole, as a result arrived to its end, while the third describes it as a circle, which has a presupposed purpose and beginning, and during its becoming reaches its end, that is, it closes in as a circle and forms a closed whole. This is, according to the fourth quote, the scientific form of philosophy. Making philosophy a science and constructing it as a system closed (in itself) is thus one and the same thing. For this reason, a philosophy which has not constructed itself as a system cannot lay claim to the status of science and – as we have seen – this is precisely what Hegel disapproved of Schelling. These are central theses of the self-understanding of Hegel’s philosophy, which leave no doubt about how Hegel looked at philosophy and his own philosophy as well. Hegel had this text printed himself, so we have no reason to doubt its authenticity.

---


2 Moreover, a particular – negative – philological situation can further enforce the authenticity of the quoted texts. In 1831, a few weeks before his death, Hegel started to rewrite the Preface in preparation for a second edition that he had been planning for some time. He reached with the revision approximately half-way through the Preface, more precisely to the paragraph beginning with *Analysis of an idea* (§ 32), but all the fragments I quoted precede this paragraph in the text.
I. 5. The fundamental dilemma following from the articulation of this objection, and concerning the new historical-critical edition and capable in a sense to bring it to crisis, can be reconstructed as follows. Our presentation of the history of the Hegel-editions started from the simple and almost trivial statement that the arguments on the necessity of new editions all grew out of the critical reflections on edition history. This – as we have seen – is completely and, indeed, primarily valid for the Hegel-editions. Since the old editions do not meet modern scholarly requirements and are full of deficiencies, therefore there is a need for new, reliable editions. This conclusion seems unobjectionable. However, is this argument exhaustive? Is it indeed the reason – the only reason – for the necessity of the new edition?

If we turn, in a somewhat pedantic way, to the traditional logic of syllogisms, we see that in order to draw a conclusion we need at least two premises. One single premise is never enough to correctly draw a conclusion from. So there must be an implicit, second premise in the background, which does not come to the forefront because it seems so trivial, so self-evident. It may of course be so – let us not doubt it –, but it still is, it still exists nonetheless, and thus it deserves being made heard and explicit. So: the new Hegel-edition is necessary because: 1. the old one has many shortcomings, and 2. (to put it in one of several possible ways) Hegel is admittedly a great philosopher, whose work deserves being made available in a new, scientifically reliable source, or – to put it differently – it is the duty of the present age to make his work available in a new, scientifically reliable source.

Let us stay with formal logic a bit longer. It is a requirement that the two premises of the conclusion must come from different sources of knowledge, that is, they cannot be related to each other in any way. If this is not the case, if they are somehow related, then we no longer have to do with two premises, but only one. Let us take the classic example: 1. All man is mortal, 2. Socrates is a man, so 3. Socrates is mortal. The first two premises cannot be deduced from each other. We know from different sources of knowledge that all men are mortal, and that Socrates is a man. From the enunciation “all man is mortal” cannot be deduced that “Socrates is a man”. (If we think that Socrates belongs to “all men”, since he is a man too, then we beg the question, i.e., presume exactly what should be proved; Socrates belongs to “all men” if I already know – and this of course means: from some other source – that he is also a man, but this is precisely the question here).

Let us return to the Hegel-editions. Where, from what source do we know that Hegel is a great philosopher? Is it indeed the case here that the second premise is independent from the first? In the light of what was argued above, it is quite obvious: the

FVA, which the first premise declares to be deficient, is not only not independent of the second premise’s source of knowledge, but is mostly identical with it. The reception history of Hegelian philosophy, which founded Hegel’s fame as a philosopher and presented Hegel as a great philosopher, was determined to the full by the FVA. Therefore if the FVA is rendered questionable, then implicitly the philosophical greatness of Hegel – a greatness handed down by the reception history starting from the FVA edition – is also rendered questionable. However, if this latter (Hegel’s greatness as a philosopher) is put under suspicion, it also renders then questionable the necessity of a new edition, needing decades of work and a considerable material and intellectual input. That the new edition will make available and mediate a more accurate image of Hegel – may well be possible; but whether this Hegel should be worth being presented in a new edition, is an issue that cannot be anticipated.

From all those said before it results that one should be careful about criticizing the FVA. Now, this point of view appears indeed – although instinctively rather than consciously – in the writings of the academic edition’s editors. While illustrating the deficiencies of the FVA, they remember over and over again the indisputable merits of this edition. Firstly, about its having grounded Hegel’s fame and transmitted it to posterity. Friedhelm Nicolin, the initiator and mentor of the GW, emphasized it from the very beginning: “Hegel’s thinking had exercised a worldwide influence due to the FVA. Followers and antagonists in the 19th and 20th century read Hegel in this edition. The translations to foreign languages of his individual works were based on these text editions. Last but not least, the indirect effect of Hegel’s image in the history of philosophy was also determined by this edition. […] Finally, as regards the original documents which were still available for Hegel’s disciples, but have since been lost, this edition makes up the permanent part of the sources of Hegel’s work.”¹ It should be added that here at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s Nicolin tried to argue for the necessity of the new edition not merely by reference to philological reasons: first of all, he referred to a particular modern necessity, a renewing interest worldwide in Hegel’s philosophy.² Then, following Nicolin, the idea of the actualization of Hegelian thought for present thinking did continue appearing in the writings of other co-operators and editors of the Hegel Archives.³

As for the merits of the FVA, Walter Jaeschke still continues to emphasize in our times – after the turn of the millennium, almost fifty years following Nicolin’s quoted words and connected to them – that “The ‘Friends of the Deceased’ created the Corpus Hegelianum and the image of Hegelian philosophy which […] defined its direct influence and which has lasted until these days.”⁴ From the period between these two seminal opinions, I shall quote Christoph Jamme, who wrote in the first half of the

² Ibid., 308.
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1980s: “Despite all of its editorial questionability, the FVA is outstandingly important.” Since – by the more recent 20th century editions based on the FVA, such as Glockner’s so-called anniversary edition or the Theorie Werkausgabe – “it has fundamentally influenced the reception history of Hegelian philosophy up to the middle of the 20th century and beyond; it has formed the basis of Hegel-interpretations from Marx and Kierkegaard to Adorno.”¹ The significance of reception history can of course hardly be overestimated from a hermeneutical perspective: no matter what the edition policy of the FVA was like, and no matter how we think about it now in the light of today’s philological standards, it is a fact that this edition created the dominant Hegel-image. The young Marx – whose thinking was determined all his life by the struggle with Hegel as mediated by the FVA – wrote in his doctoral thesis, debating the question of the ontological proof of the existence of God that the essential thing is not whether or not there were gods, but that people believed in them in the course of history, and “in this sense all gods, both pagan and Christian, possessed a real existence. [...] Kant’s criticism [of the ontological proof of God – I.F.M] means nothing here. If someone imagines to have a hundred Thalers […], if he believes in it, then the hundred imagined Thalers have the same value for him as a hundred real ones. E.g. he will run into debt over his imagination, the imagination will have effect, just like the whole humanity ran into debt on their gods’ account.”² Similarly, it can be said: irrespective of how the “real” Hegel, Hegel “in himself” may be construed to have been – provided this question is meaningful at all,³ and provided there is any empirical evidence extant to reconstruct it,⁴ to finalize this (still not entirely clearly meaningful) enterprise –, his reception history

³ “Ein Kant an sich […] ist ein Grundmißverständnis” (A Kant in himself […] is a fundamental misunderstanding”). Heidegger GA 3, 301.
⁴ No kind of empiric knowledge can be used to reconstruct something like a “real x” – even if the sources are abundant, or even if (or rather especially if) they are endless – since this “real x” always presupposes the primacy of the a priori unity of a concept or an idea. “The desire either to prove or to refute ideas on the basis of facts is nonsense – according to the quotation Kant used: ex pumice aquam.” – wrote Husserl. Edmund Husserl, “Philosophy as Rigorous Science,” in Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy, translated by Quentin Lauer (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 71–147. The quotation in Kant’s The Critique of Practical Reason, trans. and ed. Mary J. Gregor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); on ideas see also: Critique of Pure Reason, trans. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See also: Jean-Paul Sartre, The Emotions: Outline of a Theory, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1993), pp. 4–5. “[T]he idea of man […] will be
could not still be ignored or eliminated even in that case. Should we still expect a new, significant, more authentic image of Hegel on the basis of the GW, the almost two centuries-long effective history of the reception of Hegelian philosophy cannot be undone.

I. 6. Thus the FVA serves the GW in a double, ambivalent way: both negatively and positively. Indeed, the GW is very much dependent on this ambivalence in order to justify itself. It must feed on the FVA – both negatively and positively – as a parasite. The thorough criticism of the editorial principles and practice, as well as editorial policy of the FVA is just as much a decisive part of the necessity and self-justification of the GW as the assumption of Hegel’s greatness and importance as a philosopher constructed and handed down due to the same FVA. However, this ambivalence brings about several incompatibilities and results in a number of “non sequitur”. In any case, taking back or moderating the criticism of the FVA, or counter-balancing it by accentuating its merits creates a dubious obscurity. It seems advisable to veil or conceal the common root of this double – positive and negative – reference.

I have previously cited Nicolin, who claimed it was a merit of the FVA, amongst other things, that “Hegel’s thinking has gained its worldwide influence due to the FVA.” But – let us not postpone the question any further – did Hegel deserve indeed this “worldwide influence”? For precisely by taking seriously the criticism concerning the FVA the traditional image of Hegel – or: the traditional image of Hegel’s greatness as a philosopher – should be shattered, as a result of, and in parallel with, this criticism. As a matter of fact, if one ventures to consistently think over this issue, one should become absolutely sceptical about the nature and calibre of Hegelian thinking. One cannot make the pretension – although, of course, one does, and by doing so makes the ambivalent, tacit impression – as if Hegel’s importance as a philosopher were a widely

only a conjecture aiming to establish connections between disparate materials”; if “some psychologists were to use a certain conception of man before this ultimate synthesis were possible, it would be […] like an idea in the Kantian sense, and their first duty would be never to lose sight of the fact that it was a regulating concept. […] To expect the fact is, by definition, to expect the isolated, to prefer, because of positivism, the accidental to the essential, the contingent to the necessary, disorder to order; it is, on principle, to case what is essential into the future: ‘That will do for later, when we shall have assembled enough facts.’ […] it is just as impossible to get to essence by accumulating accidents as to reach 1 by adding figures to the right of 0,99.” Jean-Paul Sartre: Esquisse d’une théorie des émotions. Paris: Hermann & Cie 1939, p. 5: “C’est dire que l’idée d’homme, si jamais elle prend un sens positif, ne sera qu’une conjecture visant à établir des connexions entre des matériaux disparates et qui ne tirera sa vraisemblance que de sa réussite. […] Si pourtant certains psychologues usaien d’une certaine conception de l’homme avant que cette synthèse ultime ne fût possible, ce ne pourrait être qu’à titre rigoureusement personnel et comme fil conducteur ou mieux comme idée au sens kantien et leur premier devoir serait de ne jamais perdre de vue qu’il s’agit d’un concept régulateur. […] Attendre le fait, c’est, par définition, attendre l’isolé, c’est préférer, par positivisme, l’accident à l’essentiel, le contingent au nécessaire, le désordre à l’ordre; c’est rejeter, par principe, l’essentiel dans l’avenir: ‘Ce n’est pour plus tard, quand nous aurons réuni assez de faits.’ […] Les psychologues ne se rendent pas compte, en effet, qu’il est tout aussi impossible d’attendre l’essence en entassant les accidents que d’aboutir à l’unité en ajoutant indéfiniment des chiffres à la droite de 0,99.”
known, acquitted, concluded fact, whereby the disciples editing the FVA deserved to be praised and patted on the back for recognizing it,—in other words, as if it were a fact which we already know and take for granted as something beyond dispute and beyond doubt. The criticism of the FVA— if taken seriously— must throw into crisis or pull down with it the Hegel that it “constructed” or “built up” (to return to this political-like expression). The ambivalent reference to the FVA or the FVA’s use or exploitation— both in a negative, and a positive sense— for the advantage and justification of the GW is a phenomenon which precedes and accompanies the initiative and development of the GW. It is articulated differently depending on the audience it addresses or the interests of its particular context, while the reference is usually very careful not to “bring together” its thoughts; therefore it “conducts a household of its own,” “weighs and measures by a twofold standard,” to use Hegelian expressions.

The argument that the FVA does not meet contemporary scholarly standards is a direct basis for the necessity of the new edition. The second, tacit premise, which should accompany the first and come in its completion, and must sometimes be expressed nonetheless, says that: a “Kulturvolk” or “Kulturnation” (such as the Germans) — or in a more emphatic formulation: a “Kulturvolk” or “Kulturnation” of the

---

1 Hegel, *Phenomenology of Mind*, trans. J. B. Baillie (London: Harper & Row, 1967), § 205. Online edition: http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/ph/phprefac.htm (Accessed: 01.02.2012) “This [sceptical] form of consciousness is, therefore, the aimless fickleness and instability of going to and fro, hither and thither, from one extreme of self-same self-consciousness, to the other contingent, confused and confusing consciousness. It *does not itself bring these two thoughts of itself together*. It finds its freedom, at one time, in the form of elevation above all the whirling complexity and all the contingency of mere existence, and again, at another time, likewise confesses to falling back upon what is unessential, and to being taken up with that.” And also: ibid., § 572. “The believing mood *weighs and measures by a twofold standard*, it has two sorts of eyes and ears, uses two voices to express its meaning, it duplicates all ideas, *without comparing and relating the sense and meaning in the two forms used*. Or we may say belief lives its life amidst two sorts of perceptions, the one the perceptions of thought which is asleep, purely uncritical and uncomprehending, the other those of waking consciousness living solely and simply in the world of sense; and in each of them it manages to *conduct a household of its own*.” (Italics mine — I.M.F.). See Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. In: Hegel: *Werke in zwanzig Bänden. Theorie Werkausgabe*. Auf der Grundlage der Werke v. 1832-1845 neu edierte Ausgabe. Redaktion Eva Moldenhauer und Karl Markus Michel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1970, Bd. 3, p. 162: “Dies [ skeptische] Bewußtsein ist also diese bewußtlose Faselei, von dem einen Extreme des sichselbstgleichen Selbstbewußtseins zum andern des zufälligen, verworrenen und verwirrenden Bewußtseins hinüber- und herübergesehen. Es selbst *bringt* diese beiden Gedanken seiner selbst *nicht zusammen* [Italics mine — I.M.F.]; es verkennt seine Freiheit *einmal* als Erhebung über alle Verwirrung und alle Zufälligkeit des Daseins und bekennt sich ebenso das *andere Mal* wieder als ein Zurückfallen in die Unwesentlichkeit und als ein Heruntreiben in ihr.” Cf. also p. 423: “Das glaubende Bewußtsein führt doppeltes Maß und Gewicht [Italics mine — I.M.F.], es hat zweierlei Augen, zweierlei Ohren, zweierlei Zunge und Sprache, es hat alle Vorstellungen verdoppelt, *ohne diese Doppelsinnigkeit zu vergleichen* [Italics mine — I.M.F.]. Oder der Glaube lebt in zweierlei Wahrnehmungen, der einen, der Wahrnehmung des schlafenden, rein in begrifflosen Gedanken, der anderen des wachen, rein in der sinnlichen Wirklichkeit lebenden Bewußtseins, und in jeder führt er eine eigene *Haushaltung* [Italics mine — I.M.F.].“
sort of the Germans – have the elementary obligation both towards themselves and towards the educated, scholarly world to make available the works of the outstanding thinkers of their past in scientifically reliable editions, meeting contemporary exigencies. The essential part of this double reference is that “it does not itself bring these two thoughts of itself together”: the second premise – as it should in a syllogism – appears as a distinct source of knowledge although in fact it is not. This second premise is needed nonetheless, it cannot be done without: if the edition project wants to avoid turning against itself and undermine the scientific and institutional foundations of its own enterprise, then it can be by no means of interest to the GW to overthrow or revise the image of Hegel’s greatness as a philosopher. On the contrary: it must make use of it as a justification for its own enterprise and its importance, for its purported national-cultural mission. The reference therefore – here, in this context – remains silent about the connection of the two premises: namely, the fact that Hegel’s philosophical greatness is a product of the scientifically condemned FVA. Were it not silent about it, the second premise would be overthrown, and the justification of the necessity of a new edition would seriously lose its weight.

However, in a different context this fact does not have to be dismissed in silence. Once the self-justification of the GW has been successful, it can well be formulated: it happens with the purpose both of generously recognizing the merits of the FVA, and the accentuation of the importance of its task – further enhanced by the fame of the praised predecessors – as well as the raising of scholarly requirements. Since it is the merit of the FVA to have perpetuated Hegel’s philosophical greatness in its own – debatable – way, then a contemporary, scientifically more reliable edition could even more raise the hope and expectation to reformulate and present this greatness in an undistorted, modern, scientific form. In this context the theoretical emphasis of the fact elsewhere kept silent of how significantly a textual and life-work edition can transform consciousness and shape the reception history is expressly an advantage and not at all a drawback. It formulates the expectation that the new edition will be a great accomplishment similar to the old one. By the two premises according to which: 1. the FVA performed a culturally significant act, and 2. the FVA used scientifically questionable methods, results the promise that: if 2. is corrected, that is, a scientifically reliable edition is made, it would bring along with it also premise 1, that is, it would be a culturally equally significant act.

I.7. However, the GW is the prisoner of FVA also in another sense: in a sense which could also exemplify the “conducting of a household of one’s own,” therefore it is not uninteresting to enter into some detail. The basic objection against the FVA is that it focused on the Berlin Hegel, that is, the Berlin lectures, the texts of which did not come directly from Hegel and which were compiled together to form unitary works. These volumes, which were not prepared and submitted for print by Hegel, take up more than half of the edition; in their case, much more textual criticism is needed than for those works which Hegel himself had published. The GW wanted to compete with the FVA primarily about the second series of the edition, the preparation of the lectures, since it was this part of the FVA which was most criticised and condemned, also firstly by the GW, therefore it seemed desirable and necessary to offer an alternative in this field.
To compete with the FVA means however, that the GW in this respect is subject to the previous edition. Had the FVA not attributed such an outstanding role to the lectures, perhaps the GW would not have placed them in the forefront either. However, the GW also tried to justify the importance of editing the lectures, this time not on the basis of compilations, with a circumstance partly connected to the previous one, and partly independent of it. It argued that Hegel’s great influence, because of the relative scarcity of published works, was primarily grounded by the orally delivered lectures, his fame is due to those, therefore it is highly justified to pay extra editorial attention to them and, following a thorough critical textual analysis, make them available to the audience in a form which satisfies contemporary scholarly standards. This argument appears as essential because it (is practically the only one which) tries to validate Hegel’s fame and influence not on the basis of the FVA edition, but in a way evading it, independently from it. The new edition is claimed to have to pay special attention to the lectures because Hegel gained his fame primarily by these and not by his printed works. This creates the impression that, besides and beyond the imperfection of the FVA, we have gained one further argument to justify the outstanding editorial interest in the lectures. The edition of the lectures therefore is especially significant because, 1. the way the FVA edited them is highly imperfect, unacceptable for modern standards, and 2. Hegel’s fame as a philosopher was primarily established by his oral lectures. Or, to put it more impressively: the edition of the lectures is especially significant because 1. Hegel’s fame as a philosopher was primarily established by his oral lectures, and 2. these were highly imperfectly edited by the FVA.

However, a closer analysis of the argument reveals once more its ambivalences. It can be questioned indeed whether these two arguments are truly independent of each other – and enforce each other – or rather there is one single argument in fact, that is, the existence of two arguments is only an appearance. Indeed, in the previous formulation the expression “by them” [the lectures] can be understood in two ways: first, as directly by them (so, directly by the oral delivery, and not by (or not only by) the FVA), then as indirectly by them, insofar as the FVA, focusing on the lectures, made them available in print, and this was the basis of their later broad influence. Of course, this statement cannot be refuted. Whether directly, through their oral delivery, or by their later edition, it is a fact: the lectures did have indeed a major influence. The ambivalence of this latter formulation also creates a dubious – though from an editorial viewpoint beneficial – obscurity; at any rate, it is obvious that at a closer look this argument (namely, the reference to the great influence of the lectures) for establishing Hegel’s fame apart from the FVA can hardly be tenable. Any attempt to account for Hegel’s fame and reception history by overlooking the FVA is necessarily doomed to end up in failure.

But let us see some characteristic formulations. The starting point is in almost all cases a kind of specific negativity, which then is turned into positivity. The negativity lies in the fact that Hegel – unlike his idealist predecessors and Kant – published very little in his lifetime. His fame, unlike his predecessors’, had not been established by the little number of his printed works (most of which had already been hardly accessible by that time). But since Hegel was a great philosopher (as we of course already know), therefore – if we wish to know his thinking –, we must concentrate on the reconstruction of his university lectures, which are much more significant in the process of the
publication of his works than in the case of his forebears. And since Hegel’s lecture manuscripts have been handed down in very fragmentary forms, one must heavily draw on the student notes still available, the publication of which exceeds in significance the importance of lecture editions of other philosophers. If for no other reason, then because the FVA also published first of all the lecture notes. “Simply by presenting Hegel’s work in a closed form, by introducing the lecture volumes as complements, what is more, higher-level complements of Hegel’s unpublished works, and only thus could this edition exert a decisive influence lasting to this day” – writes Walter Jaeschke.

“First of all, Hegel’s influence was established by his lectures; there he gathered his students around him and founded his school,” wrote Otto Pöggeler at the beginning of the 1990s. “Distinctly from Kant and Fichte, the decisive part of Hegel’s works was formed indeed by his lectures.” The claim that Kant was primarily influential by his printed works, while this was not the case for Hegel, was already formulated by Christoph Jamme in the 1980s, and Lothar Wigger also stressed: “As opposed to Kant, Hegel was primarily influential due to his lectures, in which he concretely elaborated important parts of his system.” Then after the turn of the millennium Walter Jaeschke

---

1 This reference is almost completely valid, although both Fichte and Schelling have a considerable amount of unpublished writings, and especially in Fichte’s case the various drafts of “science knowledge” (Wissenschaftslehre) which formed the core of his thinking were largely remained unpublished in the philosopher’s lifetime, and were only made available by the new, forty-volume historical-critical edition initiated some years before the Hegel-edition, in the beginning of the 1960s, and now at its termination (while the first series of the complete edition, containing the works published in the philosopher’s lifetime, consisted of ten volumes, the second series containing the works from his legacy consisted of fourteen volumes). In any case, it is valid for both of them that they published enough writings during their lifetime to establish their fame (in Fichte’s case the unpublished manuscripts of the Wissenschaftslehre were adequately compensated by the popular writings meant for the audience at large, such as the Speeches to the German Nation). For Kant the influence of his three critiques evidently eclipsed the aura of his university lectures; furthermore, Kant consciously considered his works as an organon “by which he intended to influence the audience.” Eckart Förster, “Die Vorreden,” in Immanuel Kant: Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Klassiker Auslegen, vol. 17, eds. G. Mohr, M. Willaschek (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998), 37–55, 37.
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continued to emphasize: “Unlike the works of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, Hegel’s philosophy received little public attention and discussion in his lifetime.”\(^1\) In one of his writings two decades earlier Jaeschke expressed this same thesis in more detail as well. “Distinctly from the cases of Leibniz, Kant, Fichte, or Schelling, the major influence of Hegel’s works starting from the edition of his lectures. […] From the perspective of the reception history of his philosophy, Hegel’s activity as a lecturer at Berlin University proved to be decisive, and it proved to be so both from the point of view of its broad influence, and the foundation of the Hegelian school, which was of course only established by his educational activity in Berlin.”\(^2\)

Our investigation could naturally ask the question whether this both–and denotes two distinct things indeed. The question is answered in a sense by Jaeschke himself in his previously cited work from 2003, which is worth being cited at some length: “Hegel’s philosophy received little public attention and discussion in his lifetime. His actual reception history […] started only posthumously. […] Contrary to widespread legends which saw him as the emperor of philosophy of his age, Hegel’s influence in his lifetime was limited to the classroom, his aura only reached Halle, and remained only partial even in Berlin.”\(^3\)

This qualification seems to heavily contradict any statement that stresses the significant influence of the lectures – formulated by others as well as Jaeschke himself in his earlier writings cited before – and seems to be difficult to reconcile with the first part of the both–and construction of the above mentioned sentence. In this respect in fact it does answer – albeit in a negative sense – the question whether the both–and denotes indeed two things. The contradiction can be explained (or dissolved) by the difference in knowledge interests or – as I have mentioned above – the difference in contexts, which in this particular case means the targeted audience. The last cited fragment comes from a handbook, while the former from a scholarly journal. Now, evidently a handbook is written not so much for the experts of a discipline, but for the audience at large. The need for a new edition must be justified towards the experts of the discipline (and not less towards cultural policy and science financing); however, such a justification loses its relevance or at least remains in the background in presentations written for the wide

---
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audience. Nevertheless, the interest of the wide audience can very well be raised by curiosities such as the discovery that the world-famous philosopher was practically unknown in his own age. Moreover, this latter representation is probably closer to reality, while the former is prone to project this wide influence back to Hegel’s time, to his Berlin period. (It should deserve a little digression to call attention to this particular anomaly of the profession, this kind of “transcendental appearance or illusion” in a Kantian sense, which Kant describes in opposition to empirical or logical appearance as follows: “This illusion it is impossible to avoid, just as we cannot avoid perceiving that the sea appears to be higher at a distance than it is near the shore”\(^1\) – namely, to the fact that the present is prone to date the influence of a work it considers outstanding to as early as possible, preferably to the very age when it was written.)

Therefore the references to Hegel’s “widely influential” lectures are ambivalent, and capable of creating appropriate obscurity; the meaning may be either the effect of the orally delivered lectures, or that of the printed version published by the slightly more than half a dozen disciples in the FVA edition, and this shift in meaning can alternate, in accordance with the all-time necessities and contexts. The two meanings are indefinitely – and, let us add, beneficially – intertwined. Christoph Jamme in his already cited work spoke about the “inglorious fame” (“unrühmliche Berühmtheit”) that Hegel’s works had to deal with firstly due to the methods used in editing the lectures. This is a fortunate expression – but not only in the meaning intended by the author, but also in that further sense that the researchers editing the GW in their statements about the FVA can alternately stress the positive connotations of the noun or the negative connotations of the adjective, in accordance with the context and the all-time needs of the GW.\(^2\)

However, that much should be added by all means: without this “inglorious fame” Hegel could hardly have become who he was later to be, and the GW could also hardly have come into being.

I.8. It has been repeatedly mentioned above that the edition of the lectures is the most controversial point of the FVA, and that the GW considers its fundamental task to offer an alternative to the FVA precisely in this matter. However, the elaboration of adequate editorial principles has been a problem from the very beginning. There was agreement only about the fact that it cannot be pursued as the FVA did. In the mid-1970s Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert complained about there being no philological standards for the edition of the lectures.\(^3\) A few years later, Walter Jaeschke – editor of the FVA, today the director of the Archives – already summarized as follows: “we have been dealing with it for years to proceed with the planning and preparation of the second

\(^1\) See Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, B353f. [Transcendental logic. Second Division. I. Of Transcendental Illusory Appearance]
http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/4280/pg4280.html
(“... so wenig als wir es vermeiden können, daß uns das Meer in der Mitte nicht höher scheine, wie an dem Ufer”).
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series, the edition of the lecture notes as well, in parallel with the first series of the complete edition.”\(^1\) The elaboration of the concept is evidently a time-consuming activity, and it should by no means be hastened, we could say, since twenty-eight years have passed since the publication of the above lines. The edition started in the 1960s and was planned for forty volumes; it should have been finished by the turn of the millennium, in forty year’s time\(^2\) – whereas the editorial brochure planned the publication of the opening volume of the second series only for 2008, evidently on the basis of a well-designed concept, but definitely – as mentioned above – following a decade of test-edition series.

The editorial announcement of this initial volume of the second series makes use to the full of the above displayed ambivalence. Hegel’s fame, the editorial reads, was established by his Berlin lectures, and his great influence on his contemporaries was due less to his earlier published writings than to his lectures held at Berlin University.\(^3\) Nonetheless, the text goes on, the FVA’s procedure to compile a sovereign main text out of various source texts is not an acceptable way to go for the GW. Instead, the second series of the GW will contain “the authentic wording of all extant lecture notes” (“der authentische Wortlaut aller erhaltenen Nachschriften”).\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Walter Jaeschke, “Probleme der Edition der Nachschriften von Hegels Vorlesungen,” *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 3 (1980): 51–63, 51 (“Wir sind ... seit mehreren Jahren damit beschäftigt, parallel zur Arbeit an der ersten Abteilung auch die Planung und Vorarbeiten für die zweite Abteilung, also für die Edition der Nachschriften, voranzutreiben [...]”). Friedhelm Nicolin noted already in the second half of the 1950s that “the publication of the lectures has begun” (Friedhelm Nicolin, “Probleme und Stand der Hegel-Edition,” *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 1 (1957): 117–129, 128.) He also mentioned that there was great anticipation for the long heralded early writings of Hegel (although the first of the planned two volumes of these latter writings only appeared in 1989 [GW 1], while the second [GW 2], which should comprise the Frankfurt writings, possibly the most acclaimed of this period, is still unpublished).

\(^2\) See the summary of Otto Pöggeler, “Die historisch-kritische Edition in der Wissenschaftsorganisation,” *Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte*, eds. Walter Jaeschke, Wilhelm G. Jacobs und Hermann Krings (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1987), 27–37, 33. “According to the plan designed in the 1960s, Hegel’s works are to appear over a period of forty years in forty volumes.” One of the primary motivating factors of the new edition was that – as I have previously mentioned – even the ever so honourable efforts of individual researchers will not be enough to complete a new Hegel edition within one generation’s time. However, the present state of the Hegel-edition sets forth the perspective that the editorial work of a whole generation of researchers and philologists of Hegel will not suffice to do so either.

\(^3\) http://www.meiner.de/product_info.php?products_id=2962: “Hegels Ruhm gründet sich auf seine Berliner Vorlesungen, die in der zweiten Abteilung der ’Gesammelten Werke’ nun erstmals in textkritischer Edition vorgelegt werden. [...] Hegels große Wirkung auf seine Zeitgenossen beruhte nicht so sehr auf der Rezeption seiner zuvor publizierten Schriften, sondern vor allem auf seinen Vorlesungen an der Berliner Universität, an die er 1818 berufen wurde und an der bis zu seinem Tod im Jahr 1831 den Ton angab.”

\(^4\) “Für die Edition der Vorlesungen in der historisch-kritischen Ausgabe der ’Gesammelten Werke’ kann das Prinzip der ’freihändigen’ Kompilation eines Haupttextes aus diversen Quelltexten, das [...] von den Herausgebern der ’Freundesausgabe’ befolgt wurde, allerdings keine Gel tung mehr haben. Geboten wird daher in der zweiten Abteilung der ’GW’, die die Bände 23 bis
Although it is advisable to evaluate the opening volume only after its appearance and the ensuing scholarly echo, and a thorough value-judgment can obviously be made only perspectively, after several volumes have been published, a remark can be made nonetheless: the expression within the quotation marks is very difficult to understand. Since the “test edition” of the lectures and the subsequent debates clearly show that, while the FVA’s way is not a pursuable one, the opposite extreme, the publication of all student notes extant, is nothing more effective or executable either.\footnote{For the followings, see: Walter Jaeschke, “Probleme der Edition der Nachschriften von Hegels Vorlesungen,” \textit{Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie} 3 (1980): 51–63, 53–59.} Firstly because of the material-intellectual-physical overwork, since – as it has been mentioned before – the Hegel Archives possesses approximately ninety lecture notes, and this would entail the publication of almost as many or only a little fewer volumes, while there is hardly enough capacity for such an endeavour. Secondly, this method is also counter-productive, since by this edition it would, so-to-say, “dead edit” its author (“tot edieren”; I shall return to it further on). On the other hand, not all lecture notes extant deserve to be published, that is, not all of them are in a condition to be worth publication. The previously repeatedly considered proposition to edit the notes according to academic years, including the lecture notes of a particular series into one volume (“Jahrgangstexte”) would be too mechanical and inexpedient. Hegel’s teaching activity in Berlin extended to twenty-six semesters, with an average of two lectures per semester, therefore – as far as the sources are improved – we would still be speaking about the edition of sixty or seventy volumes, which is not only too much, but also not justified, since the notes of various years are unevenly documented; some better, others less, yet others very poorly. Moreover, Hegel’s lectures in some years were quite similar. The solution apparently chosen by the second series (deducing from the planned amount of ten volumes) was already formulated by Walter Jaeschke. According to him, the lecture notes referring to one discipline or subject (e.g. metaphysics, philosophy of religion, aesthetics, history of philosophy), coming from subsequent years – and different students – should not be published individually, but compiled into one single – or, if justified (if there are significant conceptual differences between the years), two or three – volume(s) in such a way that the best lecture note is chosen as the “lead text” (“Leittext”), while the other notes – from the same year but different author, or adjacent years but on similar subject – will serve as control or complementary texts (“Kontrolltext”, “Ergänzungstext”), and will appear in footnotes or attachments, or in the textual critical apparatus. The edition of the lectures is organized thus around “year’s texts” (“Jahrgangstexte”), where one volume integrates several years’ texts. This edition technique will make possible the publication of the thirteen preserved notes in logic in three or four volumes.

The sketched proposition is felicitous, but its success depends on the fortunate encounter of too many contingent circumstances. It is a question, first of all, whether the preserved lecture notes will fall in line with the concept. What happens if several lectures notes can rightfully claim to be “lead texts”, or the opposite: none seems worthy of this title? If the second series will fulfill this task, as far as the notes extant are not too many, it will be easier said than done. The first series has proved to be too many and too few. The first question is: does this volume meet the required condition of a “lead text”, or is it better to do without it and let the other notes be published together with the others?

\footnote{Der authentische Wortlaut aller erhaltenen Nachschriften zu den von Hegel gehaltenen Vorlesungen, um der Forschung ein sicheres Fundament zu geben.” (Emphasis by I.F.M.)}
of it? Then: the criteria for establishing the “lead text” are not clear or clearly identifiable. Otto Pöggeler was apparently right to claim that various notetakers (“Nachschreiber”) could work together, exchange their notes, or copy from each other.\(^1\) Thus, if for example three of a lecture’s five extant notes are highly consistent with each other, it is still no evidence for their authenticity. Be it as it may, the publisher’s assurance that the second series of the GW will yield the “authentic wording of all extant lecture notes” is quite obscure and unfounded; one can hardly explain what an “authentic wording” would mean here, and especially, how this latter would refer to “all” lecture notes.

At any rate, the integrated (combined) edition of the lectures by years, although maintaining the critical attitude towards compilation, seems to make steps in the direction of the FVA’s concept of Hegel’s “system”. In addition to this, the ambition of competing with the FVA also seems to remain in the background, and this way the role of the lectures in the integrated edition (dramatically stressed before) diminishes or loses its importance as well. While the lectures were contained in more than half of the FVA’s volumes, the second series of the GW, in contrast to the twenty-two volumes of the first series, will publish the lectures in only ten volumes.

Despite the grouping into thematic units, the edition based on combined years’ texts is still highly reclining on the principle of evolution history, stresses Jaeschke.\(^2\) Ever since Dilthey, the perspective of evolution history is a recurrent keyword of Hegel-editions. I have been arguing earlier (section I.3.) that the new, modern Hegel-edition, the GW does not lack the traces of the philosophical spirit and worldview of the age either, only that it expresses it differently than the FVA, and that it is precisely the evolutionary perspective which is the leading motif of expressing the spirit of the age. Since the main subject of this paper is the relationship of philology and philosophy or philology and hermeneutics – the thesis that the establishment of the text and the edition of the text, or the critical and lifework-editions in general, do not happen in a space void of interpretation or above history – it will not be superfluous to return to this question in the concluding part of this summary of the history of Hegel’s edition (which has hopefully illustrated this relationship in several different ways).

I.9. The critical reflections about the “complete” and the “real” Hegel have constituted the overture of the GW – as discussed in part I.1. – in the sense that the FVA contained neither the one, nor the other.\(^3\) Which Hegel is the “real” Hegel – that is, the tacit assumption that the “real” Hegel will be contained in the lifework edition drawn up on the basis of the evolutionary Hegel-image, and not in the disciples’ edition – is not at all a trivial, self-evident question: and to its greatest part is dependent on philosophical considerations on truth. At any rate, the real/true Hegel for the disciples may well have been the systematic Hegel, the Hegel of the FVA. They could argue this on the basis of the philosophical concepts and authority of their master. For – we have heard it – “the

---

3 See Friedhelm Nicolin, “Probleme und Stand der Hegel-Edition,” 118. Part of the researchers took then over this characterization. See e.g. Wigger, “75 Jahre kritische Hegel-Ausgaben,” 103.
truth is the whole.” “The true shape in which the truth exists can only be its scientific system.” Obviously, it is possible to come out with other kinds of philosophical concepts on truth, but these will be just as debatable as all philosophical concepts in general. It is a naivety to believe that the rhetoric on the “real” Hegel could find itself a stable ground outside philosophy, and thus could feel exempted (as some kind of ultimate truth) from philosophical discussion. It can be claimed of course that (the meaning of) truth is different for us today than it was for Hegel or his disciples. Today we understand something else as the “real” Hegel. But this only means that we live in a different age. Still, we do not live in an absolute age either.

The situation is the same with reference to the “complete” Hegel. Similarly to the “real”, Hegel also had his own clear opinion about the “complete”, as apparent from the quoted passages of the *Phenomenology* and his remarks on Schelling. The legitimacy of the modern complaint that the FVA does not contain the “complete” Hegel because it only very selectively draws on the early manuscripts – it consciously puts aside and eliminates the writings which are documents of Hegel’s evolution, while it publishes the Berlin lectures in a highly overestimating manner –, so because its editorial method is highly selective, depends on what we mean by “complete”. The disciples could rightfully believe that they published indeed the “complete” Hegel (“complete” in the sense shown by the quotes), and to this purpose they resorted, wherever necessary, to the method that they are blamed about today: the compilation of manuscripts and lecture notes. Hegel reprehended Schelling for putting forth his developing, shaping thoughts for the wide public instead of waiting until his thoughts had gained their final shape, crystallized, and formed a system. The disciples could have answered: they did not wish to burden or confuse the reader with unnecessary and irrelevant things – as Hegel seems to have thought Schelling did. For them, the missed things: the manuscripts representing the various, consecutive stages of the evolution history of Hegelian thought were definitely not part of the “complete” works (based on the understanding of “complete” mediated to them by the Hegelian system).

Every selection has its criteria – however, this statement is not less valid for the (apparent) lack of any selection. The disciples could have argued against the modern, evolution-historical Hegel-edition by saying that it wants to employ no kind of selection, only taking into consideration the one single, external (!) criterion of what Hegel himself (incidentally) submitted for publication and what he had no time to publish, or what manuscripts and notes were preserved – by this, a lifework-edition only betrays (and/or conceals) its own perplexity. Its perplexity regarding the question: what does Hegel’s philosophy consist of? And through this, also the fact is revealed that Hegel’s philosophy does not concern the editors any longer, it does not affect them, it has no live relationship with them any more. (And indeed: the editors of the GW are Hegel-researchers, but they are hardly Hegelians). The “complete” they wished to edit may be said to be nothing else than the accidental empirical set of completely heterogeneous and disparate things,¹ and the obtained result hardly assists the reader in familiarizing

---

¹ See Friedhelm Nicolin, “Die neue Hegel-Gesamtausgabe,” 310. As to its content, “the fundamental principle of completeness is valid” for the new complete edition. “The edition must contain everything that Hegel ever published in print, or everything that was preserved in his legacy in manuscripts or posthumous editions.” The objective is to “make visible, as much as
him/herself with Hegel, but rather overwhelms and confuses him or her. The editorial uncertainty causes the reader’s disorientation. While an edition (seen from the perspective of the disciples) would have the task to undertake a fundamental role in the dispersion of the system – whether or not as an unconquerable fortress –, or at least, as a minimal condition, in raising the interest and sympathy towards it.

At the same time, this reasoning, as it had been mentioned before, is very much present in the attempt to avert the risk of “tot edieren”. “There can easily be found basic editorial principles for the edition of the students’ notes which so-to-say overwhelm the author by his edition [einen Autor tot zu edieren],” highlighted Jaeschke. “A supposed philological accuracy and thoughtlessness – at least with reference to this problem – are not very far from each other.” This latter thesis – as the theoretical formulation of the relationship and inner connections of philology and hermeneutics – can be accepted indeed to the fullest with a pure heart. However, it is worth noting meanwhile: there can be various kinds of reactions to the supposed or real danger outlined; the complete edition of Heidegger, started in 1975 with its over one hundred planned volumes – precisely one hundred and two – and seventy-seven actually published volumes until October 2008, seems to have remained indifferent to it, or wanted to defiantly challenge it.

The need for the evolution-historical image and edition of Hegel, propagated by the spirit of the age and undertaken by the GW together with all other editions following
the FVA, reaches back to Dilthey.¹ It is from him that the nearly programmatic famous words derive: “The time of struggling with Hegel has come to an end, the time of his historical knowledge has arrived. Only this historical perspective will be able to separate the transient and the permanent in Hegel.”² These lines were written in conclusion of the review which Dilthey wrote on the appearance of the two-volume edition, published in 1887 by Karl Hegel, of Hegel’s correspondence as a late supplement of the FVA.³ This publication and its review by Dilthey marks a kind of time limit: the change of a philosophical worldview and spirit of the age which determines and separates two editions. Seen from here, the edition of Hegel’s correspondence is itself a kind of shift: a bridge from the systematic Hegel of the FVA to the historical Hegel. Highly welcoming this latter kind of edition, Dilthey intended to radicalize it; his conclusion projects forth the necessity of accomplishing this task. “We have received these two volumes with great gratitude,” he wrote immediately before the quoted words: “But these make us realize even more the necessity to create, on the basis of the completely new apparatus, the evolution history of Hegel [Entwicklungsgeschichte] by the publication of the more complete abstracts of the manuscripts of his early years, and that this way the nice work once started by Haym – before the opening of the legacy of the romantics and Schelling, and in addition precisely in the time of the struggles with speculative systems – would adequately come to its end.” („Mit lebhaftem Danke haben wir diese beiden Bände aufgenommen. Aber sie können nur unser Bedürfniss um so lebhafter erregen, dass auf

¹ This is also valid for the new, academic edition of the lifeworks of Fichte and Schelling. “Dilthey’s concept on the academic edition of Kant’s Collected writings is the pattern for the basic editorial principles of the historical-critical edition of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel half a century later. The complete processing of the author’s intellectual legacy, the edition within the framework of four series (works, letters, manuscripts, lectures), the chronological organization of the material which makes possible to reconstruct the author’s evolution history, the preservation of historical language use, the documentation of the creation of individual texts, the list of all textual variants, reference to cited places, and objective explanations – these are the most important characteristics taken over from the Kant-edition” (Wolfhart Henckmann, “Fichte – Schelling – Hegel,” Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte, eds. Walter Jaeschke, Wilhelm G. Jacobs and Hermann Krings [Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1987], 83–115; 83: “Diltheys Konzeption der Akademie-Ausgabe von Kants Gesammelten Schriften ist das Modell, nach dem noch ein halbes Jahrhundert später die Grundzüge der historisch-kritischen Ausgaben der Werke von Fichte, Schelling und Hegel entworfen worden sind. Vollständige Erfassung der geistigen Hinterlassenschaft des Autors, Einteilung in die vier Reihen der Werke, Briefe, des handschriftlichen Nachlasses und der Vorlesungen, chronologische Anordnung der Materialien, aus der die Entwicklungs geschichte des Autors abgelesen werden kann, Wahrung der historischen Sprachform, Dokumentation der Entstehung der einzelnen Texte, Verzeichnis aller Textvarianten, Zitatnachweise und Sacherklärungen – dies sind die wichtigsten Standards, die von der Kant-Ausgabe übernommen worden sind”)


Grund des neuen vollständigen Apparates eine Entwicklungsgeschichte Hegel’s unter Mittheilung ganz ausreichender Auszüge aus den Manuscriten seiner früheren Jahre uns geschenkt werde und so das eins von Haym vor der völligen Eröffnung der Nachlasse der Romantiker und Schelling’s, dazu noch in der Zeit des Kampfes mit den speculativen Systemen so schon Begonnene entsprechend vollendet werde.”

I shall return to Haym soon, but in order to illustrate the differences between the two kinds of age climates, it is worthwhile to return to and dwell on Hegel’s age for a while. The description of the age is offered first of all by the plastic summary of Richard Kroner’s work.¹ The age of German idealism, dating it from the year of publication of the Critique of Pure Reason to the year of publication of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, wrote Kroner at the beginning of his outstanding work, comprises in fact the four decades between 1781 and 1821. This age is penetrated by a spirit which “is comparable to the eschatological hopes of the forming Christianity; the day of the truth must dawn now or never again; it is at hand, it is our calling to accomplish it.”² In order to illustrate the intellectual climage, Kroner cites Hegel’s letter written to Schelling in January 1795: “Let the kingdom of God come, and let us not sit idle.”³ This spirit is similarly represented already in the final lines of Kant’s main critical work: “only the way of criticism remains open,” Kant retrospectively summarizes his seminal work. “The readers, if they had enough good will and patience to accompany me on this road, can now judge whether it is possible, if they are willing to contribute, to widen this path into a highway, and turn into reality before the end of our century that what so many centuries could not accomplish, namely to answer those question, to the full satisfaction of the human mind, which have always raised – although to no avail up to now – their desire of knowledge.”⁴ Reading these lines, one may remark: it is evident in this approach that for the representatives of German idealism – and especially for Hegel – these words of Kant sounded as summons. They were extremely willing to widen the path of criticism into a highway, and they tried to give final answers to the questions raising the humans’ desire of knowledge. Kroner then illustrates this spirit and the corresponding tone on the basis of various writings of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, but we shall not follow his summarizing any further.

² “…etwas von dem Hauche der eschatologischen Hoffnungen aus der Zeit des Christentums” hat; “jetzt oder niemals muß der Tag der Wahrheit anbrechen, er ist nahe, wir sind berufen, ihn herbeizuführen”. We have seen before (in part I.3.) that the tone of the funeral orations delivered at Hegel’s death are very much similar to this.
⁴ Kant: Kritik der reinen Vernunft, B884: “Der kritische Weg ist allein noch offen. Wenn der Leser diesen in meiner Gesellschaft durchzuwandern Gefälligkeit und Geduld gehabt hat, so mag er jetzt urteilen, ob nicht, wenn es ihm beliebt, das Seinige dazu beizutragen, um diesen Fußsteig zur Heeresstraße [Italics mine – I.M.F.] zu machen, dasjenige, was viele Jahrhunderte nicht leisten konnten [Italics mine – I.M.F.], noch vor Ablauf des gegenwärtigen erreicht werden [Italics mine – I.M.F.] möge: nämlich die menschliche Vernunft in dem, was ihre Wißbegierde jederzeit, bisher aber vergeblich, beschäftigt hat, zur völligen Befriedigung zu bringen.
It should be noted at any rate that the period of fifteen years after Hegel’s death – the very period while the disciples were editing the FVA – was still reigned by the intellectual climate signalled by Kroner, to such an extent that even Schelling’s Berlin lectures in the 1840s unfolded against its background. The way how Hegelians reacted to Schelling’s occupation of the Berlin cathedra was reminiscent of the tone of the funeral speeches delivered upon Hegel’s death. In his account of Schelling’s inaugural speech in Berlin in November 1841, the young – and at that time still very Hegelian – Engels wrote the following: “Our job will be […] to protect the grave of the great master from vituperations. We shall not refrain from struggle. Nothing can be more desirable for us than to temporarily become ecclesia pressa [repressed church]. Here the souls part. That which is true, will resist to the ordeal of fire, that which is false, we shall gladly miss it from among ourselves. […] the youth has never poured in such a great number under our flags, the thought that reigns over us has never unfolded with such richness, the courage, sensibility, talent has never been on our side as much as it is now. Therefore we shall boldly confront the new enemy […].”1 In his brochure published one year later, Engels also wrote lines which mirrored the contemporary influence of the FVA and which are worth cited here because, according to my knowledge, they have not been put to use yet from the point of view of FVA’s philology and reception history, although possibly so from other points of view. “When Hegel died in 1831 and left his system as heritage to his students, their number was relatively small. […] His writings taken in public […] could only count on the small number and biased audience of scientists. […] But it was when Hegel died, that his philosophy started its true life. The edition of his complete works, and especially his lectures had an immense influence. New gates were opened to that hidden, wonderful treasure that lay in the silent cave of the mount […] At the same time the teaching gained a more human, more approachable form on the lips of Hegel’s disciples.”2

---


These lines hardly need any commentary: not only do they stand evidence for the great influence of the FVA through the eyes of a contemporary, but they also show that the effort of this edition, as formulated by Walter Jaeschke in his quoted note, “to present the lecture volumes as a supplement, and directly as a higher-level supplement, to Hegel’s unpublished works”¹ was not at all unsuccessful. In addition, it is not merely incidental that Engels’s writing contains the objection to Schelling quoted above – objection born in an utterly Hegelian spirit – that “in the history of recent philosophy [Schelling] played an important role, but despite any of his initiatives he never offered a finished system, and always postponed coming to grips with science.”²

Schelling’s lecture in Berlin was in Karl Jaspers’s formulation the last occasion for the university to play a decisive role for the public at large, and for philosophy to count as a world-shaping power and event.³ Schelling’s inauguration address was delivered in front of several hundreds of people – the largest auditorium was not large enough, the students threatened to climb in through the windows if they could not get in through the doors (they needed entrance tickets for this)⁴ – among whom there were “university notabilities and the coryphaeoi of science” and the representatives of “all social statuses, nations, and religions,” “old physicians and priests,” “white-bearded field officers” and “young volunteers.”⁵ The audience comprised contemporary or future intellectual or political personalities such as Alexander von Humboldt, Savigny, Kierkegaard, Bakunynin, Lasalle, Leopold von Ranke, Jacob Burkhardt, Droysen, Trendelenburg. Many notabilities sat among the listeners: high ranking state officials, functionaries, officers and high priests. The lecture, so it seemed, caused no disappointment, but lived up to the expectations. As Xavier Tilliette wrote as a summary: “Notabilities and unknown people, admirers and adversaries all declared with little dissent: they had witnessed a great event.”⁶

The increased attention and the eschatological anticipation surrounding philosophy in the age of idealism which preceded and accompanied Schelling’s lecture in Berlin can also be very well perceived in Engels’s description. The militant young Hegelian painted the following picture about the atmosphere preceding Schelling’s occupation of the Berlin cathedra: “If anyone who has the slightest knowledge about the

---

² Friedrich Engels, “Schelling und die Offenbarung,” 166. See note 2 on page 120 above on the objection towards Schelling.
power of the intellect over the world was asked now in Berlin which is the battlefield where the fight for the reign over Germany’s political and religious public opinion, that is, over Germany itself is going on, then he would answer: this battlefield is on the university, and precisely in lecture room 6, where Schelling holds his lectures on the philosophy of revelation.”\(^1\) Schelling of course, writes Jaspers, similarly to his contemporaries, lived with the awareness of the turn of the age, moreover, “together with all those intellects whom he had met in Jena, his thinking was penetrated not merely by the awareness of a new age, but outright of a turning point in world history.”\(^2\) The awareness of the turning point, the eschatological expectation of the coming of a new age is very much present in Schelling as well – this awareness will then survive in a modified form in Marx’s thinking as well.

This short panorama shows how the spirit of idealism permeated not only the thinking of the idealists and Hegel, but – more importantly in the current context – also the disciples’ self-interpretation of their task – perceived as a mission – to edit and publish Hegel’s works. Compared to this, the age characterized by the collapse of German idealism – to borrow the title of Paul Ernst’s influential book published after the first World War\(^3\) – which marked the second half of the 19\(^{th}\) century, only found its way to Hegel – if at all – in a historical approach. This approach is best signalled by the title of the first significant work of the literature on Hegel, Rudolf Haym’s book published in 1857: *Hegel und seine Zeit*.\(^4\) Hegel’s work is represented in the context of its own age and evolution – that is: not our age, but the age of Haym. Hegel must be understood starting from his own age – in the background of this harmless and benevolent, and seemingly natural requirement lies the recognition: if we start out from our own age, we find no ways to him. Dilthey also stressed in his cited review: “Haym newly processed the manuscripts of the legacy, and was the first to present the inner evolution history [Entwicklungsgeschichte] of his system.”\(^5\) And indeed: as Haym wrote in the introduction, his purpose was not dogmatic, his work “wishes to offer the objective

---

\(^{1}\) Friedrich Engels, “Schelling über Hegel,” 162 ff.: “Wenn ihr jetzt hier in Berlin irgendeinen Menschen, der auch nur eine Ahnung von der Macht des Geistes über die Welt hat, nach dem Kampfplatz fraget, auf dem um die Herrschaft über die öffentliche Meinung Deutschlands in Politik und Religion, also über Deutschland selbst, gestritten wird, so wird er auch antworten, dieser Kampfplatz sei in der Universität, und zwar das Auditorium Nr. 6, wo Schelling seine Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Offenbarung hält.”


history” of Hegelian philosophy rather than a presentation of its parts or a criticism or polemics in the usual meaning of the word; and although presentation and criticism are also part of his intentions, he still strives to prepare the ground for both “in a historical way”, “by discussing the origins and evolution” of this philosophy. “Nobody would dare state today – unless he was completely anachronistic or blind – that this system would still rule over life and science as it once used to.”¹ However, a philosophical system can only be overthrown by another system, writes Haym (of course this idea shows very much the influence of the Hegelian concept of system), a mental edifice cannot be demolished by mental fragments. There is no shortage of course of pretenders for the vacant throne. On the other hand, “the truth is […] that the realm of philosophy has remained today altogether without a leading philosophy, it is now in a state of disintegration and chaos.”²

The state of disintegration and chaos favours the unfolding and flourishing of historical interest, which is born in fact with the decline of system philosophy, gradually taking its place. As Haym clearly claims, the interests of the modern age no longer favour spirit: whether poetry or philosophy. “The fall of Hegelian philosophy is in connection with a general fatigue of philosophy.” Our age is no longer an age of philosophical systems, but much rather one of technical discoveries: “the emotional and mental world of the previous decade is separated from ours by a sharply traced division line.”³

As long as the spirit of the age has fallen out of the range of the reception history of Hegelian philosophy, it can only approach Hegel in a historical way. This is the confrontation of reception history and historicism. If something no longer stands in the reception history of something previous, than this something can only be accessed in a historical way – this is the age of the flourishing of historicism. Because historicism, as Gadamer argues, tears the threads connecting the present to the past; and it tries to find its way historically in the second run to something that it has ceased all living relations

¹ Haym, Hegel und seine Zeit, p. 3: “Niemand, es müßte denn ein ganz Zurückgebliebener oder ein ganz Blinder sein, wagt zu behaupten, daß dieses System noch heute Leben und Wissenschaft beherrsche, wie es es beherrschte hat.”
² Rudolph Haym, Hegel und seine Zeit, 2. (expanded ed.: 2–4.) (“An Prätendenten, es ist wahr, auf den leer gewordenen Thron ist kein Mangel. […] Die Wahrheit ist […], daß sich das Reich der Philosophie im Zustande vollkommener Herrenlosigkeit, im Zustande der Auflösung und Zerrüttung befindet.”)
³ Ibid., 5 f. (“Der Verfall der Hegel’schen Philosophie steht im Zusammenhang mit der Ermattung der Philosophie überhaupt. […] Wie durch einen scharfgezogenen Strich ist die Empfindungs- und Ansichtswelt des vorigen Jahrzehnts von unserer gegenwärtigen getrennt.”)
with in the first run. The connection to tradition – the creative furthering of tradition – will be replaced by the ambition of its objective (historical) knowledge. This latter means, even in its starting point and objective, the elimination of any connection. Historical consciousness, as Gadamer writes, dissolves the living relation of life, it creates a distance towards history, it places within brackets “the primary role of that life reference that tradition means for the present age,” “reflects itself out of the life reference connected to tradition.” By this, historical consciousness enforces tradition, but only “historically”, that is, in its own otherness, and not as something that has an effect over us and continues in us.

It is worth following Gadamer’s representation a little longer, since his description is fully appropriate to picture the change of the spirit of the age in which the relating to Hegel went through a basic transformation; – it is so appropriate that one might think that it may have been particularly this change that he had in view when formulating his assessment of historicism. In addition, it is also not incidental that, when describing this change, the reference to Dilthey is repeatedly uttered in an authoritative way. “Just like the strangeness which the mechanical age felt against nature as natural world, was epistemologically expressed in the concept of self-consciousness and its? clear and well articulated […] rules,” he writes, “the same way 19th-century intellectual sciences felt a similar strangeness towards the historical world. The intellectual creations of the past […] no longer belong to the self-evident content of the present, but they are objects which must be researched, givennesses by which the past can be represented. Thus Dilthey is also guided by the concept of givenness when he forms the concept of experience.” In his obituary written on Wilhelm Scherer, Dilthey stresses that Scherer’s method was guided by the spirit of natural sciences. He tried to explain why Scherer submitted so much to the influence of English empiricism: ‘He was a modern man, and the world of our ancestors has no longer been a home for his spirit and heart, but a historical object.’ Dilthey’s last statement could be regarded more or less as a self-characterization or self-interpretation as well.

2 Ibid., 201.: “Vorgängigkeit des geschichtlichen Lebensbezugs, den die Überlieferung für die Gegenwart darstellt”.
3 Ibid., 366.
Now it is hardly a mistake to say: the statement that “The intellectual creations of the past [...] no longer belong to the self-evident content of the present” is perfectly valid for Hegel, or rather, it is primarily valid precisely for Hegel. Hegel’s “intellectual creation no longer belongs to the self-evident content of the present,” Hegel’s world – “is no longer a home, but as historical object for the spirit and heart” of his descendants – the second half of the 19th century and the new editions starting from Dilthey’s directive. The strangeness towards it is a new and living experience; therefore one should not primarily fight for it – stand up for it or turn against it and confront it –, but get to know it first. Get to know – this means: we do not actually know it, it is strange for us. Strangeness means: the living life connection has broken. If we struggle with something – whether for it or against it – then we know it. Therefore Dilthey’s directive is more painful for a Hegelian (as for instance Lukács and the majority of 20th-century Hegelian Marxism) than any attack of Hegel’s adversaries against the master. Who is attacked, is alive and living. What they want to get to know, becomes (already only) a historical object. Gadamer’s formulation characterizes with utmost precision that intellectual climate the comprehensive horizon of which has outlined, starting from the second half of the 19th century, the new coordinates of relating to Hegel: “The intellectual creations of the past [...] no longer belong to the self-evident content of the present, but they are objects which must be researched, givennesses by which the past can be represented.” („Die geistigen Schöpfungen der Vergangenheit [...] gehören nicht mehr zu dem selbstverständlichen Inhalt der Gegenwart, sondern sind der Erforschung aufgegebene Gegenstände, Gegebenheiten, aus denen sich eine Vergangenheit vergegenwärtigen läßt.“)

It is this spirit which creates and pervades the background and – explicit or implicit, conscious or unconscious – precondition for the need for new, “evolution historical” Hegel-editions. For Dilthey, writes the modern Hegel-researcher, “Hegel’s system became historical; the sketches of the young Hegel must not be regarded as half-finished pre-stages of the system but as independent concepts. This maxim is valid for any later evolution historical [entwicklungsgeschichtlich] interpretation of the young Hegel.”1 From this point on it is evident what Theodor Haering clearly claimed at the end of the 1930s: to be a Hegel-researcher and a Hegelian researcher are two different things. Haering settled it from the very beginning: “he shares Hegel’s basic point of view under no circumstances,” he is “not a Hegelian in any sense”; his purpose is “a step-by-step representation of Hegel’s evolution.” Hegel’s philosophy is for contemporary people like that of the Egyptians or Babylonians: they are the crucial sources of every future philosophy, but they are “an unknown and unapproachable realm” for the modern age.2


At the same time, reversely, Dilthey also characterized with similar precision
the difference between the Hegel-disciples’ relation to Hegel and his own age’s changed
relation to the philosopher. As he wrote at the beginning of his cited review, “Since
these disciples were completely permeated by the historical influence of the [Hegelian]
system, they could attain, without any kind of a schoolmaster’s pedantry, such an
influence of his legacy which equalled that of books.”¹ The statement of the first part of
the sentence is very likely highly pertinent and true. The disciples “were completely
permeated by the historical potency of the system”: the FVA was fully born in the swirl
of the reception history of Hegelian thinking.² Posterity however only sought its way to
Hegel in a “historical” way, the fascination stopped: the new text editions, the collection
and edition of extant manuscripts and lecture notes are nothing else than the products of
this search, of the access via the “historical” way.³

This part can be concluded with the following remark. It had become clear by
the 1950s that even the ever so honourable efforts of individual researchers would not
suffice to complete the tasks of a new Hegel-edition, as claimed in the introduction;
there is a need for an institutional background and synchronized teamwork. We may
now add to this: it seems that one generation is not enough even for a whole team,
several are needed.

(“Wie diese Schüler von dem Gefühl der geschichtlichen Wirkungskraft des Systems noch ganz
erfüllt waren, haben sie ohne schulmeisterische Pedanterie dem Nachlass eine Wirkung, die der
von Büchern gleich käme, zu geben gewusst ...”)

² Dilthey’s formulation here is melancholic and distanced. The disciples “were completely
pervaded by the historical potency of the system”: whoever uses this formulation, hardly stands
himself any more in the catchment area of this potency. The one who does would hardly say: “I
am pervaded by this or that potency”. He would rather feel – just as Hegel’s students might have
felt – that they are touched by the truth (and not by the potency of one or another philosophical
system).

³ Of course, the chances of this access are hardly any better than the success of the research of
Jesus’s life (Leben-Jesu-Forschung) with the historical-critical method – that is, quite low. Seen
from here, the differentiation between Jesus of the faith and the historical Jesus approximately
corresponds – mutatis mutandis – to the differentiation between Hegel of the system and the
historical Hegel. Jesus is just as difficult to be found in a merely historical way as Hegel.
Moreover, so it seems, Hegel himself was also aware of the drawbacks of the historical-critical
research of Jesus’s life. “If faith wishes to draw from history the mode of founding or at least
justifying its content of which the Enlightenment speaks,” wrote Hegel in his Phenomenology,
“and seriously believes at and behaves as if the whole matter depended on it, then it had already
himself be seduced by the Enlightenment; and his efforts to found or enforce himself in such
a way only prove his contamination” (The Phenomenology of Spirit, 286.) Otto Pöggeler referred
to the negative effect of he historical, or rather evolution-historical life-work editions when he
remarked that “No matter how important the edition of the classics may be – they ruin our
relationship to philosophy: they refer the thoughts of a “great” philosopher from an evolution-
historical point of view only to the complete life-work, and not primarilly to the thing itself.” (Otto
Jacobs and Hermann Krings [Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1987], 27–37, 37.)
II.

At first, we started out from the thesis that establishing the text is a first step in the traditional (philological-positivist) conception, then as a second step follows the interpretation of the textual variant established and put forth as a result of philological work. One of the basic theses of this present work is that the establishment of the text does not happen under laboratory conditions, as if in a space void of interpretation, and that thus philology and hermeneutics are multiply intertwined.

A traditional difficulty in establishing the text is itself of a philological origin, insofar as – in order to establish the text – the philological-textual critical work going back to the edition history of a particular text must often face the fact that some texts were published by their authors in several editions, and thus in several variants which may more or less differ from one another. What is there to do in such cases? Which should then be the canonical text? How can this be established, by restoring [setting-in-place] or producing [setting-forth]?1

1 By the above formulation I try to represent (albeit necessarily imperfectly) the German dichotomy of Feststellen–Herstellen. On their differences see, e.g. Paul Ziche, “Editionswissenschaft: Historisch-kritisches Edieren. Beispiele aus der Akademie-Ausgabe von Schellings Werken,” Akademie Aktuell. Zeitschrift der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften vol. 20, 1 (2007), 27–31; 27.: “Das ‘Herstellen’ oder ‘Feststellen’ eines Textes bildet einen unverzichtbaren Arbeitsschritt einer kritischen Edition. Das setzt voraus, dass vor einer solchen editorischen Feststellung ein Text nicht wirklich feststeht, sondern erst im Prozess des Edierens entsteht. Eine Edition bewahrt oder reproduziert nicht nur etwas bereits Vorliegendes […]” (“The producing [setting-forth] or establishing [setting-in-place] of a text is an indispensable working stage of a critical edition. This implies the precondition that before such an editorial production the text does not really exist, but it comes into being in the very process of edition. A certain edition does not merely preserve or reproduce something that already exists.”) – The following explanation may be needed for understanding the relationship between “establishment”, “restoration [setting-in-place]” and “production [setting-forth]”. The “establishment” of the text means its determination, fixing, its “setting-in-place”, and in this sense it cannot be clearly separated from “production”, “setting-forth”, which ultimately also leads to some kind of fixation in place: this is a process in which the text is set so-to-say from the back to the front, to a certain place, to its own (canonical) place, and as a result it is there now, it stands steady, still, fixed [steht fest] before us. “Setting-forth” as a process should be understood about the same way as a manufacturer sets forth a product or the police sets forth a suspect: the product did not exist before its production, the suspect existed but had been hiding before, or at least had not been previously found, but now – as he was found and stopped, held back (and probably also arrested) – he is (steadily) held, therefore he can be disposed of, for instance, he can be interrogated (or the product can be sold or used). As a result of setting-forth, setting-in-place they can be localized, they have their place: the location of the text set forth is a paper-based manuscript or a printed book, preserved in a library (archive, manuscript collection), the location of the suspect is the prison guarded by the police, the product’s location is the warehouse: the object (or subject) set forth can be adequately delivered, requested and given back. The identity of the person set forth is verified just like that of a product or an established text (textual identity, Wortlaut), after which the identity of both is ensured and unchanged. The set-forth is the one who (or which) was sought and, following its identification, it is set in its own place – it is set-in-place (to print or library, to prison or police, to warehouse or store). Incidentally, the German verbs “festhalten” and “festsetzen”, similar to “feststellen” in their meaning of “fixing”, also possess the sense of “capture”, “detain”, “lay down”. The selected example tries to visualize how the “setting-forth” can be at the same time (a sort of) setting-in-
There are several far-reaching questions emerging in relation to this, but within the confines of this paper I shall only present one single example in some detail. Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* is one of the classical works of the history of philosophy, and quite likely one of the most outstanding works of modern philosophy. This work was published in 1781, and a second, revised edition appeared in 1787. Kant wrote an utterly new preface to this second edition, he kept the introduction, but significantly extended it, and reworked the text itself as well in some of its parts – among others, in the section on transcendental aesthetics –, and almost completely rewrote the chapter on transcendental deduction; except for two introductory parts, the thirty-five pages long part of the first edition was now replaced by forty new pages of text, and he also made other essential changes to the text of the first edition.1

During the time elapsed since Kant’s death, each and every edition or translation of Kant’s work has necessarily had to face the problem of which edition’s text to reproduce (or which to take as the basis for translation), or simply how to deal with the problem of the two editions. The path taken by the edition of the Prussian Royal Academy of Sciences in 1911, that they published the texts of both editions in separate volumes (as volumes three and four of the academic edition) is evidently only open for an academic edition; however, not even this is perfect, since – as attention has been drawn to it, arguably quite legitimately – this edition makes it highly difficult to place as well; however, there is a difference in this process between the production of a product (*Herstellen*) and the “detainment” (*Feststellen, festsetzen*) of the suspect, inasmuch as the former comes into being in the course of its production, while the latter already existed before it, while still it comes into being in the real sense through its “production”, its “setting-forth”, that is, it changes its mode of being, it changes its legal status, the same as the text of a critical edition also becomes “canonical” only after its establishment.

1 On the differences of the two editions, see for example part V. of the thorough introduction of the translators in the new English edition (Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allan Wood [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 66–73, mainly 70ff.) See also Wolfgang Carl, “Die transzendentale Deduktion in der zweiten Auflage,” in *Immanuel Kant: Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Klassiker Auslegen* vols. 17–18, eds. G. Mohr and M. Willaschek (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998), 189–216; 189: “For the second edition of the *Critique*, Kant completely rewrote the section on the transcendental deduction of pure rational concepts. Although Kant himself only spoke about corrections made only in the “representation”, the two formulations clearly differ from each other in their content as well.” See also: Wolfgang Carl, *Die transzendentale Deduktion in der ersten Auflage der Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Ein Kommentar* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1992) and Hansgeorg Hoppe, “Die transzendentale Deduktion in der ersten Auflage,” in *Immanuel Kant: Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, 159–188. Furthermore, see also: Dieter Sturma, “Die Paralogismen der reinen Vernunft in der zweiten Auflage,” in ibid., 391–411; 392: “Kant called the reworked parts of the second edition only ‘the change of the way of representation’. […] This reference suggests that the A- and B-paralogisms differ just in stylistic issues. This setting is not satisfactory if only for the reason that despite any emphatic formulations, B-paralogisms are still not exempt from redundancies and obscurities, which attests that the ‘change of the way of representation’ could have had other motifs as well. However, if we look at the entirety of B-paralogisms, we shall have the impression that the way of argumentation has also changed here.”
compare the individual text fragments in the two editions. Apart from this, the academic edition is not even unbiased, since the editorial method still betrays some kind of tacit preference. Seemingly, the publication in two separate volumes does not take sides as to which of the two editions has a better (canonical? final?) text. However, the problem of the succession of the texts, that the third volume of the academic edition contains the full text of the second edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, while the fourth volume contains the text of the first edition, in a reverse chronological order; and that the text of the first edition printed in volume four is not complete and lasts only until Kant had no longer altered the text (namely, it contains nearly half of the complete text, so in comparison with the 552 pages of the second edition printed in the third volume, the fourth volume only counts 252 pages): this double editorial decision tacitly yet clearly commits itself to the second edition, while considering the first interesting only in a philological and historical respect. This editorial method clearly suggests: the canonical text is the text of the second edition, the first is only auxiliary in relation to the second for the sake of completeness (which a critical edition must always bear in mind) as a textual variant, and it can be of interest as such – as a historical or philological addition.

We cannot discuss in detail all the solutions attempted by various Kant-editions in the past more than two hundred years. It is enough to say that – although there have been attempts to avoid the forced either–or choice (the decision to rely mainly on the text of either the first, or the second edition), that is, attempts at the associated typographical reproduction of both editions in some form, which, besides its advantages, also has its drawbacks or even pitfalls – the most common or typical solution is, these days as well, to take the second edition as the main text and to reproduce the first edition’s differences either in the notes or (in case of lengthier differences) elsewhere, mostly in appendices or following the corresponding text or the second edition (this method was followed by both Hungarian editions, too).

There are two considerations worth taking into account about this solution. Firstly, Kant himself wrote at the end of the preface to the second edition that he made no changes concerning the essence, that is, matters of content, compared to the first

---


2 See for instance the 1877 Kehrback edition’s revised 1924 version by Raymund Schmidt, and its unaltered reprint in 1979 (Leipzig: Reclam). This edition uses the alternation of Gothic and Latin letters according to well-defined criteria, in combination with a two-columned typesetting in an attempt to simultaneously reproduce the texts of both editions and this way, as can be read in the preliminary note, “it can be used as an original textual variant for both the first and the second editions” (p. VI.)

3 Wilhelm Weischedel, the editor of the currently most used twelve-volume *Werkausgabe*, repeatedly reprinted since 1968, summarized the main guidelines of the Kant-interpretations of just the past two hundred years when he wrote in his editorial afterword: “The second edition mostly revised and altered by Kant himself is preferred in the establishment of the text; the differences in the first edition […] will be indicated in the notes […] Where Kant had modified lengthier fragments, […] there both formulations will be printed successively.” (Kant, *Werke in zwölf Bänden, Theorie-Werkausgabe*, ed. Wilhelm Weischedel [Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974], vol. 4, 716 f.)
edition, but he improved the mode of presentation, he changed the formulation in several misleading places, and hopefully made thus his ideas intelligible. However, were these indications not there, it could still be intuitively acknowledged and accepted: if an author publishes his work anew years after its first edition in a revised version, then he must evidently think that its text is an improved, corrected variant, therefore it should be considered as the final version to be reproduced in the future. So – beyond Kant’s concrete case – it has become, in a sense, a rule of edition technique that the last text version published in an author’s lifetime should be considered the authentic text. Editors thus, writes Wilhelm G. Jacobs in comment to this thesis, so to speak fulfil the deceased’s last will: if a work was published in several editions in its author’s lifetime then the editors take the last edition as a basis, as the last word of the deceased with respect to the matter.¹

Obviously, the textual variant eventually chosen for printing significantly determines the subsequent interpretation, including the reception history. Conversely, it is also valid: the interpretation – insofar as it must decide which text to publish, which variant it considers worthy of print – anticipates the textual edition, precedes it. At any rate, textual edition and interpretation go hand in hand. Those who take as a basis the text of the second edition – this group is more numerous in the reception history of Kant’s work – naturally accept the interpretation that the second edition is better and clearer than the first: the new text created by reformulations – on the basis of the reception of the first edition and also in reaction to the judgments and often also misunderstandings published in the reviews written in the meantime – offers a more forceful and consistent presentation of the basic idea of the Critique; in other words, it is indeed a “corrected edition”.

Nevertheless, it is essential that we must also refer to the exceptions, among whom most important are Schopenhauer and Heidegger. Schopenhauer wrote that he could only understand Kant’s main work and he was only able to dissolve the contradictions previously sensed only when he read the work in the first edition already difficult to find at that time. Pages 348–392 of the first edition, which, according to Schopenhauer, contained a brilliant representation of Kant’s idealism, disappeared in the second edition, and were replaced by a set of contradictory statements. “By this, the text of the Critique of Pure Reason widely used between 1787 and 1838 became a distorted and spoiled text, and the work itself a self-contradictory book the meaning of which could no longer be clear and comprehensible for anyone.”² – said Schopenhauer. For this reason, he felt directly entitled to turn to the reader: “No one should imagine that they know the Critique of Pure Reason and that they are able to create a clear picture of Kant’s teaching if they only read the work in the second edition or another edition

reproducing the second one; this is completely impossible, since then they only read a mutilated, spoiled, in a sense inauthentic (!) text. It is my duty to determinately say it for everybody’s warning.”¹ In 1837 Schopenhauer turned to Karl Rosenkranz, Hegel’s disciple who edited the complete works of Kant, in a letter asking him to publish Kant’s critical main work in its original form, that is, in the first edition. Rosenkranz completed the request in 1838, and by this, according to Schopenhauer, he “gained unsurpassable merits”: “he saved the most important work of German literature perhaps from destruction”.²

According to Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant one of the central parts of the work, the chapter on the deduction of pure rational concepts, in the first edition version reveals the difficulties deriving from the main problematization of the work in a more open and manifest way than the heavily reformulated text of the second edition. What is more: the reason of changing the formulation could have been precisely the fact that Kant recoiled from the difficulties arising around the concept of transcendental imagination and the troubling risks causing the instability of the construct of pure reason; in the second edition he radically reinterpreted the concept of transcendental imagination and strove to reduce its role to a minimum.³ Attention should not be paid to what Kant says but to what happens, what is going on in the course of the new foundation of metaphysics attempted by him. And this happening reveals shrinking back, retreating or recoiling.⁴

Kant searched the connection of the two branches of human cognizance, sensibility as receptivity and passivity, and thinking as activity and spontaneity, in the synthesis of imagination, which he was inclined to interpret in the first edition of the

¹ Ibid., 587. (“Keiner bilde sich ein, die »Kritik der reinenVernunft« zu kennen und einen deutlichen Begriff von Kants Lehre zu haben, wenn er jene nur in der zweiten, oder einer der folgenden Auflagen gelesen hat; das ist schlechterdings unmöglich: denn er hat nur einen verstümmelten, verdorbenen, gewissermaßen unechten Text gelesen. Es ist meine Pflicht, Dies hier entschieden und zu Jedermanns Warnung auszusprechen.” [Emphasis mine, I.F.M.])
² Ibid., 587. (“In Folge meiner Vorstellungen [...] hat im Jahre 1838 Herr Professor Rosenkranz sich bewegen gefunden, die »Kritik der reinen Vernunft« in ihrer ursprünglichen Gestalt wieder herzustellen, indem er sie [...] nach der ersten Auflage von 1781 abdrucken ließ, wodurch er sich um die Philosophie ein unschätzbares Verdienst erworben, ja das wichtigste Werk der Deutschen Literatur vielleicht vom Untergange gerettet hat; und dies soll man ihm nie vergessen.”) See also Karl Rosenkranz, Geschichte der Kant'schen Philosophie, ed. S. Dietzsch [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987; 1st ed. Leipzig: Leopold Voss, 1840], 160.)
³ Cf. Heidegger GA 3, 160ff, 164, 168, 214f; GA 25, 279. Transcendental imagination “is only nominally present” in the second edition, which loses its function of “an individual fundamental ability, which mediates in an original way between sensibility and reason in their possible unity”, “its function is taken over by reason” (GA 3, 164 [Die transzendentale Einbildungskraft wäre “in der zweiten Auflage nur noch dem Namen nach da’; sie fungiere “nicht mehr als eigenständiges Grundvermögen, das Sinnlichkeit und Verstand in ihrer möglichen Einheit ursprünglich vermittelt”, “sein Amt ist dem Verstand übertragen.”]; cf. also GA 25, 412).
⁴ The term “recoiling” (Zurückweichen) appears in GA 3, 160, 165, 168, 215, but it also appears already in § 6 of Time and Being. (Sein und Zeit [Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1979], 23: “Wovor Kant hier gleichsam zurückweicht, das muß thematisch und grundsätzlich ans Licht gebracht werden [...]”). The 1929 Kant-book can be regarded as a detailed exposition of this concise interpretation of Kant raised in a few sentences in Heidegger’s capital work.
Critique as an independent spiritual ability, the common root of the two branches.¹ But since imagination was considered to refer to sense perception and time, but this Kant’s entire enterprise, the preservation of the “pureness” of pure reason, was endangered. This way Kant stopped to follow the path he started, and in the second edition of his work presented a serious reconsideration of the issue of imagination. Led by the ambition to find a new, steady foundation for metaphysics, to base it on the subjectivity of the subject, on “pure reason,” what Kant does in fact – writes Heidegger – is precisely to undermine the foundation he has just wanted to lay; he, so-to-say, digs out the earth from underneath it [den Boden weggräbt].² Recoiling is a result of this. Beneath the earth dug out from there an abyss was revealed. Seeing the abyss opening up in front of him while he tried to lay the foundations of metaphysics, Kant recoiled and hurried to cover it over. The reformulated text of the second edition’s chapter on deduction is a result of this cover-up attempt.

The traditional – neo-Kantian – claim, that Kant cleared the text of the second edition from the “psychologistic” reminiscences still their in the first one is – according to Heidegger – false from its very beginning. The first is just as little “psychologistic” as the second is “logical”.³ Since however neo-Kantianism saw Kant’s foremost work and its philosophical accomplishment in the (anti-psychologistic) epistemology founding positive sciences, although in Heidegger’s view it is primarily an attempt for the foundation of metaphysics,⁴ it is understandable that the primacy of logic, seen from this perspective, might have seemed an advantange, and therefore the text of the second edition counted as a standard. “That seemingly external question” – writes Heidegger – “whether the second edition of the Critique of Pure Reason deserves to be preferred to the first one in its interpretation or it is the other way round, is but a pale reflection of the question decisive for the Kantian foundation of metaphysics and its interpretation: is the transcendental imagination as a foundation strong enough to define in an original way – in its unity and entirety – the finite essence of human subjectivity […]?”⁵

As an in-depth analysis of the various edition-technical attempts of Kant-editions during the past two hundred years is not our task here, neither is the discussion of two hundred years’ interpretations of Kant, nor, in connection with this, the polemical examination of Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant, in effect truly suggestive and conceptual indeed. For the purposes of the problem discussed here, a very weak formulation will perfectly suffice. Namely, that Heidegger’s interpretation must not be “true” from the point of view of the problem discussed, it is enough that is may as well be true in principle – moreover, Kant also knew this strategy, and called it the polemical use of reason.⁶ If it fulfils this condition – and I think it does, what’s more, it overfulfils

---

¹ Cf. Heidegger GA 3, 137ff especially 140; GA 25, 276ff.
³ Heidegger, GA 3, 170.
⁴ Heidegger seriously contested already in his early lectures, for example in 1921–22, that Kant’s accomplishment would have unfolded primarily in the field of epistemology (cf. GA 61, 97).
⁵ Heidegger GA 3, 171.
⁶ “By the polemical use of reason I mean that reason defends its theses against their dogmatic negation. This is not to say that its statements may not be false, only that nobody can state its opposite with apodictic certainty (or even with higher probability).” In extreme cases “we could contrast the pompousness of one party with the – equally legitimate – pompousness of the other, so
it – then it will be able to destabilize the opposing view, its self-evident, complacent self-confidence that it has no alternative. In this case Heidegger’s interpretation can destabilize the self-evidence of the thesis which says: “later edition = better edition” or “the text of the later edition = the better (canonical) text”, “the later textual variant = the better textual variant”. No matter what stance we take in the matter, it is obvious: the choice of one edition to prefer over the other is very much a matter of interpretation. However, this preference depending on interpretation precedes the decision on the choice of the textual variant to be printed, seemingly pertaining only to the competence of philology. That is to say, interpretation, hermeneutics precedes philology.

Heidegger had expounded his preference for the earlier text on other occasions as well, approximately one decade before the appearance of his book on Kant. He premised his first university lecture on the interpretation of the main work of his former professor, the neo-Kantian Rickert, with a short edition-historical survey. He minutely exposed that the first edition of 1892 the *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis* as a habilitation writing consisted of 91 small-sized pages, but by the third edition in 1915 “a whole new book was born, which already shows on the outside by the fact that it numbers 456 large-sized pages.” In the followings, Heidegger turns against Rickert’s self-interpretation – just like against Kant’s later on: “Rickert says in the foreword of this edition that ‘the earlier editions must not be used any more.’ The basic idea, as it was formulated in the first edition, should nevertheless be retained, therefore in presenting its short characterization and problem-historical connections I shall primarily refer to the first edition, mainly because Rickert’s decisive ideas are expressed in even simpler ways here and they are not burdened immeasurably by several far-flung, lengthy and often over-elaborate critical discussions with unnamed opponents, as it so often happens in the third edition.”

Somewhat later he stresses again: “[The problem] must be understood in its main tendency, and in such a way as it arises from historical motivation. Therefore [I shall take into consideration] the first edition, despite Rickert’s observation.”

that the mind this way would at least be shocked by the attack of the opponent, start to be suspicious about the excessive needs and listen to the voice of criticism” (Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, A739 f, A757 = B767 f, B785: “Unter dem polemischen Gebrauche der reinen Vernunft verstehe ich nun die Verteidigung ihrer Sätze gegen die dogmatischen Verneinungen derselben. Hier kommt es nun nicht darauf an, ob ihre Behauptungen nicht vielleicht auch falsch sein möchten, sondern nur, daß niemand das Gegenteil jemals mit apodiktischer Gewißheit (ja auch nur mit größerem Scheine) behaupten möchte.”). The polemical use of pure reason serves to destabilize the claims pretending to possess the apodictic truth (saying that what I state may have no less right to claim that it is true than what you state), and not to be a true statement itself. This use serves as a defence.


Heidegger’s preference for the first editions in the case of Kant and Rickert is possibly connected with the wider dimensions of his philosophy, namely with the disposition to return to the original, and is prone to regard tradition – the derivative, the subsequent, as a movement which obscures the origin, and distances from it – as decadence, emptiness, decline. According to Heidegger, tradition is characterized precisely by being emptied, levelled, by the fact that it exhausts and the veils over the meaning of the original insights of tradition. “Tradition as it becomes dominant makes that what it ‘transmits’ primarily and mostly so unaccessible that it much rather obscures it.”1 The Husserlian principle of “back to the things” is transformed at Heidegger into “back to the origins”, or “back to the historical beginnings,” back to history. Seen from this perspective, the initial, most “original” return to the origins, the new enforcement of the radiating power of the origin is the true beginning of philosophy or philosophizing, it is philosophy itself. Accordingly, philosophers are in fact eternal starters – or rather restarters – whose questions, not accidentally and precisely because of this, are typically directed to the beginnings, to the beginnings of things. No surprise thus that in his second period, Heidegger’s intellectual efforts increasingly revolved around a new, “different beginning”, “another beginning” (“anderer Anfang”) of European philosophy and history. From Heidegger’s point of view, of all great things beginning is the greatest, since, as something that cannot be traced back to anything and cannot be deduced from anything, is a mystery utterly resisting understanding, and conceals within itself an inexhaustible richness; one that in all its unfolding or derivation may necessarily mean retrogression, impoverishment, decline.2 The Being and Time begins with the statement: the question referring to being which stood in the foreground of the thinking of Plato and Aristotle, has fallen into oblivion, became trivial and was reduced to silence. “What they once succeeded, with the greatest effort of thinking and albeit only fragmentarily and as a first attempt, to grasp of phenomena, has long before become trivial.”3 Philosophers are thus in fact beginners, who possess “eternal youth”.4 Reference must also be made to

1 SZ 21.: “Die hierbei zur Herrschaft kommende Tradition macht zunächst und zumeist das, was sie »übergibt«, so wenig zugänglich, daß sie es vielmehr verdeckt.” The product of this approach is the following statement: we are with Kant against Kantianism. (GA 25, 279.)

2 Cf. e.g. GA 45, 110, 114, and also the second next note below.

3 SZ 1§. “Und was ehemals in der höchsten Anstrengung des Denkens den Phänomenen abgerungen wurde, wenngleich bruchstückhaft und in ersten Anläufen, ist längst trivialisiert.”

Heidegger’s master, Husserl, who thinks that philosophy “is in its essence a science of the true beginnings”,¹ and who, accordingly, established his own philosophical attitude on the level of a “beginner”, and considered that “at least at his old age he reached perfect certainty at least for himself about the fact that he could finally call himself a real beginner.”²

Now, supposedly it may also be regarded as a kind of philological ramification or increment of this philosophical approach – phenomenological-hermeneutical, directed to the beginnings – that in the course of his historical interpretations of philosophy, Heidegger sometimes prefers the first edition of the works of certain thinkers. The fact that the philological preference may be connected with philosophical considerations, is embedded into a philosophical background: this may only seem condemnable or detrimental for a positivist conception feeding the illusion of a philology devoid of philosophy. In fact, it is mostly an advantage since the philosophical embeddedness makes itself visible, and therefore it makes possible its own rational discussion: from a different point of view, for instance from a Hegelian one – for which, as we have seen, “truth is the whole”, and the absolute “is only at the end what it is” – becomes debatable, polemical. The Hegelian stance as a philosophical stance at the same time, as we have seen, may suggest completely different philological and edition technical consequences, and the edition of the disciples quite accurately accomplished with reference to Hegel’s works.

However, it is not necessary to share Heidegger’s philosophical point of view – the outlined philosophical background which is supposedly connected to his preference for first editions – in order to take its philological consequences as acceptable or plausible. These consequences are valid in themselves. That is to say, if we do not exclude the supposition that it is theoretically possible that an earlier text may formulate preference to inquire about the beginnings – i.e. the beginnings of all things, the *arkhai* – since they are reluctant to simply accept that which has been handed down as self-evident (*selbstverständlich*) and lives on in the present. That the particular subject of philosophy is exactly that what appears as self-evident in everyday life, and that philosophy must be able to sight directly a kind of mystery in this alleged self-evidence: these insights had already played a central role for Husserl; see e.g. *Die Idee der Phänomenologie, Husserliana*, vol. 2. ed. W. Biemel (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973), 19. (“Die Erkenntnis, im natürlichen Denken die allerselbstverständlichste Sache, steht mit einem Mal als Mysterium da”); *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentalen Phänomenologie, Husserliana*, vol. 6. ed. W. Biemel (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1976), 183 ff. (“Von vornherein lebt der Phänomenologe in der Paradoxie, das Selbstverständliche als fraglich, als rätselhaft ansehen zu müssen und hinfors kein anderes wissenschaftliches Thema haben zu können als dieses”) etc. Therefore such beginners are sometimes prone to consider the beginning as the greatest, perhaps the greatest of all (future) things. (see e.g. *Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität. Das Rektorat 1933/34*, ed. H. Heidegger [Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann, 1983], 12; *Einführung in die Metaphysik* [Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1976], 12, 145; GA 5, 64, 327.; GA 34, 15.; GA 45, 110, 114; GA 65, 57.; GA 51, 15). I use the term “beginning” here in the meaning of “Anfang” and not “Beginn” (about this differentiation see GA 39, 1 f; GA 54, 9f).

² Edmund Husserl, “Nachwort zu den Ideen” (1930). *Husserliana* vol. 5, 161. Husserl also added here: his efforts can only be understood and appreciated, his work can only be adequately approached by he “who struggles for the beginning of philosophy” (ibid., 162.).
in a more open and unveiled manner – as if in statu nascendi – the thoughts of its author, while it may happen that in a later version the original thought becomes obscured, it is concealed, palled, becomes unrecognizable, or at least it will not remain as directly accessible as it was at its first formulation, then Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant would make plausible the possibility that in certain cases the earlier version is to be preferred to the subsequent ones. However, in this case it can be said: the statement that the later text is the final, authentic version is thus unfounded and by no means can be generalized. More accurately, it is itself dependent on the acceptance of various philosophical conceptions (e.g. mirroring the Hegelian approach); conceptions which – as philosophical suppositions – are themselves debatable, that is to say, they are not absolute statements beyond any doubt and without any alternative. Whatever may be the case, the historical-critical edition in process of the other two outstanding philosophers of German idealism, Fichte and Schelling, always uses the first edition (Erstdruck) of the writings published in the authors’ lifetime, and marks the incidental variations in the notes or the critical apparatus.¹

¹ On Fichte, see: Wolfhart Henckmann, “Fichte – Schelling – Hegel,” In Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte, eds. Walter Jaeschke, Wilhelm G. Jacobs und Hermann Krings (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1987), 83–115, 90. (Henckmann refers to the fact that the Fichte-edition differs in this respect from the complete works of the philosopher edited by his son in eleven volumes. On Schelling, see: Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, Historisch-kritische Ausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, eds. Hans Michael Baumgartner, Wilhelm G. Jacobs, Jörg Jantzen, Hermann Krings und Hermann Zeltner, 1st series: Werke (Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog), vol. 1, 1976, 15. On the history of Schelling-editions and the new historical-critical edition see the detailed study of Luigi Pareyson, “La nuova edizione storico-critica di Schelling,” Filosofia, Nuova Serie XXX/1 (1979), 45–90. Due to the influence of certain observations of Pareyson and some other reviews written in the meantime, the edition technical principles of the Schelling-edition went through some changes between the first and second volumes. These deserve to be presented in some more detail since they offer insight into the concrete concepts as well as difficulties or dilemmas regarding the bibliographical structure or text formation of the individual volumes of the critical edition. For the sake of a better, easier readability the diacritical marks referring to the critical apparatus were removed starting with the second volume of the complete edition, and the critical and explanatory notes were not formatted as footnotes but as continuous endnotes at the very end of the volume, before the indexes, and the references to the adequate text fragments were made by marking the page- and line numbers of the primary texts. Thus the footnotes only contained the indications of the textual variants, and this was evidently justified by the need to more determinedly distinguish the differences between the two textual levels. This was supposed to suggest the modifications or variants of the primary text itself (changes between the versions published in Schelling’s lifetime, or in certain cases in various copies of the same edition, or even in the first complete edition published by Schelling’s son), which must have primacy over the apparatus clarifying and explaining the text, containing further references, completions, commentaries, quotations – that is, let’s say, over the level of the articulation of the secondary text. At the same time, the very useful, so-called “Editorischer Bericht” has been preserved in an unchanged form in front of each text, the structure of which always contains a threefold division. As a first step, the editor of the specific text reports, under the title “Zur Edition des Textes”, on the first edition of the text, the extant or accessible copies, the condition of the text, on possible second or subsequent reprints, offers a – primarily bibliographical – description or information, summarizes the transmission of the text, attempts a comparison of various editions, and tries to recover the text or manuscript.
Attention should not be paid to what Kant says, but to what happens in the course of the new foundation of metaphysics he attempted – I summarized above a cardinal thesis of Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant. Variants A and B of the chapter on deduction of Kant’s main work, according to Heidegger, contains a happening (recoiling or shrinking back, which is a back-and-forth movement – that is, the “forth” must be preceded by a “back”, but this is not so important at this time). It is worth noting that this concept of various textual variants as occurrence – as we could call this kind of interpretation – has its representatives also in the contemporary literature on Kant. For example, the interpretation of Hansgeorg Hoppe, although much less conceptual than Heidegger’s, shares the latter’s concept on the inner happening of the text.\(^1\) In his approach deduction B attempts at taking a step further in order to solve some of the problems left open in deduction A, but precisely because of this knowledge of deduction A is indispensable for the understanding of the problem as a whole. Seen from here, one may legitimately speak of the happening of the text; that is to say, the question of which

comes first of the two textual variants of deduction is simply eliminated. Should we think that the later variant must be preferred, we still cannot disregard the earlier one, since only on the basis of this – the earlier – can we understand, and appreciate accordingly, the later. The question of either–or is an incorrect and false question. This question can only be formulated in a meaningful way in the event of perceiving the text as a formation (Das Gebilde) – torn out from its possible evolution history – frozen at a certain moment and thus made timeless. It would suffice to make a short reference to the fact that one of the classical cases of text happening is the relationship of the Old and the New Testament, where the latter writes further and thus reinterprets or completes the text of the former.¹ The traditional dilemma of Hegel-research, namely that the researcher cannot be certain, from a philological point of view, even about the title of the *Phenomenology*, also belongs to the same circle of problems: some bound copies still bear the original title given by Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Erfahrung des Bewußtseins*,

¹ Tradition has had an important role in the formation – and also the further evolution – of the texts of the Old and New Testaments. See for this more recently: Karl Kardinal Lehmann, “Norma normans non normata? Bibel im Begründungszusammenhang von Theologie und Lehramt,” zur debatte. Themen der Katholischen Akademie Bayern 38/5 (2008): 1–4, mainly 2: the Bible itself “has been created through a long process of tradition. This tradition has in important share in the collection of the writings in the so-called obligatory “canon”. In the course of this we recognize the actual participation of the Bible in this collection and delimitation.” In the end, we arrive to the functional connection that “there is no writing without tradition, and there is no tradition without the Church, and no Church without the former two.” (p. 3). It is also worth mentioning that the historical-critical exegesis strongly connected to the historical-critical edition from a hermeneutic perspective – seen from the point of view of application – is a highly committed genre. As Martin Ebner writes: “Ever since its beginnings, the historical-critical exegesis has had a church-historical orientation. It independently and completely consciously turns against the ecclesiastical educational institution, and reads the founding documents of the church against the background of contemporary praxis and preaching as a counter-control. Inasmuch as it is the meaning of the writings that interests the ecclesiastical educational institutions, then historical criticism primarily inquires one-sidedly about the original meaning of the writings […] In this respect historical criticism feels itself to be the advocate of the strangeness [Fremdheit] of our fundamental writings. However, by no means does it happen out of pure historical interest. The true concern lies in the fact that it confronts today’s readers […] with the beginnings of the movement. That it reveals precisely what makes questionable our ideas about the beginning and our reading habits. […] The programme says: placing the text back to its age and leaving it to make its effect – however, not for the reason of archiving, but for enforcing an early Christian text in its confrontation with contemporary praxis, in such a way that contemporary theological thinking and contemporary ecclesiastical structures should be able to stand responsibly in front of the witnesses of the early times. By its insistence on the original meaning, historical criticism tries to enforce the individual right of fundamental writings, and wishes to induce a salutary shock in the contemporary readers of these texts: there were many other things at the beginning. This is accompanied by the impulse: it can be different again in the future. – In order to reach this shock induced by the strangeness of texts, historical criticism operates in two interconnected ways: it situates the text historically, and reveals the historical stratification of the texts.” In Antiquity, authoritative texts carried there creation history within themselves. The authenticity of a text increased by feeding on a previous preliminary text. M. Ebner, “Grundoperationen der historisch-kritischen Exegese,” zur debatte. Themen der Katholischen Akademie Bayern 38/5 (2008), 7 f.
changed only in the course of printing, and it is not at all a mere philological, but an utterly hermeneutical problem, implying the meaning of the entire work, the *happening of the text*, how the “science of the experience of consciousness” became, in the course of the work’s intellectual-bibliographic production, “The phenomenology of spirit”.

The first paragraph of the commentaries over the problem of application of Gadamer’s major work, that I have examined in more detail elsewhere, can be mentioned as a special case of the inner happening of the text. In my interpretation what happens here is the connection between the disappearance in all subsequent editions of a footnote appearing in the first two editions of the work, and the textual deterioration of the following footnote\(^1\) – however, we shall only find it out if we compare the texts of the various editions and we are able to conceive the text lying in front of us as if in a frozen state as a station of the happening of the text (we can trace down mainly eliminated or erased texts this way). Since the Collected Works edition of Gadamer’s major opus is in fact the fifth edition of the work, which takes as its basis the text of the fourth edition, this happening of the text remains thus hidden for the readers of the final, ten-volume edition of Gadamer’s work, and could only become accessible in case of its comparison with the texts of the first two editions.

Similarly, in Kant’s case as well – this is the minimal requirement of Heidegger’s interpretation – one must be familiar with both versions of the chapter on deduction in order to be able to judge the nature of the modifications. Text deterioration is itself a happening of the text – a special case of it – one that *eo ipso* questions the conviction that the text of the last or later edition is (more) authentic in comparison with the earlier ones.

Some further cases are also worth listing, in which the thesis that the last or latest textual variant published in the author’s lifetime can be regarded as the authentic – or more authentic – text also cannot be maintained. I have in mind the various textual modifications made from one edition to the next in certain works of Heidegger, that I have discussed in more detail elsewhere, therefore I shall only briefly refer to them here. In § 44 c. of *Being and Time* there are certain interesting remarks on the sceptic, scepticism, and the refutation of scepticism. In the seventh edition of the work, Heidegger made modifications in a key sentence of this section, and this new text was published in all subsequent editions of the work, which witnessed fourteen editions in Heidegger’s lifetime. By this modification, the former “nie” (never) was replaced by “je” (once), and this is of course not an insignificant change. The question of which of the two versions can be regarded as the authentic version (a question which in a traditional sense, that is, in the sense of “Textherstellung”, can be regarded as philological) leads to no significant results unless completing it with hermeneutical effort. Apparently, the textual modification lends a completely new meaning to the text,\(^1\)

---

but a more careful analysis rather shows a shift of emphasis.\footnote{Cf. István Fehér M., \textit{Heidegger és a szkeptizmus. A szkeptikus kételeken át a hermeneutikai kérdésig} (Heidegger and scepticism. From sceptical doubt to hermeneutic question) (Budapest: Korona Nova, 1998.), 23.: “The key sentence in question of the Heideggerian text […] can be meaningful in the case of both textual variants – that is to say, the either–or alternative of meaningfulness can be avoided, or it does not exist –, at most the emphasis lies elsewhere in the two variants.” See also 45.: “It can be epitomized that the two textual variants created by the modification lying at the centre of our analysis delineates two meanings, distinct in their emphases, within the analyzed text: various, equally sensible formations of meaning are delineated in the analyzed text depending on our interpretation along one or the other version, depending on which variant we include in the chain of thought.”} Just like in the case of the other two textual modifications usually discussed in the literature on Heidegger, where the problem also appears primarily as a philological question. However, at a first sight the modification in these cases (at least philologically) is even more radical: it reverses the meaning of the text. In paragraph 4 of § 3 of \textit{Being and Time}, the term “durchsichtig” was changed in the complete edition into “nicht durchsichtig”\footnote{“Die eigentliche »Bewegung« der Wissenschaften spielt sich ab in der mehr oder minder radikalen und ihr selbst [nicht]durchsichtigen Revision der Grundbegriffe” (SZ 9.) This modification appears in the Gesamtausgabe-edition of \textit{Being and Time} – and in the individual editions following the GA, that is, beginning with the 15th edition of the series of individual editions –; this is an editorial modification made on the basis of Heidegger’s note in his own copy. See: Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, \textit{Hermeneutische Phänomenologie des Daseins. Eine Erläuterung von Sein und Zeit}, vol. 1. »Einleitung: Die Exposition der Frage nach dem Sinn von Sein« (Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann, 1987), 86 ff. Tibor Schwendtner discusses in detail Von Herrmann’s editorial interference in his book \textit{Heidegger tudományfelfogása (Az 1919–1929-es időszak írásainak tükrében)} (Heidegger’s concept of science [In the mirror of his writings from the 1919–1929 period]) (Budapest: Osiris, 2000), 118 ff. – In my view, it is about the grammatical–syntactic question whether the scope of the expression “mehr oder minder” (“more-or-less”) extends to only one or both of the two adjectives – or in fact an adjective and an adjectival structure – following, and connected to it. If it does, then the modification if superfluous and it rather causes textual deterioration. If it does not, then the textual modification is justified. I have as yet to discuss this problem with several German university colleagues, among whom also Germanists, but I received no definitive, certain answer, which may lead to the conclusion that this is a stylistically ambiguous structure.– Heidegger’s note in his own copy is also difficult to interpret. Should we see it as an intention of text emendation, or a subsequent commentary, rethinking or completing the original text? (“A revision more-or-less transparent for itself: well, at a deeper thought, rather less than more, so one could also say: a more-or-less not transparent revision…”). Finally, it cannot be disregarded that the “more-or-less” – inasmuch as its scope also includes “revision” – somehow tempers the significance of the counterpoint; what can “more-or-less” be stated to be “x”, that can (“more-or-less”) be stated to be “not-x” as well. What is “partly” transparent, that is also “partly” non-transparent – and this is not a contradiction to such an extent that it can even be attached to the text, too (“partly transparent, partly non-transparent”), but even if it is not attached, and the text transforms from “partly transparent” to “partly non-transparent”, what happens is not the reversion of meaning, but rather the shift of emphasis, of the weights. In a certain sense the case is similar to the replacement of “ever”– “never”, which also covers a shift of emphasis.} on the one hand, and one sentence of the afterword of “What is Metaphysics?” went through a radical change on the other hand: the sentence fragment which prior to the fourth edition
appeared as “[...]
das Sein wohl west ohne das Seiende, daß niemals aber ein Seiende ist ohne das Sein”,
changed, from the fifth edition onwards, to “[...]
das Sein nie west ohne das Seiende, daß niemals ein Seiendes ist ohne das Sein”
in an approximate translation: “although there is being without beings, but there are no beings without being”,
and: “there never is being without beings, there never are beings without being.”

Just like the classic philological question referring to the authentic variant in the case of
Kant’s major work – is it the first or the second edition of The Critique of Pure Reason
that can be regarded as authentic variant? – cannot be unequivocally answered,
similarly, it seems like an unproductive or mistaken problematization to investigate
whether, with regard to the Heideggerian modification, it is the earlier or later textual
variant that should be preferred.

The above mentioned modification of the afterword of What is metaphysics?
yields an opportunity for a short attempt of explanation. It can be equally said that – with
certain simplification and extrapolation – there is being without beings, and there is no
being without beings, insofar as both statements are, in their own way – seen form a
certain (restricted) perspective – valid, while they are imperfect from different
perspectives: the imperfectness and onesidedness of the one is counterbalanced or
“equalled” by the imperfectness and onesidedness of the other. Every philosophy which
is characterized by the rejection of the subject-object dualism, must fight with its
linguistic predicament – Hegel had already complained about it as well.

1 See GA 9, 306. In relation to the philological-hermeneutical debates about the textual
modifications, having the ambition to critically assess or dissolve the difficulties or contradictions
caused by these modifications, see Max Müller, Existenzphilosophie im geistigen Leben der
Gegenwart (Heidelberg: Kerle, 1949), 50, 75 f. (M. Müller: Existenzphilosophie. Von der
Metaphysik zur Metahistorik, 4th, extended edition, ed. A. Halder [Freiburg/München: Alber,
1986], 55 f, 84 f.); Walter Schulz, “Über den philosophiegeschichtlichen Ort Martin Heideggers,”
Perspektiven zur Deutung seines Werks, ed. O. Pöggeler (Köln/Berlin: Kiepenheuer & Witch,
1953), 160 ff. György Lukács, Az ész trónfosztása (The dethronement of the mind) (Budapest:
Magvető, 1978), 742.

2 See Hegel: A szellem fenomenológiaja, 19.: “They take the subject as a constant point, to which
the predicates are attached as to their support.” In addition, see primarily the thoughts concerning
the “speculative theorem”, in particular, the following fragment: “The philosophical theorem,
because it is a theorem, triggers the impression that we are dealing with the ordinary relation of
subject and predicate and the common behaviour of knowledge” (ibid., 41.). Also see the
following specific place of the young Hegel’s Frankfurt fragment of a system: “if I say that it
[being] is the connectedness of opposition and relation, then this connectedness itself can also be
isolated and dissaproved its opposition to non-connectedness; thus I would have to say: being is
the connectedness of connectedness and non-connectedness. Every single term is a product of
reflexion [...]” (Hegel, “Rendszertöredék” (Fragment of a System), in Ifjúkori írások. Válogatás
(Works from the age of youth. A collection), trans. Gábor Révai (Budapest: Gondolat, 1982),
140.) The identicalness and non-identicalness of being and consciousness, respectively the
disclosure of negative dialectics struggles with the same shortness of language; about this, see
footnote 56. of my article with the title “Lukács és Sartre. Két gondolati út metszéspontjai és elá-
to show elsewhere, philosophy has, in a particular sense, no “language” of its own.¹ In Heidegger’s case the relation of being and beings can only be “one-sidedly”, that is, imperfectly expressed by any kind of statement, and here lies the explanation of the “equalling” of one one-sidedness with another – contrary – one-sidedness. The question of an authentic or preferable textual variant, here as well as elsewhere, is highly dependent on interpretive operations: it happens in a space dependent of interpretation just as much as the questioning of the meaning of the question itself. This operation brings to light in the question itself some kind of pre-supposed meaning, or, if you want, bias.

III.
Insofar as the concept of text happening means being opposed to the concept of a text frozen into timelessness, and implies a kind of destruction–deconstruction of the concept of text, and if this thesis has been founded above primarily by the references to the two editions of Kant’s Critique, then in any case the self-identity of the text seemed to have been preserved in an unchanged form at least with respect to individual editions. It cannot be superfluous to make one step further and say that in certain cases even the self-identity of the texts of the “first edition”, “second edition” may as well become very volatile, that is, questionable. And on top of it, this happens not so much in the – according to some interpreters – ideal-idealistic, volatile interpretive space of hermeneutics, but rather in its roughly material mediality. In this sense the following part should be titled: “Textual criticism and radar technology”.

Paul Ziche, one of the editors of the historical-critical edition of Schelling’s lifework, wrote not long ago: the “setting-forth” or “establishment” of the text is an indispensable work stage of a critical edition. This presupposes of course that prior to such an editorial establishment there is no text – it only comes into being in the course of preparation for print. Then he continued: “The idea of an unequivocal, abstractly existing text, materially accomplished in different copies cannot be maintained from the point of view of 18th century printed works.”² This is not only to say that the text of the first editions contains many printing errors: the history of printing had its contacts with criminality much more often than an unsuspicious reader – a “non-critical text user” or “the user of non-critical texts” – would kindly presume. Pirate editions published without permission, claiming to imitate a legitimate edition, were quite frequent; and although they were not criminal in nature, the resetting or reprint of certain texts or parts

of texts was a frequent complicating factor for orientation between the various editions. With just a bit of exaggeration, it can be said – claims Ziche – that the first edition of a work published around 1800 hardly had any copy completely identical with another one.¹

It has been mentioned before: in the course of the edition of individual authorial works, a historical-critical edition must take into account all the editions of the work in question published in the author’s lifetime, and, regardless of what edition technique it would apply in the end – whether the text of the first, second, or some later edition, or the very last edition published in the author’s lifetime – some way it must reproduce the minor or major textual alterations of various editions. Now we must ask the question how, through which operations the establishment of the text of various editions may actually happen. The answer seems simple: copies of the different editions must be acquired and read simultaneously (collated, “kollationieren”). But if we want to operate really thoroughly, then we obviously recognize: it is not only the copies of various editions that must be collated, but several copies of the same edition must also be acquired, and the comparison of these must result in the text (textual identity, or the establishment of the text or textual identity) of the edition in question (first, second, etc.)

This is exactly the procedure followed by the Schelling-edition; several copies were acquired of each edition, and their comparison resulted in the surprising recognition: the texts of Schelling’s various works showed differences of various degrees even in the several copies analyzed.

Interestingly, this result was born with the use of the instruments of radar technology, astronomy, and military technology. English Shakespeare-philologist Charlton Hinman, who set out to compare more than eighty copies of first editions of Shakespeare’s works, made use of his experiences gained in WWII, when he had to uncover and identify suspicious establishments using radar images. For this, an earlier procedure was used, developed for the astronomic researches of the 1920s and 1930s for discovering moving objects, which also served to discover the planet Pluto. During this procedure two snapshots taken at different times and placed precisely over each other are compared by alternately illuminating them, while the essential differences – in astronomy and military technology the movements – become directly apparent. Hinman constructed a machinery, which was later called “Hinman-Kollator”, for making this technology also applicable to civil, that is, scientific, purposes. The two copies to compare are projected over each other in such a way that the two copies are lit in a rapid sequence one after the other, and this makes clearly visible as a moving object even the slightest difference – such as a missing comma – between them. The textual differences between the individual editions of Schelling’s works were discovered and analyzed with

the help of this technique. Ziche mentioned a characteristic example about an essential textual variant discovered in an 1800 edition of Schelling’s work *The System of Transcendental Idealism*, which he illustrated with a facsimile image. Thus, the expression “freyen Handeln” of one copy was replaced in the other one by “Anschauen” (this change can hardly be regarded as the correction of a printing error), and only the latter makes a meaningful text. Now, the historical-critical edition has the task, states Ziche, to reconstruct the textual “movements” in a way similar to the “Hinman-Kollator”.

The text was repeatedly modified during printing, if for no other than technical reasons. The lead types used for typesetting were not enough, therefore the individual printing sheets were typeset, paginated, and printed separately, and corrected during printing. After printing, the paginated sheets were taken apart, the types were used for printing the next sheet, and the printed sheets were heaped up. This way the work was never printed as a whole, and therefore the proof of the whole work was never produced as a whole either. In the next phase, the sheets of the many heaps were bound together randomly to form the individual copies (randomly choosing from the corrected or modified sheets and the original sheets alike). This also meant that the textual identity of the copies coming from the very same printing press was not ensured.

This is to say that the identity of the text in the mentioned case is uncertain even on the level of individual editions, and the assessment of the textual alteration within the same editions needs further interpretation. So the question which is the preferable variant – and in this case not even for the purpose of establishing the final text of the work itself (its authentic text), but only that of one of its editions – can hardly be answered again without a hermeneutic effort.


2 We are wondering what results an examination with a Hinman collator would have regarding the two editions of Kant’s *Critique*. After all, the edition of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science is from the 1910s, when the Hinman collator had not been known, consequently, a similar comparison could not be done, and as far as I know, it has not been done posteriorly either. Is it possible that an examination of this type would attenuate the tacit assumption regarding the identicalness of the first and the second edition of the *Critique*?
IV.
A paper entitled “Textual Criticism, Edition History, Interpretation” should indeed deal with, if only within the range of certain remarks, Heidegger’s philological–hermeneutic observations on the edition of Aristotle. At the beginning of the 1920s Heidegger started working on a phenomenological (phenomenological-hermeneutic) interpretation of Aristotle; although the number of the manuscripts grew, and after the while the work reached an advanced stage – so much so that in a letter written to Roman Ingarden on 14 December 1922 Husserl reported that in volume VII of the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* edited by him “appears Heidegger’s fundamental […] work on Aristotle”,¹ and it seems that the work was ready for print in the summer

---

of 1925\(^1\) – the promised interpretation of Aristotle has never been published in print, either then, in the 1920s, or ever after. What is available for us today of this work, is the famous “Natorp-account”, an approximately forty typewritten pages long abstract bearing the title *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles (Anzeige der hermeneutischen Situation)*,\(^2\) and the university lectures of the 1920s.\(^3\) Although Heidegger’s interpretation of Aristotle has never been published, it is not unimportant that his major work, the *Being and Time* published in 1927, grew out of this intellectual endeavour after various modifications. This way there is a direct relationship between the planned interpretation of Aristotle and the *Being and Time*. In a retrospective summary of this work, Gadamer wrote about Heidegger’s approach and the structure of the planned work that “Heidegger has found indeed a new and unusual access to Aristotle. He approached it, so-to-say, from below, from actual life. His first lectures did not treat Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* or *Physics*, but his *Rhetoric*. The subject of these lectures on Aristotle was a major aspect of all rhetoric, described first by Plato in *Phaedrus*, namely that in order to persuade the audience, we must first know it. Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* became for Heidegger an introduction to philosophical anthropology. In the second book of *Rhetoric*, Heidegger’s attention was primarily drawn to the discussion of the affects, the *pathē*. These affects signal the audience’s inclination towards, or reaction against, the rhetor’s speech. It was with regard to this Aristotelian pattern, completed with his own life experience, that Heidegger gained insight into what he later termed, in *Being and Time*, ‘Befindlichkeit’.”\(^4\) Indeed, there are some laconic references to this in Heidegger’s major work. In § 29, dealing with “Befindlichkeit”, Heidegger notes: “Aristotle discusses *pathē* in the second book of his *Rhetoric*. This work – in opposition to the traditional orientation of the notion of rhetoric to some kind of ‘discipline’ – must be perceived as the first systematic hermeneutics of everyday being-together.”\(^5\) Now, with the newly published text of the 1924 university lectures as volume 18 of the complete works, there is a chance to study this meaningful, yet enigmatically concise reference against a much wider textual basis. The broader context of Heidegger’s ideas is formed by the critical reconsideration of the historical shaping of philosophical disciplines that Heidegger calls destruction. This is about the reconsideration, guided by phenomenological-hermeneutical inquiries, of the set map of philosophical disciplines,


\(^5\) *Sein und Zeit*, 29. §. 138. See the quoted Hungarian translation, 167.
the loosening of the conceptuality of tradition, with the purpose of a positive appropriation of tradition (neither its servile acceptance, nor its unthoughtful rejection). This reconsideration neither leaves untouched the foundations of the historically created philosophical disciplines as well. In this case we are speaking about rhetoric. Heidegger formulates the provocative thesis—which may also shed light on the cited reference of the *Being and Time*—that the traditional disciplinary approach to rhetoric is not helpful at all in understanding Aristotelian rhetoric, on the contrary, it directly hinders its understanding. In Heidegger’s view the confusion around rhetoric—and this is the point where the philological notes that interest us follow—was apparent already at the time of the edition of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, inasmuch as it was placed at the very end of the Berlin academic edition of Aristotle, prepared by Bekker in the 1830s, a time when the understanding and appreciation of rhetoric was at its lowest. “They didn’t know where to place it, so they put it at the end! A brilliant proof of perfect helplessness!”—complains Heidegger.1 Tradition has long lost its understanding of rhetoric, he continues; it was degraded into a school discipline already in the time of Hellenism and in the early Middle Ages. The original meaning of rhetoric has long fallen into oblivion. In contrast, rhetoric is nothing else, Heidegger claims, “than the discipline in which the self-interpretation of the concrete human being-here explicitly happens. Rhetoric is none other than the interpretation of the concrete human being-here, the hermeneutics of being-here.”2 Consequently there is an inner relationship between rhetoric and hermeneutics for Heidegger, and besides the rehabilitation of rhetoric it also becomes visible how organically the planned, but never published interpretation of Aristotle (or more accurately the dialogue with Aristotle, since the Greek philosopher was not so much an object of interpretation for Heidegger, than a partner in a dialogue) was embedded into the approach of his major work, how deeply it influenced Heidegger’s hermeneutic perspective and with it, the basic structure of the *Being and Time*. It is understandable thus that Heidegger was disappointed about the *Rhetoric’s* placement at the very end of the corpus, and considered it a sign of philosophy’s loss of orientation in the 19th century. At the same time, the fact that Heidegger preferred the “life-philosophical” Aristotle—his aesthetic, rhetorical, and ethical writings—to the “scientific” Aristotle—his writings in logic, metaphysics, and natural philosophy, and tried, if at all, to approach, or bridge the gap between, the latter by means of the former, or, as Gadamer formulated, “from below, from actual life”, from practical philosophy: well, this sheds particular light precisely over Heidegger’s own philosophical stance. This approach had, of course, not been ready from the beginnings, but was shaping, as if in its way to itself, in the course of years precisely through the theoretical reconsiderations of, among others, Aristotle, and eventually found itself in the philosopher’s major work.3 It highlighted that particular approach which led to the

---

1 Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie, GA 18, 109f.
2 Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie, GA 18, 110. Additionally, see Heidegger, *Sein und Wahrheit*, GA 36/37, 158.: “the science that is concerned with the capacity of speaking, namely rhetorics is the basic science of man, the political science.”
3 Regarding this, see Franco Volpi’s basic monograph: *Heidegger e Aristotele* (Padova: Daphne, 1984); mainly the pages 90–116., and id.: “Dasein comme praxis: L’assimilation et la radicalisation heideggerienne de la philosophie pratique d’Aristote”, *Heidegger et l’idée de la phénomé-
breakup with, and radical turning away from, the usual ways of philosophizing of the age, eminently with the epistemological and scientific orientation of neo-Kantianism, and to an opening towards “the actual life”. Seen from here, we have good reason to assume a similarity between the ruling philosophical spirit of the 19th century and the Aristotle-edition published in this period reminiscent of the one claimed to exist between the Hegelianism of Hegel’s disciples and the principles governing the edition of the FVA. (The difference might only be grasped in some shift of emphasis: there, the similarity was lying in-between the editorial principles – the philological establishment of the texts – and the spirit of the philosophy edited, and here, between the editorial principles – the establishment of the sequence of the texts – and the spirit pervading the age, and the age’s scientific thinking.) If Heidegger opposed the ruling philosophical spirit of the age, then he must have opposed the Aristotle-edition pervaded by this spirit as well as the interpretation of Aristotle, defined by both of these aspects. However, just like in the case of his interpretation of Kant, it is unnecessary for us to discuss in more depth Heidegger’s interpretations with regard to the “correctness” of his understanding of Aristotle and its connections with his own system of thinking. It is a historical fact that rhetoric has lost its importance during modernity.\footnote{See for example: Jean Grondin, “Die Hermeneutik und die rhetorische Tradition”, in id., Von Heidegger zu Gadamer. Unterwegs zur Hermeneutik (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001), 17–45, here: 19., with other references.} If Heidegger’s complaint is accurate, then his remark may highlight the philological fact that Bekker’s Berlin edition of Aristotle’s works, the standard edition to this day, and the sequence of the manuscripts in the printed version was significantly pervaded by the philosophical and science theory climate of its own age, the modernity. The climate defined by the victorious breakthrough of the method of mathematical natural sciences, the formation of the paradigm of scientific methodology, and the related devaluation of the humanities, stretching back to Bacon and Descartes, one result of which was the playing down and discrediting of rhetoric. (Descartes turned the verisimilar, which has to do with rhetoric, almost into a synonym of falseness).\footnote{Related to the topic, see Samuel IJsseling: Rhetorik und Philosophie. Eine historisch-systematische Einführung (Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Frommann–Holzboog, 1988), 92ff.} So, the fact that the Berlin edition placed the Rhetoric to the very end of the corpus, must have had its effects on several generations of the late 19th – early 20th-century readers, pervaded in other respects as well by the spirit of the age; the decision about the sequence of texts meant just as much a tacit stance influencing interpretation in the case of the importance of certain writings as the publication of the two editions of Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason as part of the academic edition of Kant – as we have seen above – which tacitly preferred the second edition. Gadamer’s cited remark that Heidegger’s first lectures – in an “unusual approach” [ungewöhnlicher Zugang] – did not treat Aristotle’s Metaphysics or Physics, negatively imply that the usual approaches of the standard interpretations of the age (and of the 19th century) did exactly that, and the philological organization of Aristotle’s
texts in the Bekker-edition – over and above its character defined by the spirit of the age – might have also had a role in it. This state of affairs may be meaningful for a paper with the title “Textual Criticism, Edition History, Interpretation” insofar as in the light of Heidegger’s remarks, and reconsidering these remarks – similarly to the FVA edition of Hegel – the thesis that edition history and interpretation mutually define each other can also be valid for Aristotle’s work as well: on the one hand, edition history is itself an operation guided by preliminary understanding, interpretation (in our case by a worldview and understanding pervaded by the spirit of the age), which, on the other hand, significantly influences the future history of effect and interpretation of the edited author. At any rate, the establishment of the text – in this case: the organization and sequence of writings in the textual corpus preserved – did not happen here either under laboratory conditions, in a space void of interpretation.

Heidegger confronted the standard interpretation of Aristotle in another point as well, and since this confrontation also contained philological elements – and since the spirit of the age also had a considerable role here, too – it is worth discussing it in somewhat more detail. The issue here is the relationship of being and time, of a paramount importance for Heidegger’s entire path as a thinker, the fundamental reference point for which was the final chapter (10) of book IX (1=theta) of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*. This chapter is found at the end of a book – Heidegger noted in 1925/26 – which is one of the most difficult books of the treatises collected under the title *Metaphysics*. “The understanding of Greek ontology and thus the problem of truth depends on the possibility of access to this chapter”, 1 formulates Heidegger in his important addition. Heidegger as a thinker had repeatedly returned to the detailed interpretation of this chapter, and developed his own interpretation in a theoretical-critical dialogue with the standard traditional interpretations of Aristotle.

Now, tradition has had a hard time interpreting this final chapter; not once, the opinion that this manuscript appears in the wrong place has also been formulated. The well-known researcher of Aristotle, Werner Jaeger, in his 1912 work entitled *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles*, in conclusion of the preliminary works of H. Bonitz and others, stated that this edition justaposed individual treatises, lecture manuscripts, and introductions, which all dealt with ontological issues but were not necessarily interconnected either in content or in methodology. Jaeger settled that books Z, H, and 1 belonged together, and exposed that he considered these books most relevant from an ontological point of view – for this very reason it became questionable for him that 1 10 belonged to 1. In reference to Schwegler and Christ, who thought that this chapter did not fit into the conceptual context, Jaeger only made a short commentary, saying that “this chapter stands there lacking any connection”, it is nothing else than “a kind of attachment”. W. D. Ross in this fundamental edition published in 1924 commented on this section in a similar manner: this chapter “has little to do with the rest of book” (Oxford, 1924, vol. 2, 274.) In his later major work, the *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* published in 1923, Jaeger changed his mind – influenced by Bonitz’s 1849 commentary, who did not dispute the placement of the chapter, but in Heidegger’s view his arguments were just as invalid as Jaeger’s

---

1 Martin Heidegger, *Logik. Die Frage nach der Wahrheit*, GA 21, 174. About the following ones, see ibid., 171ff.
counter-arguments –, but he did not justify this change appropriately. For Heidegger, the uncertainty and obscurity in what regards the place and content of this chapter can be explained by the fact that the relationship of being and truth is disregarded; moreover, it is not even observed as at all. “We must understand in advance the inner relation of the interpretation of being and truth […],” he said in 1925/26, “that is, we must clarify philosophically the subject matter of the texts in question, before we would proceed to make obscure philological assumptions about their contextual connections.”

Philosophy (hermeneutics, interpretation) must therefore precede philology. The question whether the text of the chapter at issue belongs there or not – a question which refers to editing the texts and manuscripts into a coherent textual corpus, and is thus an eminently textual critical, philological question – can only be answered substantially (and sound assumptions can also be only formulated) if we have understood first and interpreted in an appropriate way what it is about. It is again unnecessary to go deeper into Heidegger’s more than twenty pages long interpretation following the mentioned introduction – just like in the case of his Kant-interpretation above or that of his interpretation regarding the place of rhetoric –; it is enough to see the strong interconnectedness of philosophy (hermeneutics) and philology. The question of where to include a certain textual fragment when collating several manuscripts, and whether that certain part indeed belongs where it was originally placed, presupposes interpretation, it cannot be decided on merely philological grounds. (The question regarding the text, Heidegger formulates in 1930, is connected to the question regarding the object).2

Preliminary interpretation, however, is also influenced one way or another by the spirit of the age. Now, since in modernity, and primarily in the 19th century, truth has gained an eminently epistemological meaning, that is, it was understood as the truth of proposition, or cognition – and not of being –; well, it was only in this governing spirit of the age that the philological uncertainty regarding the placement of the chapter in question could have occurred at all as a problem. A chapter of logic cannot pertain to metaphysics, thinks Schwegler, and Jaeger even goes one step further, when he claims to enforce the chapter’s strangeness from the book by saying: the main obstruction of the chapter’s pertinence to the book is not only that its subject is the true being, but also that it denotes this being as an “actual” being.3 This, according to Jaeger, would be a highly implausible idea, not typical for Aristotle. This characterization should accordingly be either deleted from the text – as does Ross –, or fundamentally reinterpreted – as does Schwegler. That the discussion of truth and falseness – writes Heidegger in 1925/26 – “forms the highest peak of ontological investigations […], is meaningless and impossible for traditional philosophy. Because truth [according to the ruling approach of modernity] pertains still to judgment and thinking […], therefore it is hardly the definition of the being of beings, and by no means its “most authentic” definition; hence

2 Martin Heidegger, Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit. Einleitung in die Philosophie, GA 31, 80. (“Zusammenhang von Textfrage und Sachfrage”).
3 Martin Heidegger, Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit. Einleitung in die Philosophie, GA 31, 82.
comes the uncertainty and variation about the pertinence of this chapter […]”¹ Because, as he returned to the problem in 1930, “every beginner in philosophy knows that the problem of truth pertains to logic, not to metaphysics, and especially not to the treatise which discusses the fundamental problem of metaphysics.”² In consequence, it has yet little significance how the interpreters answer the question referring to its pertinence – whether they think it belongs there or not. Just like in the case of the interpretation of Kant above, we could refer here to the method of the polemic use of the mind used by Kant.³ Heidegger’s influential interpretation on the relationship of being and truth must not necessarily be “true” in order to shatter the traditional interpretation of Aristotle, and highlight their being bound to their age, and thus question their indubitable authority.

The issue discussed here differs from the problem of rhetoric inasmuch as, in the case of rhetoric, it was the science theoretical evaluation of rhetoric in the spirit of the age which included Aristotle’s writing to the end of the corpus, while here the approach of modernity regarding the relationship of metaphysics–ontology and epistemology created a philological (or pseudo-philological) problem: whether a text referring to the definition of truth can be placed next to metaphysical or ontological texts, whether it belongs there or not. This latter dilemma is also a typically modern one. However, it is a common feature of both questions that the philological problem is preceded by some kind of hermeneutical-philosophical operation: in the first case, the contemporary understanding, preliminary interpretation of rhetoric – namely, that it enjoyed no high regard – decides the editorial technique applied, in the second case the approach of the philosophy of the age suggests the philological questions regarding the revision of the Hellenistic disposition of Aristotelian writings. And it does this starting from the naïve presupposition that Aristotle must have thought about the concept of truth the same way as we think today, and if a text fragment contradicts it, then we are entitled to doubt its pertinence to the work in question.⁴

V.

A paper entitled “Textual Criticism, Edition History, Interpretation” cannot afford leaving out (it should indeed be treated as a separate study) one of the major and most authoritative lifework-editions, both in length and in contents, of the past decades: the complete edition of Heidegger’s works begun in the last twenty-five years of the past century. The project of this endeavour started in 1975 has repeatedly changed and been extended compared to the initial plans: the complete edition of Heidegger’s works begun in the last twenty-five years of the past century. The project of this endeavour started in 1975 has repeatedly changed and been extended compared to the initial plans: the complete edition of Heidegger, which, with its one hundred and two planned volumes according to the present, updated project, and seventy-seven actually published volumes (the decisive majority of which contain previously unpublished writings, several appearing already in the second or third

¹ Martin Heidegger, Logik. Die Frage nach der Wahrheit, GA 21, 171.
² Martin Heidegger, Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit. Einleitung in die Philosophie, GA 31, 81.
³ See note 6 on page 155.
⁴ For more on the correlations of being and truth in Heidegger’s conception, see István Fehér M., Martin Heidegger. Egy XX. századi gondolkodó életútja, 29f, 160–165., and Heidegger és a szkeptizmust. A szkeptikus kételeen át a hermeneutikai kérdésig (Heidegger and scepticism. Through sceptical doubt to the hermeneutical question) (Budapest: Korona Nova, 1998), 51–64.
edition), is one of the most remarkable lifework-editions in the contemporary literary panorama. All the more so since the volumes of the complete edition – despite the well-known linguistic difficulties connected to the translations of Heideggerian texts – are also published in English, French, Italian, and Spanish editions following the original ones, and this is a practically singular thing in the academic world (so far twenty-six volumes were published in English, sixteen in French, thirty-six in Italian, and twenty-seven in Spanish, and twenty-two-five more are forthcoming).¹

Martin Heidegger, who was born in 1889 and died in 1976, has long been considered one of the most important thinkers of the 20th century; however, it has increasingly become the prevailing opinion that Heidegger is the greatest thinker of the century. This opinion is largely influenced by the writings of the philosopher’s legacy, published in the period following his death. Heidegger’s lifework is decisive for the philosophical debates in many parts of the world; besides its influence in Germany, let us only think of the fact that contemporary French philosophy would be completely unconceivable without Heidegger’s influence and the critical dialogue with him, that outstanding attention has been given to him in Japan ever since the 1930s, that his thoughts have raised great interest in Italy and the neo-Latin countries since the 1950s, and that the confrontation with the Heideggerian ideas has lately increasingly become a decisive part of philosophical consciousness in the USA as well. It is significant from this perspective that in the year of the 100th anniversary of Heidegger’s birth, in 1989, conferences and symposia were organized all over the world, approaching one hundred in number.

When Martin Heidegger died in 1976, at eighty-seven years of age, it had already been clear for many that one of the greatest thinkers of the 20th century passed away. However, it could hardly have been predicted that the philosopher’s thoughts have not lost their strength even after his death, but maintained, and what is more, even increased their influence. In the last years of his life, Heidegger was organizing his manuscripts with the help of some friends and disciples, and was thinking about the fate of his legacy. Slowly, the project of the complete edition of his works was formed, and Heidegger could still live to see, in 1975, the first published volume of the series. The editorial works started vigorously, and as a result of the hard work, two or three volumes have been published each year for the last over thirty years (which is approximately the opposite of the editions of idealist philosophers treated above, which usually come out with one volume each two or three, or even more, years.) Since most volumes contain unpublished writings, over the last few years the interpretation of Heidegger has been placed upon new foundations across the world.

It is only possible to truly assess how little Heidegger published in his lifetime if we see the dimensions of his unpublished legacy. This notable reticence is the result of several reasons, and therefore the fate of the legacy has not been certain either. In the last decades of his life, Heidegger published so few writings also because he thought that his age could not understand him. This opinion of his did not change then until his death. He considered that it was fatal to publish the manuscripts of his legacy since his age would have deeply misunderstood and misinterpreted them to such an extent that it would have been completely misled the future generations. And it is still better than

¹ See Heidegger Studien 24, 252ff.
misunderstanding if the writings remained unaccessible for a while, until the children of a happier age would read them with fresh eyes and without bias. When will this age be mature enough for receiving his writings, is of course impossible to know; one thing is certain: this age will not cease from one day to the next.

When the future fate of his manuscripts came into discussion, Heidegger first expressed his will to block his legacy for one hundred years. This was followed by various debates, considerations, and persuasions with the family and friends. One of the most serious arguments was that in an atomic war – the possibility of which was very plausible in Heidegger’s analysis of the age – his writings could be easily destroyed, and therefore it should really be reconsidered whether it is advisable to block them for such a long time. This argument was not really convincing for Heidegger. There are atomic-safe shelters, bunkers, he said, it should only be seen to it that his writings be transported to such places and preserved there. Finally, the decisive argument was that although his writings could survive an atomic war – it is not impossible –, but it could very well happen that there would not be any survivors left to read them. Eventually, Heidegger reluctantly accepted this argument. Characteristically, the only argument to convince him to publish his unpublished legacy was that perhaps there will be no people one hundred years later. That is to say, had he seen any guarantees that people were still living on earth one hundred years from now, he would have not allowed his writings to be accessible in the present.

“Ways – not works”: this was the motto placed by Heidegger in front of his works some days before his death. This is not about publishing an author’s opinions, presenting his stance, or organizing these in a historical order – claimed one of the proposed introductions of the complete edition – but about the issue of thinking. The former is of course quite possible in our age, the age of information, but from the point of view of accessing the issue of thinking, it lacks any significance. The task of the complete edition is to assist in asking, understanding, profoundly questioning the question – in facing the issue of thinking.1

Accordingly, the complete edition of Heidegger’s lifework is not a historical-critical edition,2 but one corresponding to Heidegger’s last will: “Ausgabe letzter Hand”,

---

1 GA 1, 438.
2 Behind the conception of the historical–critical edition there is a research program, as Hans Gerhard Senger claims, whose history has not been written yet – it also has a historical continuity which exceeds the historicism of the 19th century that has been considered its source medium until now. More precisely, it dates back to the Renaissance humanism, or directly to the age of Alexandrian philology; the term “critique” was first used in the 17th century in the sense of judging and differentiating with the aim of creating historically valid texts and filtering out the unhistorical projections. As far as the philological apparatus is concerned, there already existed registers in the 16th century. (Hans Gerhard Senger, “Die historisch-kritische Edition historisch-kritisch betrachtet”, in Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte, eds. Walter Jaeschke, Wilhelm G. Jacobs and Hermann Krings (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1987), 1–20.: 2, 5, 7f.). About the humanists’ philological interest, also see Ulrich Muhlack, “Zum Verhältnis von Klassischer Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft im 19. Jahrhundert”, in Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert. I, ed. H. Flashar et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 225–239., here: 225f. – The historical–critical edition, as Wilhelm G. Jacobs says, does not interest them, thus they pay identical attention to
“the last edition according to the author’s last will”). This means, explains the editorial announcement of the complete edition, that the individual volumes appear in the form in which the philosopher published his writings in his lifetime: without a critical apparatus and indexes. The philological apparatus of historical-critical editions repelled Heidegger (the deterrent example for him was the Stuttgart edition, *Großoktavausgabe*, of Hölderlin’s works); he thought that the apparatus suppresses the text itself: intruding into the foreground, it always draws attention upon itself, and guides the reader towards previously defined readings and definitive questions (e.g. the comparison of textual variants, historical-philological analysis of connections raised by the commentaries, etc.) And that what is truly essential: the “thing” itself, remains in the background. Similarly (with one single exception) we find no kind of indexes (name, subject, or other) at the end of the complete edition’s volumes; these only assist a superficial reading, and there is a possibility that the reader will approach the text from the indexes. As a kind of substitute for the missing indexes, and in assistance of the reproduction of the line of thought, he considered useful a detailed table of contents compiled by the editors, of help for a better orientation in the volumes of lectures. Last but not least, his argument against critical editions was that the slowness in time of such endeavours breaks the reception and effect of the ideas, and makes almost impossible to follow up the unfolding of ideas: the edition must be completed within approximately one generation, supposing that the lifework expects an at least somewhat appropriate reception – a consideration which (as we have seen in the case of the Hegel-edition) is hardly unfounded, and can be completely agreed with. (Especially if taken into consideration that, as mentioned above, the elaboration of the editorial principles alone of the

\*each written manifestation, each data is considered *edendum*; thus the historical–critical edition is a complete edition by principle, a *Gesamtausgabe*. In this respect, the Heidegger-edition is closer to the principle of the historical–critical edition than the new Hegel edition. Jacobs’s opinion that the editor knows that his understanding of the author overshadows the edition, but he tries to make this shadow as clear as possible (Wilhelm G. Jacobs, “Textüberlieferung und historisch-kritische Edition. Typen von Editionen”, in *Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte*, 21–26., here: 21f.).

1 “Ausgabe letzter Hand” lexically means “the last edition edited by the author” (Előd Halász, *German–Hungarian Dictionary* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967), Vol. 1., 923.), while according to the Duden *Stilwörterbuch*: “letzte vom Autor selbst besorgte Ausgabe” (*Duden Stilwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Die Verwendung der Wörter im Satz*, 6th completely revised and expanded edition, ed. Günther Drosdowski, *Der Duden in 10 Bänden*, Vol. 2 (Mannheim – Wien – Zürich: Dudenverlag, 1970), 334. Both explanations should be understood *cum grano salis* in Heidegger’s case, as only regarding the works published in his lifetime (and, stricktly speaking, published in more than one edition) can we say that they are “last editions edited by the author himself”, while this does not hold to the unpublished manuscripts that were left as part of the legacy. These are not edited by the author, but there can be authorial instructions regarding the edition, that is why it seems adequate to replace “the last edition edited by the author” with “the author’s *last will*” or his “testament”, and translate the German expression accordingly.

2 Within certain limits, an index of names could even be useful, but a subject index hardly fits into the nature of the Heideggerian phenomenological–hermeneutical thinking (and its considerations and problems raised related to the philosophy of language); see my restrictive remarks preceding the subject index of my Heidegger volume (István Fehér M., *Martin Heidegger. Egy XX. századi gondolkodó életútja*, 2., 379.).
university lectures series in the new Hegel-edition took up almost three decades.) Besides, a critical edition comes in question primarily in the case of authors who already have a lifework edition (and this criterion is fulfilled for all three discussed authors of the age of idealism). Heidegger’s decision is based on his assumption – says the publisher’s announcement – that the time is not ripe as yet for a historical-critical edition of his lifework. An additional remark of the 1991 brochure which is missing from later announcements claims that, on account of the nature and scope of his philosophical legacy, the accomplishment of a historical-critical edition of Heidegger’s works would not be possible for the next fifty years.\(^1\)

The first editorial announcements refer to the structure of the complete edition, but even as late as the beginning of the 1990s, the projected number and content of the volumes of the four planned series was only concretized for the first two series and the first two volumes of the third series (vols. 1–16, 17–63, 64–65.), while for the third and fourth series only the major thematic units were distinguished, without marking the numbers of volumes. At this time, the complete edition was assumed to comprise seventy–eighty volumes; then the project of the 102 volumes gained shape by the mid-1990s.\(^2\) The most important change or completion – on the influence and for the satisfaction of the international scholarly community\(^3\) – happened at the beginning of the 1980s, in the most comprehensive and greatly interesting second series of the complete works, Heidegger’s university lectures; namely, the early Freiburg lectures (1919–1923), as long as they were still available, were announced to be published at the end of the second series, “in accordance with the decision of legacy’s guardian in 1982, following Heidegger’s instructions”.\(^4\) This way the chronological principle was clearly

---

\(^1\) It is worth adding that the Heidegger complete edition – similarly to the FVA Hegel edition – is a private undertaking, meaning that it does not belong to an institution. It is supported by the caretaker of the legacy, Hermann Heidegger and the family, co-operating with Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. With one exception, there are no permanent paid functions – contributors or editors. In opposition to this, behind a historical–critical edition usually there is some kind of institution that more or less finances the undertaking, and it makes the scientific–professional decisions from time to time. This is the situation in the case of the edition of the philosophers of idealism, which is institutionally supported by the provincial academies (the Hegel edition is supported by the Rhine-Westphalia Acedemy, while the Fichte and Schelling edition is supported by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences).


broken. While the lectures between 1923 and 1944 follow chronologically in volumes 17 to 55 of the complete works, the early Freiburg lectures held between 1919 and 1923 are published as an attachment in volumes 56 to 63.\footnote{An edition based on the principle of chronology and development history (more or less like the Heidegger complete edition or the Hegel-edition) stands in opposition to an edition based on thematic categorization like the Husserl complete edition, the \textit{Husserliana}. An edition of this type basically determines the interpretations and the choice of interpretation topics (e.g. time consciousness, intersubjectivity). An edition based on thematic categorization is disputable in this case, because it can level the differences in the development history – see for example \textit{Husserliana}, vol. 10: \textit{Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins} (1893-1917): the manuscripts of 25 years related to the same topic get published together, or the \textit{Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität} (\textit{Husserliana}, vols. 13–15) containing three volumes, which collects the manuscripts of three decades, similarly to the edition of Hegel’s lectures issued by his students, though – we have to mention here that – in the case of the \textit{Husserliana} we are not talking about compilations, and the manuscripts belonging to different periods maintain their independence. In spite of this, an edition of this type is already decisive with respect to the history of interpretation; it only offers a view on the development of thoughts related to some specific topics, and on the development of the philosopher’s thoughts in general, in a chronological order. Of course, the edition of the Husserlian oeuvre (containing approximately forty volumes) has its own specific problems. First of all, – as the director of the Husserl-Archive stated – there is the fact that the legacy in Husserl’s case is voluminous, as well: approximately 40000 pages of manuscript written in shorthand. The edition itself admittedly does not follow a chronological order (see Samuel IJsseling, “Das Husserl-Archiv in Leuven und die Husserl-Ausgabe”, \textit{Buchstabe und Geist. Zur Überlieferung und Edition philosophischer Texte}, 137–146., here: 139, 145.).} The covers and title pages of the second series volumes have also been changed accordingly. Previously, the title was: “II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944”, but now it changed to: “II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1919–1944”, or simply: “II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen”.


However, it is not so easy to escape interpretation. To mention one single example: the hermeneutic difficulty to interpret the abbreviations cannot be neglected. For example, “ex.” may mean “existentiell” or “existenzial”, “Fkt” may equally mean “Funktion”, “Fiktion”, or “Faktum”. A place of the 20th volume of the complete works is a good example for proving how much of an interpretive operation is the decoding of abbreviations, it says: “in der theoretischen noch unmodifizierten Erfahrung”.\footnote{GA 20, 152.} The knowledge of Heidegger’s thought in the 1920s makes this formulation questionable, and the manuscript reveals an abbreviation on the corresponding place: “theor.” Grammatically, it can equally be an adjective or an adverb, and it is the duty of an interpretive reading to decide how to decode it. Consequently, it is obvious that the correct reading is the following: “in der theoretisch noch unmodifizierten Erfahrung”\footnote{Th. Kisiel, “Edition und Übersetzung. Unterwegs von Tatsachen zu Gedanken, von Werken zu Wegen”, 93.} (the difference in English: “in the not yet modified theoretical experience” versus “in the theoretically not yet modified experience”).
The edition takes as its basis the last textual variant. Nevertheless, it must be added that it does not follow the editorial practice of Hegel’s FVA since the editorial afterword at the end of the individual volumes offers a correct philological explanation on the creation and compilation of the text of the published volumes. In addition, the first series of the complete edition systematically publishes the marginal notes found in Heidegger’s own copy, through which the reader may follow, if not the creation of the text, but its authorial afterlife as well.

Taking into account the text’s stages of evolution corresponds to what I have previously termed the happening of the text. Naturally, it can be absolutely useful to trace it, but we can only find out about the happening of the text if some trace of an earlier text or variant is preserved. Let me enforce this with a further example. Several researchers formulated it as a requirement in the 1980s to publish the famous 1920/21 lectures on the phenomenology of religion, which had not been preserved in manuscript, and was circulating for decades in the form of student notes among the researchers, as a kind of underground, valuable and secret sensation. The lecture was then published in 1995, as volume 60 of the complete works, on the basis of the reconstruction of student notes.1 The title of the volume is: Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens. The editorial afterword reveals that the title of the volume comes from a note on the cover of a school notebook, used by Heidegger to bound his notes on the phenomenology of religion. Another bookcover contains the original title: Phänomenologie des religiösen Bewußtseins. Heidegger later crossed out the word Bewußtsein, and replaced it with Leben. For whoever is familiar with Heidegger’s ideatic development after WW1, and within it his profound theoretical reckoning with Husserlian phenomenology, the recognition comes as obvious: this terminological replacement in its laconic form is suitable for describing Heidegger’s entire hermeneutic turn and development in the 1920s. In short: the neo-Kantian–Husserlian concept of “consciousness” is replaced by “life”. A word is deleted, and another word takes its place. Now, even if we do not know about this development or happening, the title (Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens) remains meaningful nonetheless, but being aware of the deleted variant yields a piece of extra information by which the text can be understood in more detail, more accurately, as a result (or stage) of an inner happening. In this respect it is useful therefore to publish the deleted versions as well. Naturally, the question also rises: what if the deletion was only made in the author’s thoughts (and not on paper)? Then of course nothing will be preserved of the changes (just like on a computer, unless the track changes function is on, but then corrected misspellings and other errors are visible as well). But is it not what usually happens? When we formulate something, we are permanently deleting or modifying the text, that is, we reformulate it, most often without leaving any corrected or deleted written notes behind.

1 When asked about the Hegel-edition, Heidegger reminded us about his previous remark according to which the students’ notes on lectures are nothing but “obscure sources” (Unterwegs zur Sprache (Pfullingen: Neske, 1959), 91.: “Nachschriften sind freilich trübe Quellen”), and – referring to the publishment of the Hegel-lectures – he gave utterance to his hope that this practice would not apply to him (Hartmut Buchner: “Fragmentarisches”, Erinnerung an Martin Heidegger, ed. G. Neske, (Pfullingen: Neske, 1977), 47–51., here: 50f.). However, irrespectively of our judgement on the editions in question, it can be stated: it applied to him.
It has been said that the longest and most interesting part of the complete works of Heidegger is the lectures published in the second series. However, their preparation – in this respect similarly to the Hegel-edition of GW – causes several difficulties and raises several questions. Let us conclude this paper by adding even more questions, inquiring the foundations by directing the question to the object of edition itself.

The lecture series of both the Hegel- and Heidegger-editions has to face the difficulty that the manuscripts of the delivered lectures, although to various degrees, but are only available in very incomplete form, and the use of students' lecture notes gains importance in this context, as a kind of substitute. However, one must ask the question: what is it that we must really publish? What is really a lecture? Is it a written or oral manifestation? Strangely enough, the recurrent complaint about the incompleteness of the lecture notes presupposes that the lecture is not a performance, but a written manifestation. This assumption however is not at all obvious. At any rate, only the word can be efficient, the written, but perhaps undelivered manuscript can hardly have any influence. If it is called a “lecture”, then it is perhaps that what the author “lectures” (in speech, how else) that should be published. Even if we have access to the entire manuscript at the basis of the lecture, how do we know, in lack of student notes, that the written text was delivered in that particular form – and completeness – in speech? Evidently, it can be argued what is worthier of being published: a manuscript or the transcript of a tape? The manuscript can of course be published, but possibly in a series entitled “writings from the legacy” of the complete works edition; but a series entitled “Lectures”, if taken literally (and how else should we take it?) should aim at the reconstruction of the oral delivery. Consequently, if Heidegger (whether or not similarly to Hegel) has become known due to his influential lectures held after WWI – while he published nothing in print for around a decade – then the student notes preserved should mirror the effect of the delivered word just as much as a possibly fragmentary manuscript, which cannot be verified to have indeed been delivered in speech. If the main thesis of this paper claims that the establishment of the text does not take place within laboratory conditions, in a space void of interpretation, then we should now ask: whose text should we now establish in preparation for print? The text of the manuscript at the basis of the lecture, or that of the delivered lecture? For the series title of the complete edition announces, after all, “Vorlesungen” (lectures), and not “Vorlesungs-Manuskripte” or “Vorlesungs-Texte” (lecture-manuscripts, lecture-texts).
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Introduction

The existence of a gap – more or less acknowledged and discussed – between Western studies and translations and Romanian ones have made the latter remain almost unexplored. Western publications are, at least in appearance, more accessible to Romanian researchers. The recovery and systematization of these publications gains thus relevance.

Any quantitative study requires quantification and standardization of the issues investigated. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to organize Romanian publications on Plato and Aristotle in the first half of the twentieth century. I will consider the translations of their works, the books (monographs, exegeses or thematic publications), and studies in journals (the main journals investigated being Revista Fundațiilor Regale (The Royal Foundations’ Journal) and Revista de Filosofie (The Journal of Philosophy).

The main reasons for choosing the period between 1900 and 1948 are as follows:

1. The quasi–impossibility of carrying out a quantitative study before 1900 due to the lack of publications on Plato and Aristotle or translations of their works (even if the first translations appeared at the end of the nineteenth century– though still fragmentary).
2. The first debates in the press about the importance of classical studies appear in this period, there is an awareness of the lack of a coherent programme for translations; there
are discussions about the criteria and the foundations for training Romanian classicists (polemics on this subject were quite vehement and intense at the time).

3. The first publications appear (first translations – fragmented in the beginning, then full; the first studies and books).

4. The year 1948 diverted the course of classical studies so that a part of future publications became heavily ideological. Romanian Communist-era publications on the work of the two philosophers deserve a separate study.

The present study is structured according to the specificities mentioned above. The necessity to place these publications in a historical–cultural context is required by the very period that we have chosen – a moment when we can actually start talking about the beginning of a practical possibility of quantifying Platonic and Aristotelian publications in Romania. In the first part of this paper I shall try to outline the existence of traces of Romanian classical studies and institutional interest, in its early stage, on the works of Plato and Aristotle. Only the second part will be devoted to the actual quantitative study. For both Plato and Aristotle publications will be grouped as follows: A. translations of their works and reviews on these translations (Text 1, 2 and 3); B. books (thematic, monographs, anthologies) and their reviews (Text 4 and 5); C. studies published in journals and other publications (Text 6, 7 and 8); D. their quantification (Table 9).

Beyond quantifying these publications (trying to follow the thematic preference of publications in the era), the overall aim of this study is to see who were the translators of that period, who were the ones who wrote books or studies; and, not least, the possibility to compare quantitatively the Platonic and Aristotelian publications.

**Is there a tradition of classical studies?**

To answer this question, we shall refer for a start to one of Simion’s texts, which, through the questions it formulates and the suggestions it offers, is close to what interests us. How well was Platonism or Aristotelianism known in the Romanian territory before the twentieth century? “Addressing the problem of the influence of Italian Aristotelianism on the culture of Wallachia and Moldavia, which then belonged to Byzantine culture, one can naturally raise the question: why the influence of Aristotelianism and not Platonism? How do you explain that Byzantine Europe offered Platonism to the West, early in the fifteenth century, and received, in the seventeenth century, Aristotelianism?”

The following paragraphs are nothing more than a summary of the arguments offered by Simion. By the seventeenth century, when in the two regions there began to appear early influences of Paduan neo–Aristotelianism, emphasis was placed on the patristic philosophy of neo–Platonic origin. The explanations put forward by the author are: the existing schools on the Romanian territory during this period were created and functioned only around monasteries or churches. “For a century, Byzantine culture could be maintained only in religious schools allowed by the

---

1 Ghiță Simion, ”Influența aristotelismului Padovan în Țările Române” (The influence of Paduan Aristotelianism in the Romanian Countries), Revista de Filozofie 5-6 (1996): 393–403.

2 Ibid., 393.

3 Ibid., 393–403.
Turks. (...) The penetration of Paduan Aristotelianism marked a new stage, the second, in post–Byzantine culture, which replaced the first one, based philosophically on the patristic thought.\textsuperscript{1}

\textbf{Teodora Cosman}, \textit{Running from the Shadow 1/20}, from the series „Photograms”, 50 x 70 cm, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 2006

We might also add that, in terms of religious politics and court ceremony, the Romanian Countries had belonged since the beginning to the Byzantine “Commonwealth”, and from the point of view of the rituals and administrative language they belonged to the Slavic world. Romanian Orthodoxy was (and remains) midway between Greek speculative Orthodoxy and the mystical Russian one. Romanian territory developed in the late Middle Ages (16\textsuperscript{th} – 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries) an ascetic life with its connotations around several major monastic centres such as Poiana Mărului or Neamţ Monastery. Adding the centring on the texts of the Church Fathers (canonical writers of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 10\textsuperscript{th} centuries) and the subsequent lack of communication with Western culture (which had already been developing into another civilizing paradigm) we have a clear picture of what the Romanian culture inherited (partially) from the very beginning from the Middle Ages. Languages (in all secular and religious institutions) remain multiple, and the movement and impact of the written works are very limited. For the period between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, Georgiu\textsuperscript{2} observes the fact that both the “humanist movement” and the “Enlightenment movement” are characterized by “the

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., 393, 395.
\textsuperscript{2} Grigore Georgiu, \textit{Istoria culturii române moderne} (The History of Modern Romanian Culture) (Bucharest: Comunicare.ro, 2002).
cultural dualism” between “an official and religious culture, written in the Slavonic language, and a popular culture, unwritten, with its traditional forms”.1 During all this period theological manuscripts (especially patristic literature) had a relative spread, restricted however to certain environments; there appeared – by the intercession of scholars who have studied in Poland – the first translations of contemporary texts, and a series of works with a general content (in the long shadow of ancient models) were published, which were gradually addressed to a rising stratum of laity.

Also, the influence of Theophilus Corydaleus, a student of the University of Padua and later head of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople where Cantemir and Milescu were students, is consistent. “Corydaleus's lectures were the philosophical basis for the Royal Academies in Bucharest and Iași”.2 “In the two royal academies seven courses of Aristotelian philosophy are taught: logic, rhetoric, physics, the study of the sky, of generation and corruption, of the soul and also metaphysics, all of which are Corydaleus’s comments or his disciples”.3 Also rhetoric and logic were taught at the Greek and Latin School founded by Matei Basarab in Târgoviște in 1646, and at the Vasilian College of Iași founded in 1640 by Vasile Lupu. Here, on the other hand, a scholastic Aristotelianism was taught. “In the second half of the eighteenth century, however, Aristotelianism begins to be replaced by the Enlightenment, philosophy related to modern science”.4

Of course we cannot state the existence of a tradition of Aristotelianism or Platonism – in the classical sense of the word (the existence of Romanian schools which would practice these studies consistently, a lively debate on the thinking of the two philosophers, and also the formation of Romanian scholars in the long shadow of classical thought). But we also cannot deny concerns – more or less intense and original – which have become fruitful, only much later.

All these, perhaps, made Comarnescu5 say at the beginning of the twentieth century that “(…) the ignorance concerning Plato, Aristotle and the Bible even by students of Philosophy, the lack of translations from ancient classics – with some honourable exceptions, but with a sporadic visibility – the absence from the Romanian scene of Aeschylus and even Euripides, finally the lack of a philosophy, criticism and literature to flourish on these capital works for the human race – all these explain to a great extent the spiritual crisis of the contemporary Romanian intellectual and spiritual literate. Having been formed in the Romantic period and then in that of scientific materialism, Romanian culture was missing exactly the humanism, the classical culture, moving from patriarchalism straight to Romanticism and materialism, from naturism to a kind of archaic individualism”.6

Despite all the public debates on the problems inherent in classical studies, the status of translations and studies, it is worth noting that the people present on the scene

---

1 Ibid., 41–44.
3 Ibid., 398.
4 Ibid., 399.
6 Ibid., 631–632.
of Platonic and Aristotelian studies of the time are connected to the Western publications of their time. Some examples: Claudian\textsuperscript{1} cites Zeller, Gomperz, Pöhlman, and Ritter, and Sândulescu quotes or refers to Rostagni, Werner Jaeger, Burckhardt and Mommsen (claiming that they have demonstrated the need for an “interpretation according to the particular circumstances of the time”).\textsuperscript{2}

In this context it is not surprising that the first translations of Plato’s and Aristotle’s works take place only in the last decade of the nineteenth century (to these are added translations of the classics of literature and theology, often fragmentary). The results of a coherent programme of translations can be seen much later after some early debates, taking place mostly between the wars.

**Organizing and grouping the publications**

As mentioned in the introduction, the works will be grouped as follows: translations, studies, books; they will be presented in the texts (where the number is higher); each text will specify other criteria according to which we shall perform the distinctions. At the end of each text, we present reviews and after each type of work, we try to draw some conclusions.

The general criterion for presenting the works is the chronological one, the exception being the translations of Plato. Also, there will be separate texts for each of the two thinkers and for each type of work. We shall refer only to those studies or books with direct reference to Plato or Aristotle and we shall not take account of the books or more general studies in which one could find mentions of the two thinkers. That does not mean they do not exist (e.g. Constantin Noica, “Aristotel sau politeismul cunoașterii” (Aristotle or the polytheism of knowledge) in *Schițe pentru istoria lui Cum e cu putință ceva nou*, Bucharest: Bucovina, I.E. Torouțiu, 1940, 104–116) but for the present paper we consider strictly the translations of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and studies and books referring to the two. Still, it is worth mentioning Emile Brèhier’s study, “Reflections on Platonism”, written specifically for *The Royal Foundations’ Journal* and published in no.12 (1938), 493–509.

**A.Translations:**

For presenting the translations of Plato I gave up chronological order and I opted for the order in which they have appeared in *Opere (Works)*, edited by Petru Crețiu and Constantin Noica, Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1975–1993.

**Text 1(translations of Plato’s works):**

1. *Apologia lui Socrate/Apărarea lui Socrate* (Apology)
   a) translation from the original by I.E. Torouțiu:
   b) translation from Ancient Greek by Vasile Grecu:
      – Bucharest: Universala Leon Alcalay, 1916, 111p;

\textsuperscript{1} Alexandru Claudian, “Statul lui Platon și clasa socială cu rol economic” (Plato’s State and the social class with an economic role), *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 7 (1936): 111–120.

\textsuperscript{2} Constantin Sândulescu, “Problema cunoașterii la Platon” (The problem of knowledge in Plato), *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 6 (1942): 535.
c) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
   – in Dialoguri (Dialogues) (Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor),

d) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
   – Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare (and “Crito”), 1919, 71 p;
   – in Dialoguri (Apology, Crito, Phaedo), with an introduction and two clichés, Bucharest: România Nouă, 1923;
   – in Dialoguri (Apology, Euthyphro, Crito), vol. I, with an introductory study, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930;

2. Crito / Kriton (Crito)

a) No translator is mentioned:

b) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
   – fragment in Convorbiri literare (Literary Conversations), XLIX, 1915, pp. 1180–1194;
   – Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare, (and Apology), 1919, 71 p;
   – in Dialoguri (Apology, Crito, Phaedo), Bucharest: Română Nouă Tipografia, 1923;
   – in Dialoguri (Apology, Euthyphro, Crito), vol. I, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930;

c) translation by Vasile Grecu:
   – preface and translation from Ancient Greek, Bucharest: Universala Leon Alcalay, 1916, 80 p;

3. Alcibiade (Alcibiades)

a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
   – Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, 81 p;
   – Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944.

4. Charmides/Harmide

a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
b) translation by G. Popa–Lisseanu:
   – in Dacia în autorii clasici. II. Autorii greci și bizantini (Dacia in classical authors. II. Greek and Byzantine Authors), Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial and Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională (The Romanian Academy, Studies and Research), 1943, pp. 25–26.

5. Laches/Lahes
   a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

6. Gorgias/Georgias
   a) translation by Theofil Simenschy:
   b) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
      – 481b–506c; 521d–527e, in Sofiștii în antichitatea greacă (The Sophists in Greek Antiquity), Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1934, 71 p., pp. 25–71;

7. Protagoras
   a) translation by George Cârlan:
      – Suceava: Schools’ Bookshop, 1925, 64p.
   b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
      – Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1941.

8. Hippias Minor
   a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

9. Hippias Maior (Hippias Major)
   a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

10. Ion
    a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

11. Lysis
    a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

12. Euthyphron (Euthyphro)
    a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
    b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
        – Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.
13. **Menexenos/ Menexen (Menexenus)**  
a) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:  
   – Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

14. **Menon (Meno)**  
a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
b) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:  
   – Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

15. **Euthydemos (Euthydemus)**  
a) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:  
   – Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

16. **Phaidon (Phaedo)**  
a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
   – 114b– end, in *Convorbiri literare*, 1914, pp. 1247–1253;  
   – Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare Press, 1919, 119p;  
   – in *Dialoguri (Apology, Crito, Phaedo)*, vol. 1, Bucharest: Noua Presă Românească, 1923;  

17. **Phaidros/Fedoru (Phaedrus)**  
a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
b) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:  
c) no translator is mentioned:  

18. **Republica/Statul (Republic)**  
a) translation by Vasile Bichigean:  
19. Parmenide (Parmenide)
   a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

20. Theaetetus (Theaitetos / Teetet)
   a) translation by Constantin Săndulescu:
      – Bucharest: Societatea Română de Filosofie, 1942, 127p;

21. Sofistul (Sophistes)
   a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

22. Banchetul/Symposion
   a) translation by A. Luca:
   b) translation by Vasile Grecu:
      – Ospătul sau discuții asupra iubirii (The Banquet or discussions on love), Bucharest: Alcalay, 1920, 172p.
   c) translation by Panait Mușoiu:
      – “Despre amor” (About love), in Banchetul sau despre amor de Platon și Banchetul de Xenophon (The Banquet or about love by Plato and the Banquet by Xenophon), Bucharest: Biblioteca Revistei Ideei, 1922, pp. 43–128.
   d) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
      – 172–180h, in Revista Clasică, I, 1929, pp. 387–399;
– 180c–188e, Revista Clasică, II, 1930, pp. 55–66;
– in Dialoguri, (Banchetul, Phaidon), vol. 2, Bucharst: Casa Școalelor, 1931, pp. 5–89;
e) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
– cap. 27–29, 208c–212c in Symposion, I, no. 1, 1938, pp. 8–11;
– cap. 22–26, 201d–208b, in Symposion, nr. 7, 1943, pp. 87–94;
– Bucharest: Fundația Cultură Regală “Regele Mihai I” (King Michael I Royal Cultural Foundation), 1944, 156 p.

23. Legile (Laws)
a) translation by Elefterie Bezdechi:
b) translation by Constantin Sândulescu:
– I, 626c, 631bd, 643b, 644b; II, 653ab, III, 689dc; 701a b; IV, 713e, 714a. in Kalende, II, no. 10–11, 1943, pp. 53–54;
– V 728a,b; VI 762e; II 659c,d; VI 756z, 757a; III 689a,b; III691c; III692d, 693b; VI 765e; X903e, in Revista Fundațiilor Regale, year XI, no. 2, 1944, pp. 319–323.

Of the dialogues contained in the edition mentioned above there have not been translated: Politicus, Philebus, Timaeus,Critias. The dialogues with the most variants of translations (complete or fragmentary) are Symposion (with twelve appearances), Apology, Crito, Republic (with nine appearances), Phaedo (with eight appearances), Gorgias, Phaedrus (with five appearances), Meno, Theaetetus, Laws (with three appearances), Charmides, Protagoras, Euthyphro (with two appearances) and the rest with one variant of translation.

Of the twenty–three dialogues, eighteen were translated by Bezdechi – the most prolific translator of the period, followed by Papacostea with nine dialogues translated. But as measured by the publications (whole and fragmented), the ratio is changing: Papacostea has thirty–seven appearances, and Bezdechi twenty–three appearances. Grecu follows with three, Simenschy and Sândulescu with two each, and others with one: Torouțiu, Popa–Lisseanu, Cârlan, Bichigean, Luca, Mușoiu, Elefterie Bezdechi.

Text 2 (reviews of translations of Plato): the order being a chronological one

The most reviewed translator is Papacostea with seven reviewers, and the most reviewed dialogue is Apology.

Text 3 (translations of Aristotle): translations from Aristotle are presented in the chronological order of their appearance

1. De anima
   a) translation by Mihail Negru:
      – Bucharest: Lumen, 1911, 32 p.
2. Politica (Politics)
   a) translation by Elefterie Bezdechi:
      – introduction by Ștefan Bezdechi, Bucharest: National Culture, 1924, 335p, edited by D. Gusti;
      – III,4,5; IV,15,1; IV,15,2; IV,15,5; IV,15,6; V,3,3; V,3,4; V,3,5; V,3,6; V,3,7; VI,1,1 in Șt. Bezdechi, Sportul la eleni (Sport at the Greeks), Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930, 223p, pp. 79–85.
b) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:

3. *Etica Nicomahică* (Nicomachean Ethics)
   a) translation by Ştefan Bezdechi:
   b) No name is mentioned:
   c) translation by Traian Brăileanu:
      – translation from Greek with a foreword, a short presentation of the life and work of Aristotle and an introduction in the ethical theory of Aristotle by Traian Brăileanu, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944, 365 p.

4. *Poetica* (Poetics)
   a) translation by D.M. Pippidi:

5. *Metafizica* (Metaphysics)
   a) No name is mentioned:

   It is noted that of Plato’s translators, only Ştefan Bezdechi and Elefterie Bezdechi deal also with Aristotle. Regarding reviews, I have found only one: P.C. (P. Comarnescu), “Traducerea *Poeticii* lui Aristotel de D.M. Pippidi” (The translation of Aristotle’s Poetics by D.M. Pippidi), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, no.4, 1940, pp.236–237.

B. Books (about Plato and Aristotle) and their reviews.
We have chosen only thematic books on Plato and Aristotle, without mentioning the various philosophical anthologies or histories of philosophy which devote more or less space to Platonic and Aristotelian themes (some of which are presented in Texts 7 and 8). Their presentation will be chronological.

**Text 4 (books on Plato)**
2. Grigore Tăușan, *Filozofia lui Platon* (Caracterizarea filozofiei lui Platon. Metoda mistică. Localizarea istorică a misticismului lui Platon) (Plato’s Philosophy: The
characterization of Plato’s Philosophy. The mystical method. The historical localization of Plato’s mysticism), Bucharest: Bucovina, 1931.
5. Aram M. Frenkian, La méthode hippocratique dans le Phèdre de Platon. Note sur le sens primordial du mot katholou (a propos des idées de Nicolai Hartmann (The Hippocratic Method in Plato's Phaedrus. Note on the primordial sense of the word katholou, surrounding the ideas of Nicolai Hartmann), Bucharest: Presa Națională, 1941, 47p.

During this period we have the first two monographs (although the term appears perhaps too generous) of Plato (Papacostea, Tăușan), the other four being more or less restrictive in terms of topics treated. At a first glance it seems that only Claudian’s book had any echo in the period. Reviews of this work: Petre Botezatu, “Alexandru Claudian: Collectivism in the philosophy of Plato” (Iasi, 1936), in Revista de Filosofie, no.3/1936, pp. 317–319; the following review refers to the studies of Al. Claudian dedicated to Platonic thought: Petru Comarnescu, “Some objections to the Platonic studies of Mr. Al. Claudian”, in Revista Fundațiilor Regale, year. III, no. 3, March 1936, pp.705–710.

Text 5 (books on Aristotle)
2. Raul Teodorescu, Aristotel ca teoretician estetic (Aristotle as an aesthetic theoretician), Bucharest: Graphic Art’s Institute, 1938, 164p.


There also are the following books (not included in the tables since they refer either to both Plato and Aristotle, or they are translations): Aram M. Frenkian, Mimesis si muzică: O contribuție la estetica lui Platon și Aristotel (Mimesis and music: A contribution to the aesthetics of Plato and Aristotle), Cernăuți: The Institute of Graphic Arts and Glasul Bucovinei, 1932, 72p; Adriana Camariano–Cioran, Catehismul lui Platon (The Catechism of Plato), translated in Greek and Romanian by Adriana Camariano–Cioran, Bucharest: The Church Books, 1942; Marsilio Ficino, Asupra iubirii sau Banchetul lui Platon (On love or Plato’s Symposium), translated from Italian, with an introduction and notes by Sorin Ionescu, Bucharest: The Italian Institute for Philosophy, The Romanian Society for Philosophy, 1942, 186p; the latter with a review from Edgar Papu published in Revista de Filosofie, no.3–4/1945, pp. 351–352.

C. Studies on Plato and Aristotle
In the following text we have mentioned only the studies published in Revista de Filosofie (The Philosophy Review) and Revista Fundațiilor Regale (The Royal
Foundations’ Journal), taking into account only those papers which explicitly treat Plato or Aristotle.

Text 6 (studies in Revista de Filosofie and Revista Fundațiilor Regale)

Bezdechi and Claudian are those who wrote a large number of studies on Plato in these journals. Mr. Claudian – directly interested in the understanding of Plato’s work and not by his work as a translator – can be found also in the table dedicated to books. As one can observe, there is a single study dedicated to Aristotle in Revista Fundațiilor Regale, this kind of study missing from Revista de Filosofie.

Text 7 (Studies in other journals or publications [without the claim of a complete list()])
2. Ștefan Bezdechi, “Politica lui Aristotel” (Aristotle’s Politics), in Arhiva pentru Știință și Reformă Socială (The Archive for Science and Social Reform), no. 4–5, 1923, pp. 484–497.
3. Ștefan George, “Platon”, in Însemnări filosofice și literare (Philosophical and literary notes), Bucharest: Ion C. Văcărescu, 1926, pp. 35–52.
9. Ștefan Bezdechi, “Platon și teoria lui despre Stat” (Plato and his theory on the State), in Transilvania, no. 6, 1943, pp. 413–426.
10. D.M. Pippidi, “Platon și problema poeziei; despre Poetica de Aristotel” (Plato and the problem of poetry; on Aristotle’s Poetics), in Formarea ideilor literare în Antichitate (The Formation of literary ideas in Antiquity), București: Casa Școalelor, 1944, 176p.

And last but not least, all those general treatises on the history of philosophy, books or other courses, anthologies that include studies with references to/from Plato and Aristotle, displayed chronologically (without the claim of an exhaustive list).

Text 8 (Other publications that include studies or references about Plato and Aristotle).
1. Dimitrie Gusti, Introducere la cursul de istoria filosofiei grecești, etică și sociologie (Introduction to the course of the History of Greek Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology), București: The Carol Göbl Graphic Art Institute, 1910.
2. Mircea Florian, Îndrumare în filozofie (Guide to Philosophy), București: Socec, 1922.
3. Ștefan Bezdechi, Gânduri și chipuri din Grecia veche (Thoughts and Faces from Ancient Greece), Cluj–Napoca: “Life” Graphic Art Institute, 1927.
5. Ștefan Bezdechi, Sportul la eleni (Sport in Greeks), Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930.
9. Aram M. Frenkian, La méthode hippocratique dans le Phèdre de Platon. Note sur le sens primordial du mot katholou (a propos des idées de Nicolai Hartmann) (The Hippocratic Method in Plato's Phaedrus. Note on the primordial sense of the word
katholou – following the ideas of Nicolai Hartmann), Bucharest, Presa Națională, 1941, 47p.

10. Vasile Marghescu, Functiunea economică a științei contemporane (The economic function of contemporary science), Bucharest, 1941.


14. H. Mihăescu, Autorii greci în româneste (Greek Authors in Romanian), Iași, 1943.


The preference for Plato is to be noted once more, although the balance will shift significantly after 1948.

Conclusions
Our conclusions are based on the data presented in texts 1 to 8 and on the conclusions inserted between them. Regarding the comparative frequency of writing, we have grouped them by years as follows: for years I used a division by decades, for translations I have quantified including the fragments adding where it was appropriate the number of reviews (this also for avoiding the inequality of the writings of the two authors – Plato and Aristotle). In quantifying the books we took into account only those presented in texts 4 and 5, and regarding the studies they are quantified according to texts 6, 7 and 8.
D. Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of translations from Plato’s work</th>
<th>Number of translations from Aristotle’s work</th>
<th>Thematic books on Plato</th>
<th>Thematic books on Aristotle</th>
<th>Studies on Plato</th>
<th>Studies on Aristotle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900–1910</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911–1920</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (2 reviews)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921–1930</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 (3 reviews)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931–1940</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (6 reviews)</td>
<td>1 (1 review)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941–1948</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5 (3 reviews)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86 (14 reviews)</td>
<td>9 (1 review)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since in this period (1900–1948) Platonic and Aristotelian studies are in the pioneering stage and since there is no institutionalization of these able to provide a common direction and continuity, we stand in the impossibility of making a coherent thematic classification. If we are to grasp a preference for a particular theme in the translations of Plato, this is represented by *Symposion* with five different versions of translations including fragmentary publications (Bezdechi, Grecu, Luca, Muşoiu, Papacostea), followed by the *Apology, Crito and Republic* with four translators. We will not seek an explanation of these preferences, given the nature of our text. We add only that in the period 1945–1961 there is no other translation of Plato being made (only in 1955 were there some excerpts reprinted, translated from *The Law*, in *Crestoamaţie pentru studiul istoriei statului şi dreptului în R.P.R.* (The Reader For Studying the State History and Law in the PRR), edited by Vladimir Hanga, Bucharest: Editura pentru Literatură Economică şi Juridică, 1955, pp. 66–68, 83). Unlike Plato, who would fall into obscurity, the translation of Aristotle continued in the 1950s thanks to Frenkian, even if fragmentary, in *Texte alese* (Chosen Texts) (an introductory study and selection of texts by C.I. Gulian, Bucharest: Editura de Stat, 1951).

If in what concerns Aristotle the interest is too low in this period to talk about full critical editions or translations, regarding Plato we have two names well recognized in this period, whose translations have been reedited after 1990. Thus, in 1922, Bezdechi
was first to bring together some dialogues (Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor) in a volume (Dialogues), while Papacostea started (even if they were in an early stage and incomplete) a critical edition of Plato published between 1931 and 1935 in three volumes.

A steady increase in the number of writings can be observed, and also the significant difference in the preference for the philosophy of Plato at the expense of the Aristotelian one. Of the 175 titles, 141 are devoted to Plato, and only 34 to Aristotelian thought.

The interest for Plato dominating Romanian culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century marks the humanist phase of this culture. In a culture which – especially in its theological branch – claims itself from Platonism, the latter never gets to be a thematic issue. As it is known, orthodoxy (the right belief) is constituted as a spiritual and political reality after the schism of 1054 and especially after the Byzantine refusal of any contact with Rome after the traumatic Fourth Crusade. The Great Schism divided the Eastern and Western Church – which now evolved on different political and cultural coordinates. However, Eastern Christianity appears in 1054 very different than the Western one: more sensitive to the Platonic substrate of Christianity, and as such, more mystical, with a hieratism of the forms of worship reminiscent of the court ceremony of Roman Basileia (but in Greek!), with the famous "symphony" between temporal and religious power which makes the authority of the Church, seriously threatened in the temporal, to take refuge in the spiritual, a defensive move already visible (all the Eastern Empire at the time – 1054 – being already occupied by Islam). If we add the centring on the texts of the Church Fathers and the subsequent lack of communication with Western culture (which is already developing into another civilizing paradigm) we have a picture of what the Romanian Orthodoxy inherits from the formation of medieval states. Instead, Aristotelianism taught in royal schools (extremely prolific in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) is a school Aristotelianism (Scholastic – but not in the Western sense of the term). The interest for Aristotle only becomes visible when the Romanian culture is entering the stage of scientific concerns and, implicitly, concerns for the technologisation of a retarded world.

When Romania meets Modernity, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Modernity does not meet any resistance from Platonism, nor from Aristotelianism and as such is not defined critically in relation to them. Here, modernity has an exclusively constructive dimension and what modernity criticizes is a state of social retardation rather than acultural pattern. It is not about a cultural continuity (in the sense that we are dealing with a tradition which creates its modernity), but it's about the quasi mechanic juxtaposition of some moments of influence. On one side we have a Plato–Christianus retrieved, thanks to Patristic, via the religious route, on the other we have an Aristotle of the commentaries which is a bauble of Greek schools and, finally, on the third side, we have a Plato which has become a symbol of the ideality toward which the humanist culture aims and a methodological Aristotle, especially on the line of the dialectics, promoted by the higher education in the interwar period and, after that, in the communist era.

That is why Plato and Aristotle are returned to academic discourse without going through the critical analysis of their role in pre–modern Romanian culture.
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* The medieval inscriptions, in their great majority, were of religious character. It was the natural result of a spiritual life founded on Christian dogmas and this characteristic was determined by the function they fulfilled. The epitaphs on tombs, remembrance lists and stone crosses, as well as the writings on numerous objects used in the sermon, demanded divine help for the people mentioned in them, either dead or alive. Even more, what we generically call tomb stones represent an evidence of decorative art, they reflect the development of certain crafts and the economic situation of the society exponents who could afford to show them.¹

Written in Slavonic, Latin, Romanian, Greek and Armenian, in prose or in verse, on tomb stones, funerary or commemorative crosses in stone or marble, the inscriptions reflect mentalities and show the degree of education of the people who ordered them. Many of them are real cultural pieces, being written as a dialogue between a passer-by and the tomb. Others include moralising statements and phrases of biblical inspiration. Obviously, the texts in verses were created by learned people of some culture, but it is difficult to establish today how much of the contents of these species is literature and how much it became oral creation. It was not by chance that the subject

was investigated over time by historians, specialists in philology, theologians, art historians and their contributions are numerous and various.

As far as we are concerned, we have investigated the funerary inscriptions in two previous studies. The first one concentrated on the relationship between the epitaphs and the inscriptions carved in the tomb stones. The matter gains importance from the perspective of piecing together a Corpus of medieval inscriptions from the church objects, as the texts reproduced in certain studies as tomb inscriptions must be closely analyzed in order to highlight the ones which deserve to be part of the historical circuit as epigraphic sources, and take them apart from the mere epigrams which are meant only to be read, but which had never been carved in stone¹. In the second study we examined the funerary inscriptions from the perspective of the relationship between the living and the dead, how passing away was understood, the formulas of invoking divine help for the deceased whose tombs are embellished with stones and crosses ².

In what follows we shall examine the funerary inscriptions from a different point of view, namely that of underlining their characteristic as resources for historical demography. Hence, we shall follow the life span of the people from the last centuries, showing the ages up to which they lived and the ways of keeping track of the personal data; we shall give examples of longevity, but we shall also illustrate mortality for the following demographic categories: small children, teenagers and young women. In relation to these matters, we shall present in short a few special circumstances with protagonists evoked in the funerary texts, showing the consideration they received in the middle of their community and the conditions under which they lost their lives.

As in the case of the two studies mentioned above, the documentary ground is largely formed by unpublished texts but maybe not necessarily unknown to the researchers of old Romanian culture. This is possible as the interest for gathering medieval inscriptions manifested itself ever since the 19th century; at the time the inscriptions included also the notes on books. During the second half of the 19th century, Bishop Melchisedec Ștefănescu gathered many medieval inscriptions, out of which he published a part, but his archive, kept at Mihai Eminescu Central University Library in Iași includes quite a few unpublished inscriptions; ever since the first years of the 20th century, in 1902, N. G. Dossios published a few Inscripții grecești din capitala Moldovei, text original cu traducere în limba română (Greek inscriptions kept in the capital of Moldavia, original texts with a translation into Romanian), in fascicle II of Studii Greco – române (Greek and Romanian Studies) and between 1905 and 1908, Nicolae Iorga published two volumes of Inscripții din bisericile României (Inscriptions from Churches in Romania). In 1909, Alexandru Lapedatu published Antichitățile de la Baia (Antiques from Baia), in Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice” (Bulletin of the Committee of Historical Monuments) /, year II (1909), completed by Nicolae Iorga

¹ Elena Chiaburu, “Considerații privitoare la raportul dintre epitafe și inscripțiile sâpate pe lespezile funerare” (Considerations regarding the relationship between the epitaphs and the inscriptions carved on funerary stones), Text și discurs religios (Religious texts and discourse), 3 (2011): 101–110; (see also: http://www.cmtdr.ro/volumul3).
² Elena Chiaburu, Lumea de aici și lumea de dincolo reflectată în inscripțiile funerare din Moldova (The world from here and the world from beyond reflected in the funerary inscriptions from Moldavia), Amuarul muzeului etnografic al Moldovei, XI (2011).
in 1931 by the description of the Pietrele de mormînt ale saşilor din Baia (Tomb stones of the Transylvanian Saxons from Baia) in the same Bulletin of the Committee of Historical Monuments, year XXIV. Between the two world wars, Dimitrie Balaur researched the churches from the county of Lăpușna, the result being Manuscript VI-74 (Dimitrie Balaur, ms. Bisericile din Ținutul Lăpușnei. Materiale istorice și bisericești (Churches from the county of Lăpușna. Historical and Church Materials) [Râzeni – Lăpușna, 1928], 10 + 776 p., from the Central University Library in Iași. The scholar published a part of this work in 1934, namely the part with the notes on the books in the book entitled Biserici din Moldova de Răsărit: Cărți românești de slujbă bisericească care au trecut Prutul (sec. XVIII – XIX). Ținutul Lăpușna (Churches from Eastern Moldavia: Romanian Books of Church Sermons which Crossed the River Prut [18th – 19th century]. The county of Lăpușna), Bucharest, Printing House of Church Books. Finally, around and during the Second World War, Constantin Bobulescu undertook epigraphic surveys in the churches and monasteries from the valley of river Trotuş and from the town of Iași and afterwards he completed two manuscripts which are nowadays kept at the Library of the Academy from Bucharest: BAR, A 1610 (ms. C. Bobulescu, Valea Trotuşului (Valley of the Trotus River), volumes I and II) and BAR, A 1580 Inscripțiile bisericilor din orașul Iași (Inscriptions from the churches in the town of Iași). Occasionally, priest Bobulescu used certain inscriptions in his works, but most part did not have the luck to be published.

This study is based on the documentary sources mentioned above, out of which the most representative texts will be chosen as examples. With the purpose of attaining the coherence necessary for the analysis, studies have been also consulted in the fields of history of the church, historical demography, history of mentalities, history as such and also dictionaries which will be mentioned at the right time. The geographical area under scrutiny is the Principality of Moldavia, the research is done chronologically, until 1859, which means as long as this state organisation existed. From the confessional point of view, the analysed funerary stones belong to the Orthodox rite, predominantly from Moldavia, to the Catholic and Protestant rites (from the boroughs of Cotnari and Baia) and to the Armenian rite (from the town of Botoșani). For the easiness of the reading, in case of the texts written in Slavonic, Latin, Greek and Armenian we shall provide only the Romanian translation, respectively the English one, with a mention in the footnotes to the original form it had in the sources.

Mention must be made, even from the beginning: due to the rough materials the funerary monuments were made of (stone, grit stone, marble), the carved texts were almost all the time short (the words were often abbreviated). Consequently, unlike the rest of the categories of historical sources, the funerary inscriptions are poor in economical, military, cultural news and so on. For this reason, the data regarding the ages up to which people used to live in different eras, offered by the tomb texts are numerous, but of different values, hence the conclusions should be drawn with care and combined with other information sources. Some inscriptions offer only general information, while others are precise and even rich in details. The inscriptions of general character hint to the life stages of the deceased. For example, a deteriorated tomb stone, measuring 149 / 50–60 cm, with carved letters of 6,5 cm and decorated parts with vegetal and ornamental motifs, kept until today at the National Art Museum from Bucharest, inventory number 4388, coming from the Catholic church in Cotnari (county
of Iaşi), was set in the middle of the 17th century for the “young and honest Valentin Darvaş”. Similarly, on a marble tomb from the monastery Bogdana, county of Bacău there was an epitaph carved for Ioan Cantacuzino, passed away on 1 September 1691, from which we find out that:

"Under this marble I lie since my very youth
Which the terrible death destroyed”, caused probably by the plague which haunted Moldavia between 1690–1698, with short interruptions. At Saint Dimitrie (Bals) Church from Iaşi was buried “Elena, daughter of Gheorghe Balş; and the wise and righteous wife of Răducanu Roseti. She was kidnapped by fate at middle age”, on 13 September 1798. In the collective tomb which belonged to the family of the high official Vasile Coroi from Saint Ilie Church in Iaşi (destroyed during the Second World War – nowadays on Vasile Alecsandri street), the epitaph in verse since 18 October 1832 announces that there was also

“young Maranda, whose man was
Small Cerchez, who was also buried while young”.

Out of an incomplete inscription from Saint Ioan Zlataust Church also from Iaşi we understand that “Manolachi Ioan, bachelor, ended his life” between the years 1840 and 1849, he was also young when he died. Still there, a certain person

“Temistochi
Dead when his life was in blossom
... He also lived as a flower
... And death in their youth
Cut out their days”. We know how long he lived, the inscription says that “he was born in the year 1835, 1st of March, died in 1852, 13th of October”: consequently, he was 17.

Yet, we cannot be sure how much these appreciations meant in years, as the perception on age was relative. Thus, while Elena, wife of protopope Gavril Ciupercovici “died on the 10th of April, year 1824, at 60 years old”, but “Ştefan Balasan, a tradesman from a good family, fair churchwarden of the Holy Trinity Church” (Armenian, from Botoşani), was “his life was in blossom, at 58 years old”, when he died, in 1832. As for Alexandru Anastasă, buried in the stoop of Talpalari church from Iaşi, in “1769 born and in 1815 dead”, it was considered that only “lived in a small

1 Oraşul Bucureşti, 530, no 650 (text in Latin and translation).
2 BAR, Archive 1580 Inscripțiile bisericiilor din orasul Iași (The Inscriptions from Churches in the Town of Iasi), I, gathered by C. Bobulescu (Bucharest, 1943), 346.
“...much more dramatic, for Teodora, wife of Anastasi Brudea, dead on the 11th of March 1854, \(\textit{the whole of my life seemed a minute.}\)\(^1\)

In a few situations, the family of the deceased engraved on the funerary tomb not only the exact date of his disappearance, but also the exact time when the painful event took place. For example, at Saints Athanasius and Kiril Church from Iași it was buried a woman, Maria, the wife of a priest and on her cross it was written that she died “in 1843, June 2\(^{\text{nd}}\), Wednesday, 10 o’clock in the morning”. In Pomârla village (county of Botoșani), chancellor Anastasie Bașotă demanded there should be written on a collective tomb stone which belonged to his family, from the church with the patron of all saints” in the year of 1846, November 26\(^{\text{th}}\) to 27\(^{\text{th}}\), \(\textit{at 4 o’clock in the night, after midnight}\), his ancestor Ioan Bașotă\(^2\) died.

Going on with our analysis, we notice that many funerary inscriptions include the exact date of the deceased, so that we know how long people used to live during the period of time under study. Unique, up to now, from all the material under study, due to its precision, we consider the stone for “Magdalina Vasâliu, who died in 1856 October 27\(^{\text{th}}\), former wife of ikonomus Ioan Vasiliu, administrator, aged 47 years and 4 months”\(^3\). The great majority of the texts only give the rounded age of the deceased. The oldest funerary inscription which mentions the age of the deceased is from Baia (county of Suceava) and it belonged to monk “Ambrosius from Keczemet [...who] in the year of Redemption one thousand 600 and 18, on the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) of October his soul was taken for the holy, when he \textit{was in his thirty fifth year}”. If we take a time leap to 24\(^{\text{th}}\) of January 1791, at Saint Friday Church from Iași (demolished at the end of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century), it is where Visarion was buried, who lived for “forty years, being righteous, liked by God”. A tomb stone which is found at the History Museum was set at the head of “Teodor Petrovici, who died on the 23\(^{\text{rd}}\) of March 1800, \textit{aged 54}, in Iași”. On the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) of November 1819, at the Metropolitan Church from Iasi there was also buried “Neculai Strătulati ... also called Mironescu [...who] \textit{in kindness had lived for 55 years}”. “Court man and registrar Alexandru son of Nicolae Greculov ... he died on 13th of March 1828, \textit{in his 44th year after birth}” and he was buried at Saints Mihail and Gavril Church in Roșcani village, county of Lăpușna (today in the Republic of Moldavia), while “Boghos Iacuexport, ... aged 44, ... left to the eternal life ... in 1828 March 25\(^{\text{th}}\)” and was put in a tomb at Holy Trinity Armenian Church from Botosani. “nun Elisaveta ... Brăiasca, mother of cupbearer Ioan Brăiescu [died] \textit{aged 31}”, on the 21\(^{\text{st}}\) of September 1828 and was buried in the village of Grozești (county of Bacău). At Saint Mary Armenian church from Botoșani there was buried the body of the righteous daughter of Iodia Trancu and

---

good wife of Hagi Garabet Aburel, [...] who turned 70 years old, then left this world; 1832 August 15th, “Gheorghii Muste, 20 years old, died, year 1831 September 25th.” “Iosip, sergeant ... aged 45 left to the Lord on 17th of March 1837”. “Maria Grigoriadi, wife of a high official, born Roset, ... died in the year 1838, on 17th of August, aged 37”.

On the 4th of April 1840, there was buried “Captain Vasili Simionuvici, at the age of 40”. Panaioti Spartali komis, administrator of the White Church in Iași, he died in September 1841, “being sixty years old”. In a tomb from St Pantelimon Church in Iași there were laid together “Necula Dimitriu, aged 36. Unhappy was he in the world; his life ended on 6th of May 1842” and “Costachi, younger brother, aged 18, died in 1829 December 30th”. “Boyar Vasile Portas, owner of Cânești estate from the region of Tutova, aged 28 ... died in the year 1842 June 26th”. “Luca Ianaghi died on the 27th of February, year 1844, aged 38”.

In the month of August of the same year, “boyar Dumitriță Steriu aged 56 died”. Ioan Bașotă, mentioned above, was “84 years old” when he was buried on his family’s estate, Pomârla. “Administrator Ioan Pavlu ... ended his life in 1848 July 29th, being 57 years old”. “Teodosi săn hagi Dimitri, aged 66 died in the year 1850 April 4th.” “Court man Gheorghe, son of Alexandru Greculov” mentioned above, died on the 3rd of June, 1851, in the 25th year after his birth”. Tax-collector Costandin Bobulescul died “aged 30” on the 8th of March 1852, and was buried in Saint John Chrisostom Church (Zlataust) from Iași. After only a week, “administrator Constantin Bălan, aged 64, ended his life in the year 1852 March 15th”, he was buried at St Nicholas Church - Socola (on the big road). A month later, on the 14th of April, at Curelari Church, with Pentecost as patron, there was buried “Sândulachi Voiață, he died when he was 55 years old”. “Panaioti Pișmiși from Zagori, village of Anasudena, died in the 19th of March 1853, aged 56”. “Ana Boian, wife of court marshal ... daughter of high official Iordachi Ciriac-Siloviiharnu, ended life on 21st of July 1853 and buried on the 23rd of the same month [...] was in her 38th year of life and 22nd of marriage” with seneschal Iordachi Boian. “Costaki Adam, who died in 1854 May 1st [was] 37 years old”. “Young military administrator Vasile Barnovschi, who had spent his life until 33 years old, in the year 1855 February 29th passed away from this life to an endless life”.

“Spatharios Iancu Talpeș, aged 36, ended his life [...] on 20th of May 1856”. “Rarita, wife of Penu Predu Rizu, aged 30, [was buried] together with her two children: Paraschiva and Mihail and died the year 1858 July 19th. Ștefan, son of Vasili Vârcolici ended his life in 1858 October 22nd, aged 22”. On a funerary stone from St Nicholas Church - Ciurchi from Iași, there was engraved on 29th of March 1859 “for the knowledge of the followers: son of God Zavu Moscu and his wife Tudura died and rest .... Zavu aged 50”. Finally, “hieromonk Calinic Bibiri ended his life on the 12th of August 1859, in the fortieth year of his life”.1

---

1 Orașul București, 522–523, issue 637 (text in Latin and translation); Iorga, Pietrele de mormânt ale sâilor, 3 (text) and fig. 12, on 6; BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscriptii Iasi, I), 17, 174–175, 279, 302–304, 371, 390–391, 471–472, 498, 572, 599, 646 (with differences of reading), 749, 773, 783, 841, 881, 896–897, 928, 954; BAR A 1610 (ms. Bobulescu, Valea Trotușului), 307; Balaur, Bisericile din Lăpușna, 454; Iorga, Inscriptii, II, 126–127, nr. 345 / 10, 132–133, nr. 368/3, 200; ibid., I, 230, nr. 511/12 și 233, nr. 526/27 (trad. din lb. armeană); Ghibănescu, Bășoatești și Iași, 146.
Since the end of the 17th century, people started to keep better records of their personal data, a fact which can also be seen on the funerary inscriptions which record both the date of birth and death. Thus, “Lupul Balș who was a chancellor, son of Ioan Balș steward ... was born in the year 1691 April 28th and died in the year 1782 March 16th”. Three centuries later, on his son’s tomb “Iordache Balș great treasurer, [...it was written that] he was born in the year 7250 [1742] February 12th from the creation of the world and died in the year 7320 [1812] March 23rd”. On the tomb stone belonging to Alexandru Anastasă from the stoop of Talpalari Church in Iași there was engraved in verse:

“... here lies
That born in 1769 and died in 1815,
Alexandru Anastas called”.
At the same Talpalari Church there was a tomb stone which no longer exists today, according to which:

“Here in death bosom
Lies aga Alecu Roset;
... Born in 1795 January 19th,

Ended in 1837 June 10th”, left from the living people at 42 years old. “State councillor in activity Teodor Ioan Nedoba, who was born in 1770, died on the 25th of July, year 1846” and was buried in the church of Lohănești village, region of Lăpușna (today, Republic of Moldavia), on the right of the nave. In the church called Vulpe from Iași there was buried “Marghioara, born in 1816, married to tax-collector Gherasăm Hâncu in 1832 and left for the eternal life on the 20th of February 1849”, a young woman of only 33 years old. “To Sandu son of Ștefan Sturza, important boyar and treasurer of Moldavia, born in 1758, gone to God on the 7th of June 1831; to Ecaterina Sturza, daughter of Constantin Moruzi, Prince of MoldoWallachia born in the year 1767, gone to God on the 25th of February 1835, the son, high official Constantin Sturza, for eternal remembrance and gratitude, built this monument [in which also lies] Alexandru Mihail Sturza, born in 1794, died in 1849”

At the time, especially due to the great number of illnesses which were not known, child mortality was high, but the proving funerary inscriptions were known late, at the beginning of the 19th century. A great number of children did not survive early days, a tomb from Armenian St. Mary Church in Botoșani was made for “handsome Garabet, ... innocent child, ... son of master Cristea Balasan .... His life from God has set; his soul has flown to the children from heavens”. “Nephews and nieces” of nun Atanasia lived as follows: “Olga, born in 1834 November 19th and died in 1835 August 10th; Costachi, born in 1839 July 12th and died in 1840 September 23rd”. Unnamed daughter of “m(ister) Ioan Cuza and m(iss) Victoria Cuza, born Rosâț, was born in the year 1839 September 23rd, on a Saturday, at around 10 o’clock in the morning, but ... ended his life in the year 1840 December 30th and the second day, on St Vasile’s day, was already buried at St George church” from Fichitești village (Podu-Turcului parish, Băcău county). At Vulpe church from Iași, “by Aga Procopie Florescu and his wife Efrosina, born Cavacu, this stone was set on the tomb of their daughter, Ecaterina, born on the 10th of April 1837 and gone to eternal rest on the 2nd of January 1843”. “Aglaida, daughter of high official Ilii Pisovsche, born in 1845 March 9th and dead in 1846 May 16th” was buried at St Sava Church from Iași. One tomb from Evangelical Church in Iași kept “Ioan, Mihail, Aglaida, children of spatharios Mihăiță Dano, born: the first one on the 21st of March 1846 and died on the 21st of July 1848; the second, born on the 17th of April 1847, died on the 28th of August 1848, and the third, born on the 12th of March 1848, left this life on the 20th of August 1848”, all three dead, as it could be seen, only along a few weeks. During the same year, on a tomb stone from John Chrysostom (Zlataust) Church from Iași there was engraved a touching epitaph:

“Brothers of an early age, ruthless death took us,
One aged one year and a month, another three.
We left parents on this world, seven brothers, two sisters.
If you want to know our names: Andronachi, Encușor.
We both ended our life the year written here.
Our family’s name is Holban. 1848”1.

Although the inscriptions don’t mention this fact, it would not be impossible that these children died because of the plague which affected Moldavia in 1848. Actually, the note related to the children’s death is rarely part of the funerary inscriptions. In the same year 1848, on 30th of March, the funerary stone belonging to Ioan Adamachi from Bârboi church informs only that during his life, “there was a number of eight boys who died, of unknown age”. From another inscription we understand that a mother outlived her children: Marioara, wife of tax gatherer Gherasim Hâncu died on the 20th of February 1849, “and along her [there were buried] her children, passed away before her, namely: Alexandru, Elena and Mihail”. As we get closer to the chronological period settled as limit for our research, we shall end the enumeration with “Iacov Dabija [who was] 3 years old [when] he died in 1853 April 17th”.2 The funerary tombs witness the deaths of many people who were still in their young days. On a tomb stone from Golia monastery it was engraved on the 30th of January 1782 that “Maria at her maiden age was buried in this tomb, / Who left this life at fourteen years old”, while on the 28th of April 1804, “from the family of Kicazi, a princess Zoii, daughter of Zmaragda, died at the age of seventeen”. After one century and a half, “Alexandra Cerchiză, who died at the age of 16, in 1820 October 17th”, being buried at St Dimitrie Church from Bujorovca village, region of Soroca (today Republic of Moldovia), “in her young age”. At the Armenian St Maria Church from Botoșani on the 20th of December 1821 there was buried “David by the name, wise in words, son of Hagi Grigore Caracș, of good family, from Rusciuc, adorned in unseen gifts, beautiful face as a rose, at thirteen years old he left his parents in grief before time”. On the 15th of June 1831, in the cemetery of the same church it was made a “grave for the boy called Sahag Bolfoșul, who died aged 12. The age when you were hardly blossoming, sweet Sahag!,” exclaimed the grieving parents. A tomb stone from Banu church from Iași announces that “the one who receives help from above, from the arms of my poor parents, in no time was taken, child of Priest Posa, administrator and of Maria Morozan. I was called Mihail, only child of my willing parents, I lived for 12 years and 3 months on earth. In the year 1843 January 14th, I ended my temporary life”3.

As it is known, in the previous centuries, the girls married very young. We only give the example of Maria, wife of Sahag Bolfoșul from Botoșani, dead on the 8th of

1 Iorga, Inscripții, I, p. 233, nr. 524/25 (translation from Armenian); BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), p. 6, 146–147, 390, 472, 647; Dorinel Ichim, Monumente de arhitectură populară din județul Bacău. Bisericile de lemn (Monuments of Country Architecture in Bacau County (Bacău, s. a.), 102, col. II–103, col. I.
2 BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), p. 145 (Greek text and translation), 543 and 647.
September 1841 and on whose tomb it was written that “at 16 she got engaged to Sahag Bolfosul”.1

Unfortunately, mortality for young women was high, many of them often died at birth. The oldest news known by us about a wife gone to heavens while very young is from the 1st of March 1603, on a tomb stone of 78 / 49 cm (broken today in three pieces), engraved in a 6 cm letter and adorned with floral motifs, kept at the Romanian National Art Museum in Bucharest, inventory 4459: “in this tomb was buried an honest woman, Ana, daughter of Antonie, wife of master George, aged 20.”2 The funerary monuments were also a symbol of the social status, so the text engraved after three quarters of a century, on the 3rd of October 1677, for the daughter of a prince is more expressive and rich in information. On the mentioned date, at Bârnova monastery near Iasi, under a marble funerary stone, was buried “Maria, daughter of the famous Prince of Moldavia, [Eustratie] Dabija, as his only child, and in no time, death kidnapped her in her youth, finished at 15 years old. She lived for a short while with Gheorghe, important man, from the princely family of Rusetesti, and left him a widower”. Moving to the middle class of the society, we can say that their funerary stones were simpler and if we take one leap for one century and a half we discover “Zahara, wife of Vasile, presbytery and administrator [of the long gone St Ilie Church, still from Iasi], aged 17 years, ended her life on 1833, August 5th”. During the same year, wife of a high official, dead on the 2nd of May and buried at St Ioan Zlataust, “life left me behind early, in a blossoming age [but you] proved yourself an example of the most fair life, although you lived as a woman for only 25 years”. Rucsanda, daughter of Ioan Pavlu, the administrator from Banu Church in Iași, wife of Chiriac Tuțascu, “ended her life in 1844, June 13th, aged 15”, while “Maria Apasi ended her life in the year 1848, 24 years old,”3 buried at St Pantelimon Church in Iași. For the people living in the period under scrutiny, death was part of every day life, even “familiar”,4 as Toader Nicoară said. Nevertheless, even if for the people who reached adulthood and especially old age, the physical disappearance was integrated in the normal path of life, the children’s and young people’s death was always perceived as unfair, or even a punishment for the sins of their parents.

Until the middle of the 19th century, in Moldavia there were people who lived to old age as well. Pandeli Gheorghiu “ended his life in 1850 March 15th, aged 100”, the same as “nun Atanasia, aged 100, dead in 1852 January 7th, mother in law of high official Gheorghe Alhazer”, living in sin, as could be seen above, for the sad events in which she buried her grandchildren. “Vasăli Gheorghiu ended his life at the age of 90, in the year

---

1 Iorga, Inscripții, I, 231, issue 513 / 14 (translation from Armenian).
2 Orașul București, 522, issue 636 (Greek text and translation); Iorga, Pietrele de mormânt ale sașilor, 2 (text) and fig. 6, on 3.
3 Melchisedec, Bishop of Roman, Notițe istorice și arheologice adunate de la 48 de mănăstiri și biserici din Moldova (Historical and Archaeological Notes Gathered from 48 Old Monasteries and Churches in Moldavia) (Bucharest: Tipografia cărtilor bisericești, 1885), 283–284 (Greek text and translation, with some mistakes); Dossios, Studii Greco - române, II, 85; Iorga, Inscripții, II, 214, nr. 6102 (Greek text and translation and a short commentary); BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), 345, 389 r.–v. and two pages interleaved without number, 471, 750.
1858 July 22nd, together with his son, Ioan, dead in the same year, October 30th.

“Anchorite Marta, wife of deceased Petru Ciclazar, who fought in the army ... died in the year 1841 July 26th, aged 86”. At the Armenian St Maria Church from Botoșani “sleeps an important man, Sahag Bolfosul. ... At 79 years old he came to the end of his life, in the year 1830 from Redemption, July 15th”. Necolae Zagură was a great military camp administrator, “he ended his life on the 28th of October 1838, in his 75th year of life” and he was buried together with a grandson, “Petro Zagură, born on the 29th of June and passed away on the 3rd of July 1841”, who lived only for a few days. “Hagi Teodor Tomovici, who died in 1854, November 1st [was] 75 years old”. “Eufronia, wife of Negri, of Constantin, / Born Mavrogheni, sleeps her sleep. / having lived for two years and seventy others more... Born in the year 1778 and died on the 5th of May 1850 in Ieși”. “High Official Iordachi Costachi Epureanu who died in 1859 September 25th, [was also] 72 years old”. “Aga Ion Milasciuc, a doctor from Bucovina, was 65 years old [when] he died in 1859, on the 23rd of December”. Finally, “Mihalachi Maneta, founder of this holy church [St. Paraschiva from Iași], moved out of life in 1859 April 13th, aged 60th.

Incidentally, in the funerary inscriptions there can be found short stories about different events in the lives of the deceased, the positions they had or circumstances in which they lost their life: an accident, sudden illness or epidemic, facts which impressed their contemporaries. The oldest funerary inscription which talks about the circumstances of a person’s death, known by us in this stage of the research, dates from the 23rd of April 1684 and is found on a tomb from Bogdana monastery (county of Bacău), belonging to “captain Matei, also called Lepădatul”, coming from Wallachia to Moldavia and “killed by the thieves”. After a few months, on the 20th of December 1584, at Bistrița Monastery (county of Neamț), in the ante-temple (on the right) there was made “the tomb of Ivașco, great official from Wallachia. He happened to wander in the Hungarian country and to pass through Moldavia. When he was in the mountains, he was struck by a terrible death in the village of Bălăești. And Prince Petru (The Lame) took his body and buried him at Bistrița monastery”, during the times of Anastasie Father Superior. Consequently, it was about an illness which evolved very quickly and irreversibly2. We do not know the illness which defeated the official, but we could suppose it was the plague, as during the years 1584 and 1588, Wallachia and the Balkan Peninsula suffered from one of the greatest ecological disasters from the 16th century, a terrible famine mixed with a destructive pest which led to the loss of an important number of lives and huge migrations3.

A tomb stone of 150 / 58 cm, broken in two parts, with engraved letters of 7 cm on which there is drawn a monk holding a cross in his right hand, surrounded by floral motifs, kept until today at the Romanian National Museum of Art from Bucharest, inventory number 4417, proves the presence of the Franciscan monks in Moldavia, at the beginning of the 17th century, in Baia (county of Suceava): “Ambrosius from Keczemet, holy father and priest of The Order of Saint Francis, he was merciful, faithful

---

2 Iorga, Inscriptișii, I, 39–40, issue 87/5 (Slavonic text and translation); Melchisedec, Notiște istorice și arheologice, 62–63, issue 3 (Slavonic text and translation).
3 Cernovodeanu, Binder, Cavalerii Apocalipsului, 54.
and kind, was wise and only a little below the saints due to his inborn kindness”\(^1\), but he died in 1618, on the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) of October.

Other two tomb stones found by the researchers during the first years of the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century, one of them at the Catholic church from Cotnari, the other one at the Orthodox church in the village tell a story from the religious context marked by intra-confessional conflicts between the Catholics from Cotnari (county of Iași). Without getting into the details of another discussion, we only want to mention that only until the end of the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century, the mentioned village was inhabited by an important Catholic community, which included Germans, Hungarians and Romanians who converted to the ideas of Jan Hus and then to the Reform (Lutheran) and then they went back to Catholicism in 1631, but they did not accept the Jesuits, whom they blamed for greed and immorality\(^2\). Under these agitated confessional circumstances, a Catholic from Cotnari, Iacob, son of Dominic, put a stone engraved with a text in Latin (today at the Romanian Museum of Art from Bucharest, inventory number 4368) in the cemetery of the Catholic church where his brother had been buried: “master Iacob, son of Dominic, took care that this stone was set, as here lie the remains of his brother to be piously remembered, mister Iokosch, who died in the year of the Lord 1631, the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) day of December\(^3\). But, a century later, in 7150 [1641 September 1\(^{\text{st}}\) – 1642 August 31\(^{\text{st}}\)] Iacob prepared his own tomb stone in the Orthodox church, with a Romanian text: “this stone was made and adorned by Iacobu, district chief magistrate, son of Dumenică, when he was alive and should he want, put it on his tomb, so as to be known; and the year was 7150\(^4\). During the reign of Vasile Lupu there was a significant change in the demographic–confessional percentage, in favour of the Orthodox, and these two tombs suggest that Iacob had abandoned the Catholic religion and adopted the Orthodox one.

During a period of time of religious hesitations, it was important to prove devotion to faith, a reason why, on a tomb stone of 157 / 66 - 59 cm, engraved with letters of 7 cm, kept nowadays at the same Romanian Museum of Art from Bucharest, inventory no 4380, it was certified for the posterity that “mister Valentin Alstner [who] died on the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) of January, year of the Lord 1647 [was a real] father of the priests, patron of the churches, an example of Catholic faith”. Another example of fidelity to faith can be found on a tomb from the 27th of May 1631: “father of pious remembrance, Gabriel Drotherma ... ended twenty five years leading this church” (the Catholic church from Cotnari). The situation was similar in several other places in Moldavia. Thus, on the tomb stone of 132 / 59 cm, engraved with letters of 7 cm and adorned with vegetal motifs, today at the Romanian National Museum of Art from Bucharest, inventory no 4379, set for “mister Ioan Kotta, of German origin, from Suceava”, who “died in 1648, on the 14\(^{\text{th}}\) of March”, it was engraved that “he was a noble in faith, due to his virtue and ancestors”\(^5\).

---

1 Orașul București, 522–523, issue 637 (Latin text, translation and photo – fig. 101); Iorga, Pietrele de mormânt ale sașilor, 3 (text) and fig. 12, on 6 (photo).
2 Valeriu D. Cotea (coord.), Podgoria Cotnari (Cotnari Vineyard) (Iași, TipoMoldova, 2010), 67.
3 Orașul București, 524, issue 640 (Latin text and translation).
4 Iorga, Inscripții, I, 12, issue VI/29; Mircea Ciubotaru, the author of the chapter on the history of Cotnari village, volume Podgoria Cotnari, 65, footnote 2, mentions a wrong date (7155 instead of 7150).
5 Orașul București, 523–524, issue 639, 528, issue 646 and 528–529, issue 647 (Latin text and translation); Alexandru Lapedatu, Antichitățile de la Baia (Antiquities from Baia), BCMI, II (1909), 61.
The presence of the Jesuits at Cotnari is also proved by a funerary tomb dating from the middle of the 17th century (today at the Romanian National Museum from Bucharest, inventory no 4389): “Andrei, a man known in the gathering of Jesus for the ardour of his faith, for the praise of the Catholic religion, for his piety, he rests here in the ground”.1

Moving to another religious register, that of the Armenians from Botoșani, grouped around St Mary and Trinity Church, the distinctive feature we have noticed at the funerary texts, in comparison to those of Orthodox origin, lies in the praise of the moral character of the deceased. Having reached this point in our analysis, mention must be made regarding all the funerary monuments, regardless of religion. The marble or grit stones, with rich sculptural ornaments were expensive products and the workers in stone who were able to do them were rare. It was often the case that the craftsmen as well as the stones were coming from abroad, a reason why the ones who could afford to embellish their tombs with sumptuous stones were coming from the well-off families at the time: princes and their families, boyars of all ranks, priests, craftsmen and traders of a certain condition. Consequently, the tomb stones were a symbol of the social and economical status of the deceased and of his family. The tombs of normal people, small craftsmen, traders and people from the church were marked with simple and inexpensive crosses or stones, out of which there have been kept only a few, if they have been kept, the texts are very brief. Hence, undoubtedly, all the people who will be mentioned in what follows were coming from the rich families of Armenian origin from Botoșani. Thus, “Iacov, son of Hagi Oxindie, churchwarden of [St. Mary] church from the small church of Botoșani, in Moldavia”, dead on the 2nd of October 1775, “was virtuous in behaviour”. Marta, wife of Boghos Lelenț, passed to the eternal life on the 10th of September 1782, had been “the kind and famous one”. Mistress Sarica”, dead on the 3rd of May 1799, “was doing only good things, did not keep them away”. “Cristea Bolfosul, his son Ioan”, dead on the 2nd of May 1802, “princely tradesman”, that is, a cattle seller for the Ottoman Empire), was “righteous”, “wise and kind, of good family, always generous to the poor”. “Priest Avedis, which was also called Barhudar”, a “holy worker for Lord Jesus was he”, “he lived a clean and fulfilled life” until the 14th of February 1814 when “his life ended, moved to the eternal one.” David Goilav, son of Luca Goilav, who passed away on the 21st of June 1826, he had been a “virtuous and lover of good person”. “Master Boghos Iacubenț” mentioned in another place, “who was aged 44, on Easter day [1828], left to the eternal life”, he had been, not more, not less “the pride of his country, the most famous in the family of Iacubenti, known by all the people”. [His contemporaries did not have any doubt that] “although death took his body, his good name did not know death.” Although unnamed, on the funerary stone it was written about “the good wife of Hagi Garabet Aburel”, dead on the 15th of August 1832, and also said that “the one filled with parently warmth”. Surely a relative of Sahag Bolfosul, dead on the 15th of July 1830, was “an important man”, “famous tradesman, of good family and always doing good for the poor, he beautifully renewed the iconostasis of this church”. His wife, Maria, buried next to him, lived until the 8th of September 1841 and “was a righteous and praised woman, her man’s wreath, mother who raised well her children and took care of her daughters and gave good advice to everybody”. As regards “Ștefan Balasan, merchant from a good family, fair administrator of Holy

---

1 Orașul București, 529–530, issue 649 (Latin text and translation).
Trinity church”, dead in 1832, the ones who ordered his funerary stone knew that he had been “from a good family, the pride of his ancestors, a wreath of good deeds in his name. He overpassed most of the virtuous people”. If “fair” Sahag Şahanian, dead on the 2nd of March 1837, “he dedicated his life to the pride of his people” but his wife, Hripsima, “spent her whole life in respect and peace and her century having passed, she got rest in death”. It was still in 1837, on the 17th of August, that “moved to her desired” place, “Hagica Varteni, a dear name, having love and mercy for the poor”, she lay by her husband’s side, “well-behaved, well-chosen and worthy of honour, Nicolae, from the family of Trancu, who was the pride of his people due to his kindness: but he left this place without heirs on earth”, before the 20th of February 1804. Even if the ones mentioned herein did not come from the wealthy class and despite the fact that we are talking about the end of the 18th century already and the first half of the 19th century, times when the elements of the secular thinking were prominently present, we still have to mention the different mentality of the Armenians, in comparison to the Orthodox people, as for the latter, the compulsory religious behaviour supposed being humble and acquiescent. The funerary texts of Orthodox origin analysed by us which included praising and even eulogistic elements are in a few number.

Another aspect regarding the life of certain individuals mentioned in the funerary inscriptions is that of their origin, belonging to different parts of the Christian world at the time. In Moldavia, as well as all around Europe, migration was present in great numbers, people who left their native places to settle in villages and towns, structures which offered protection and several possibilities to earn money. The data regarding this issue are offered by several statistics from the first half of the 19th century, but they are not the topic of our study, so that we shall support our arguments by examples taken from the funerary inscriptions as well. For example, on the 6th of October 1797 there was created an “Epitaph to the memory of a person who was still young when he passed away, here in Moldavia, ... a noble boyar ... Alexandru Callimachi, who still acted as seneschal. The Byzanthion, the famous fortress brought you to light, having ancestors of good families, and the land of Moldavia receives you now here, among the deceased”. A prose narrative by a Greek who settled in Iaşi was engraved on the tomb stone of komis Ioniţă Spartali from White Church in September 1841, where he was an administrator: “I was born in Byzanthion, my parents were born in Hios. I honestly lived in Iaşi for a long while as a tradesman... I did not reach the happiness of having children to ease my wife’s pain and to cry on their shoulder. But now, having lived for sixty years in these parts, it is here that I’m buried”.

As another example, a good part of the Armenian community had migrated to Botoşani. More precisely, “from the region of Păstunici” in Armenia were coming

1 Iorga, Inscriptii, I, 229, issue 506/7; 230, issue 508/9 and issue 511/12; 231, issue 512/13 and 513/14, issue 515/16; 231–232, issue 516/17; 232, issue 520/21; 232–233, issue 522/23; 233, issue 523/24 and issue 526/27; 234–235, issue 531/32 (translation from Armenian ).
3 Iorga, Inscriptii, II, 173, issue 463/4 and 374–375 (Greek text and translation); BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscriptii Iaşii, I), 771 (day date: 3).
people such as “Hagi Mihail, son of tradesman Marcar”, dead “in the Armenian year 1240 [1790] January 14th” and “mistress Sarica, ... daughter of Boghos” and Boghos Lelenţ, dead on the 10th of September 1782; the latter, once settled in Botoşani, he married “mistress Marta, ... daughter of Şişman Bedros, who came from Smil” [Ismail town, today in the Republic of Moldavia]. “Khatuna, a good soul, wife of Moise from Erzerum”, died on the 10th of December 1799, was “daughter of Măgârdum from the Eastern parts”. Hariton Aghababian, son of Ioan, dead on the 23rd of January 1797 had also come “from the Eastern parts”. “Priest Avedis, also called Barhudar”, was “born in the town of Smil. He lived an honest and fulfilled life, he then came to Botoşani, where his life ended, on the 14th of February 18141.

The funerary inscriptions offer other kinds of biographical information as well. For example, about Manoil Balş, son of chancellor Lupu Balş, we find out from the tomb stone that “he was first spatharus, later he moved to Rosia and as he was enrolled, he was made polkovnik and knight şi fiind în slujba oștenească s-au făcut polcovnic şi cavaleriu”, and after that, he came back to Moldavia, where “his life ended in 1812, January 19th, in Ieşi”. Dead on the 4th of November 1818, Neculai Strătulati, also called Mironescu, already mentioned here, in his life was “ruling Hetman for the people, / Chancellor without any meanness, the poor found their justice”. As regards priest Grigorie, son of Neculai Melintii, dead on the 9th of June 1831, “he served in this church [Vulpe Church from Iasi, patron Saint Anthony and Virgin Mary] even from his childhood”2.

At Saint Haralambie church from Iaşi, on a “Tuesday, 27th of August 1835”, there was buried “a son of the Épir, the one who built this monastery in endless effort, Gheorghe was his name, son of Leontarios, college assessor, righteous by the will of God”. This character’s biography could also be summed up from an inscription, engraved on some bells, this time, bells he had offered to the church, together with a cup: “Gheorghe, son of Liontari, from Iași, who was also an officer serving the princes, he also raised these three bells out of his money, in the church he worked for with warm effort, for the love of God, so that all these bells will ring, all people, big and small, should say: God forgive him! And then his soul, due to these chimes, should rest in the tents of the holy and the righteous”3. The local tradition says that the same officer George was also a captain serving Constantin Ipsilanti, Prince of Moldavia between the 8th of March 1799 and the 4th of July 1801, a position in which he had to chase the head of a posse, who was no other than his brother, Haralambie and he shot him with his own hand. He was very troubled and brought Haralambie’s head to Iași, presented it to the Prince and said: “Your highness, I fulfilled my duty, I calmed the country, but i twas my parents’ blood”. After that, he left his brother’s head on the ground, burst into tears and left the Court. The Prince rewarded Gheorghe Leondari with an estate for having proved his devotion and a short time after that, he built a church with Saint Haralambie as patron, in the remembrance of the brother he killed.4

---

1 Iorga, Inscriptii, I, 230, issue 509/10; 231, issue 514/15; 231–232, issue 516/17; 232, issue 519/20; 233, issue 523/24 (translation from Armenian).
The whole course of the life of the mandarin Panaioti Spartali, was engraved on September 1841 on the tomb stone from White Church in Iași where he was an administrator: “I was born in Byzanthion, my parents were born in Hios. I lived honestly many years, as a tradesman. I finally served my country for long [deteriorated stone, text missing]. I did not have the happiness to have children who could comfort my wife and cry with her. But now, after being for sixty years on this land, I am also buried here”\(^1\).

On the tomb stone of prince Ioan Sandu Sturza, which is found on the left side at the entrance of Bârboi Church from Iași, an epitaph in verse was written in Greek, a meditation on the passing fate of man:

> “Among the mortals of this world was I once,
> Gave advice, orders for every judgement.
> Noble from my origin and finally a prince
> I stood as support for the rights and the people.
> I saw fame and honesty around me, sceptre for the master,
> But in the end suffered the fate’s persecution.
> And now, here I lie under this stone, a mortal,
> As life is a sorrowful, cloudy desert.

He ended his life on the 2\(^{nd}\) of February 1842, after having reigned in Moldavia since the 1\(^{st}\) of July 1822 till the 23\(^{rd}\) of April 1828.\(^2\)

“Teodor Ioan Nedoba, who was born in 1770, died on the 25\(^{th}\) of July, year 1846”, was “a state chancellor in activity” when death came to him and he was buried in the church from Lohânești village, county of Lăpușna (today the Republic of Moldavia), on the right hand of the nave, under a marble stone. After the 27\(^{th}\) of November 1846, when Ioan Bașotă died, on the collective tomb of his family from Pomârla village, it was mentioned that he was “brigade leader and Russian knight [and that he received] Saint Anna’s Cross around his neck”. It was also at Bârboi church that a wife who does not mention her name asked that it should be written, on the 23\(^{rd}\) of January 1850 on the stone of that one who “has the name Filaret Atanasie, my fair and faithful husband, with an aga title, born in Byzanthion in a good family, having a deep knowledge and generous ideas, he lived for 54 years, in honour, as a real Christian, he died humbly, leaving uncomfounded sadness in my soul”. About “princess Efrosini, wife [of] C(onstantin) Negre, who was a seneschal and the daughter of prince Neculai Mavrogheni, who reigned in both principalities with honour”, we find from the tomb stone ordered by his daughter at Golia monastery from Iași on the 5\(^{th}\) of May 1850 that “she was daughter and wife, she was a very kind mother, in all circumstances a pious Christian”. Finally, about “tax-collector Costandin Bobălescu”, mentioned above and buried on the 8\(^{th}\) of March 1852 at John Chrisostom Church (Zlataust) also from Iași, we are told only that he was “husband of mistress Marghoalei (sic!)”\(^3\).

\(^1\) BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), p. 374–375 (Greek text and translation).
\(^2\) Melchisedec, Notițe istorice și arheologice, 268–269; Iorga, Inscripții, II, 144, issue 397/8; BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), 144.
\(^3\) Balaur, Bisericile din Lăpușna, 306 (text in Russian); Ghibănescu, Bașoatești și Iași, 146; BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), 98, 146 (Greek text and translation) and 391.
A few funerary stones mention a series of causes which led to the death of certain persons. Thus, on a tomb stone from a small sanctum on the left side, from the entrance of Frumoasa monastery in Iaşi, there was engraved an epitaph in verse, in Greek, for princess Ruxandra Ghica, dead in February 1780:

"... oh Roxandra, you cry for the cruel death took you
And brought you down, oh the tumour which destroys the bones of the body"\(^1\).

At the church from the Bishopric of Huşi, a marble stone tells the story of a soldier who died in the Russian-Austrian-Turkish war from 1787-1792: “Alexiu Srebriacov, commander of the troops on Don, who was killed on the 11th of December at the siege of Ismail town, when the Russian armies were commanded by Count Suvorov Rimnicski, was buried by the Bishop of Huşi [Iacov Stamati] in the year 1790 from the birth of Christ”. It was on an unknown date, but obviously not very distant that two brothers of the deceased, also military men, Major Vasilie and Lieutenant Ştefan, made a silver tabernacle for the holy remains of Saint Chiriachi’s hand kept at the Bishopric of Huşi, for the remembrance of commander Alexei, and we reproduce the story: “for the honour, gift and fame of the unchanged remains of Martyr Saint Chiriachi’s hand, this tabernacle was made with the efforts of two brothers, Major Vasilie and deputy lieutenant Ştefan Srebriacovi, to the remembrance of their brother, lieutenant in the army on the Don, Alexi Srebriacov, who was killed in the year 1790, December 11\(^{th}\), at the siege of Ismail fortress, by the Russian armies and he was buried by the holy priest Iacov, Bishop of Huşi, in the temple of Apostles Peter and Paul, in the holy church of the Bishopric of Huşi, in Moldavia, in the town of Huşi”\(^2\).

About “boyar Vasile Portas, owner of Câneşti estate from the county of Tutova, aged 28 years old, [...] we find that ] in the year 1842, on the 26\(^{th}\) of June he met his merciful death had found in Iasi”, without explaining what caused the death. But, we know that on the 1\(^{st}\) of July 1847 “to Iordache Nedelcu ... came death unexpectedly, losing breath in the ground\(^3\), a landslide, we suppose, probably while he was doing some digging works.

A real biography in verse engraved on Ioan Adamachi’s funerary stone from Bărboi Church makes known the end of his life due to an epidemic:

“Commercial life lived in honesty,
Life in no less pioussness, prudence and fear of God.
... Was wasted due to illness, leaving family and friends
But leaving especially six children and wife in sorrow.
... This is the well-known Adamachi Ioan. 1848, March 30\(^{th}\)\(^4\).

The illness which brought Ioan Adamachi down was cholera, around and during 1848, the population of Iaşi, as well as of other Moldavian towns, suffered badly

---

2 Melchisedec Ştefănescu, *Cronica Huşilor și a Episcopiei cu asemenea numire* (*Chronicles of Huși Town and of the Bishopric with the Same Name*) (Bucharest, 1869), 367–368.
from this terrible plague which also defeated Panaioti Pandeli, who “ended his life due to cholera, in 1848 June 20th, aged 50. And next to him, on the left, rests his brother, Alecu Pandeli, who ended his life due to the same illness, in 1848 July 2nd, aged 30”\(^1\).

We noticed earlier that in 1848 many children died, too, mowed down by the same frightening plague for which no cure was known. The mention of an illness which caused death to a child was made on the funerary stone belonging to an unnamed daughter of Ioan and Victoria Cuza, mentioned already, who “got ill with an apostima and the innocent child suffered from pain and ended her life ... in the year 1840 December 30th and on the second day, Saint Vasile’s day, she was buried at Saint Martyr George”\(^2\). According to the *Illustrated Romanian Dictionary*, *apostima* is an old medical term from Greek (απόστημα) which means an abscess as well as a tumour. In this case, considering the girl’s very small age, we could suppose it was rather and abscess, an infection from microbial agents for which there was no cure in the 19th century and which can have a quick evolution, accompanied by throbbing pain and fever.\(^3\)

Texts including expressions such as: “rests” or “sleeps” suggest that going to the other realm was serenely accepted as it was probably about the so-called “good” deaths, consequences of old age in Christians who lived their life in faith and without sins. The winning perception provides an optimistic support which makes the fatality of death to be accepted as found in the text engraved on the 16th of June 1831 on “the tomb of rest belonging to fair Avedic Sahag Bolfosul and his wife Flora”, who died, it seemed, a day one after the the other. “As I was like a beautiful tree and rare beauty embellished me, a mean and bitter pain interrupted the course of my life. Oh! How many tears and how much pain, how many of my lovers will not open their hearts! But who knew, who could sham the shadow of death: as old or young, she chose us and struck us with her arrow. Year 1831 from Redemption, June 15th. Still I wonder, will my life in this world turn sweeter? As what could be bitterer than living without you? You were for my soul a flower of pleasure, never withered; but leaving me, you went far away; still, it will not be long before I come as well. Let our beloved parents weep, as well as our sweet children whom we leave in sorrow”\(^4\). We are not sure, but it would not be impossible that these two husbands both died due to the great plague which struck Moldavia in 1831, having killed 7% of the town population of the country, in Botoşani town there had been 710 deaths.\(^5\)

In spite of a real pedagogy of death, we can find in many inscriptions the evocation of sufferance given by the death of someone dear, either in verse or in short stories. In times when child mortality was higher, Costin Carp’s parents, mentioned above, depicted the pain coming from the loss of their son in an epitaph in verse:

“Costin Carp was my name

\(^1\) Ibid., 175.
\(^3\) *Dicţionar explicativ ilustrat al limbii române*, 2 and 106.
\(^5\) Ecaterina Negruţ-Munteanu, *Date noi privind structura demografică a ţării şi oraşelor moldoveneşti la 1832* (New Data on the Demographic Structure of Moldavian Villages and Towns in 1832), in *Populaţie şi economie*, vol. I, 225 and Addendum no VII.
During the few years I lived.
My parents loved me,
I was their comfort,
Hoping to see me
An offspring with sweet fruit.
See where I lie now
And what a long way I have ahead
Leaving my parents
Deeply grieved and bitter.
The land covered me,
The tomb is my home,
Since childish age,
All my people weep for me
And pray God
Have mercy on my soul1.

Dead on the 30th of January 1782 and kept before burial at Golia Monastery from Iași, “maiden-like Maria” mentioned above as having died at 14 years old, “left this life / But she rejoices now among the happy,

Leaving to her parents grief and weeping,
As she was the eye of the house, covered in goodness and virtue,
From youth beauty and old age habits2.

In an epitaph in less inspired verses written on the 10th of June 1837 for Aga Alecu Roset, buried at Talpalari church in Iași,

"Here the weeping relatives
Take their grieving,
Here the stone cries
That in holy rest / His cold heart lies"3.

Nevertheless, on the 27th of February 1841, when there was engraved in a marble stone, with the Moldavian Coat of Arms, in a framing of tulips for the grave of Ioan and Victoria Cuza’s daughter, mentioned above, placed in front of the porch of Saint George wooden church from the village of Fichitești (Podu–Turcului region, Bacău county), obviously impressed by the parents’ grief, the engraver explained in prose “how much sorrow this child’s parents felt, weeping uncomforted as Rahil cried for his sons and there was no other weeping as for this innocent child, so we pray Jesus Christ to rest her eternally.”4

---

2 Dossios, Studii greco-române, II, 56; Iorga, Inscripții, I, 166–167, nr. 447/14 (Greek text and translation).
3 Ghibănescu, Din traista cu vorbe, p. 368; idem, Biserica Talpalari, 52–53; Iorga, op. cit., p. 186, issue 9; BAR, A 1580 (ms. Bobulescu, Inscripții Iași, I), 248, mentioned.
4 Ichim, Monumente de arhitectură populară din județul Bacău, 102, col. II – 103, col. I.
Some other times, the people in grief expressed their suffering for the loss of a dear one in simple phrases: “Elena, daughter of Gheorghe Balş, wise and honest wife of Răducanu Roseti”, dead “in her middle age”, as we saw, “left uncomforted sorrow for her husband as well as for all her children, especially her beloved daughters”, on the 13th of September 1798. Ana, wife of seneschal Iordachi Boian, also mentioned before, died on the 21st of July 1853 “leaving her husband and two sons in grief”. On the 20th of May 1856, when “spatharios Iancu Talpeş, aged 36 ended his life” and was buried at St Atanasie and Chiril Church from Iaşi, the tomb stone said “it was made by the mother of the deceased, Iliana Talpeş, who was deeply moved by bitter sorrow”.

Considering what has been shown so far, it results that out of all the historical sources, the inscriptions are the most widely spread ones and the most difficult to gather and even though they do not provide news as important as the ones from the narrative and diplomatic sources from the times under study, the precision of the biographical and genealogical details is greater and the provided data is safer than the ones coming from other contemporary sources. In their form which is more often stereotype, in a dry enumeration of names and dates, the funerary inscriptions talk about contemporary facts in their limited and strict material character and unlike certain chronicles, for instance, they are not aimed to be presented in certain circumstances or to bring any benefit to their authors. This is a reason why the trustworthy character of the news they include cannot be doubted.

Considering the point of view which is of interest in this paper, due to the information taken from the analysed funerary inscriptions, we conclude that the life time spent by the people from the previous centuries varied, being influenced in a great measure by the natural calamities (famine, different illnesses, especially epidemics) and wars. Mortality was high for the demographic categories which had not reached their maturity: children, teenagers, young women, but there had also been long-lived people, some of them (undoubtedly, exceptions) who lived for 100 years. Still, the conclusions should be carefully drawn, on one hand due to the nature of these inscriptions, written on rough materials which impose a limit on the length of the texts and on the other hand, due to the fact that after the town systematization during the last century, many churches lost their graveyards almost completely, or even being demolished, so that in their vast majority, the tomb stones disappeared or were destroyed. Consequently, in a compulsory way, the data from the funerary inscriptions should be added up to other sources of information.

On the other hand, considering the details they include, the funerary texts are an irreplaceable source for the local history of towns and villages, they allow the discovery of certain special circumstances having as protagonists the deceased persons they mention, they confirm the consideration they enjoyed among the community but also the unexpected and impressive circumstances for their contemporaries, situations in which they lost their lives (different accidents, unexpected illness, so on). Last but not least, the richness of names they include represents a valuable source for anthropological and toponomastic studies.

---
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Abstract: In the process of determining the place and importance of György Verestói (1698–1765; orator and reformed bishop of Transylvania) this study aims to formulate certainties by using the results of research history. The figure of the orator – despite his contemporary popularity – has nowadays faded. Most encyclopaedias contain mistaken information about Verestói and in the public consciousness of literary history there are lots of controversial facts about the topic. Moreover, his works are not separated; most databases, libraries merge his oeuvre with the younger Verestói’s one. The most important result of this research is that – having found the original Latin manuscript of the author’s autobiography – it can reassuringly clear up the questions related to the biography.
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* The researcher who wants to survey the oeuvre of György Verestói has to face a paradox phenomenon, right in the early phase of the research. It is mainly the same fact as the one mentioned in Katalin Németh S.’s detailed study in 1984: despite the reputation and popularity of the orations in the 18th century, now one cannot find a presentation based on all of the funeral speeches of Verestói. György Verestói, college teacher, later reformed bishop of Transylvania in Cluj (Kolozsvár), was a key-figure of the contemporary cultural life; his worldly funeral speeches were collected after his death and re-published in a collection entitled Friendship with the dead. Although by this time his image has become more particular on the one hand precisely by Katalin

1 This study was written during the programme of POSDRU Invest in people – project co-financed by the European Social Fund through the Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007–2013.
2 Genealogia et vita Georgii Verestói. The Verestói-manuscript can be found in the manuscript archives of the Reformed College’s library in Cluj; the library is presently managed by the Academic Library of Cluj-Napoca. Its identifier: MS R 1436.
5 György Verestói, Holtakkal való barátság, I–II. darab. (Friendship with the dead, I–II.). (Cluj: Reformed College, 1783).
Németh S.’s research, on the other hand by the publications of Áron Kibédi Varga – a detailed presentation of the orations has not happened yet. The “processing” of the orations is therefore incomplete, and the figure of the author becomes more and more uncertain as we compare different sources.

Attempts for reconstruction – Verestói’s life and the history of effect of his works – in the mirror of the bibliography

I. Interminglings of the life-history and works

In different handbooks and literary history works we can find several pieces of – diverse – information; but referring to the primary works the contingency is even more definite. The review is more difficult because the orator’s son (the younger György Verestói) created his works in the same genre, and in most libraries, catalogues, references the authors and titles are mixed.

I would mention some examples to illustrate the disorder of information in the general bibliography. In József Szinnyei’s presentation György Verestói and his son are separated by the attributes: from Csér, the elder and from Csér, the younger. According to this, the elder Verestói studied in Bahnea (Bonyha), Odorhei (Székelyudvarhely), then Cluj (Kolozsvár) and Franeker. The section dealing with his works mentions several funeral speeches and the collection – without the claim of completeness –, but refers to Zoltán Köblös who knows about 56 orations. This is why it seems to be important to examine that list.

Zoltán Köblös, when reviewing the funeral speeches in the libraries of the Transylvanian National Museum and the Reformed College of Cluj, in the name-list of the authors orders the works of the father and son to the name of György Verestói (from Csér). So we can state that József Szinnyei’s reference is mistaken about the 56 funeral speeches. Among the 56 references one can find the same oration repeatedly (in different editions), and one of them (327.) cannot be connected to either of the Verestóis. However, in the detailed enumeration, Köblös marks separately the works of the two Verestóis. Unfortunately, this tendency is not consistent.

The “separation” of the two oeuvres was relatively simple, because the father died in 1765 (March), and according to his Autobiography, his son arrived home from Franeker – finishing his studies – on the 7th of October, 1764. As a consequence, the younger Verestói’s works in the “industry of funeral speeches” could start in the best case in 1765 (before this date only his university dissertation can be mentioned). Naturally, in all cases we have to analyze the time of the delivery of the oration, not of the edition. (The differences of the formal characteristics in the orations make also clear the authors’ identity.) Zoltán Köblös’s list refers this way to 44 speeches below the name

---

of György Verestói. 34 of these can be ordered to the elder and 10 to the younger György Verestói.

Katalin Németh S.’s above mentioned – and so far the most comprehensive – study also marks some imprecisions: the error of Géza Petrik’s bibliography, the mixings in the catalogues of the OSZK and the British Museum, the fact that the Database of János Herepe does not separate the two authors, and that Domokos Kosáry attributes to the elder Verestói a work that belongs to Sámuel Verestói.

In Smirnai Szent Polikárpus (an anthology of bishops, written by Verestói’s contemporary, Péter Bod, which appeared one year after his death) the second place of the bishop’s studies is Târgu Mureș (Marosvásárhely). Later, in lots of cases – as we could see for example at Szinnyei – this place changes to Odorhei. The duality stands in a stubborn way in the bibliography – Katalin Németh S. being the only one who was interested in the solution of this literary history mystery. According to her, the name of the town was transmitted erroneously in the speeches given on Verestói’s funeral. This way, those researchers who gained their information from the funeral speeches, are all mistaken. She bases her arguments on the translation of György Verestói’s Latin autobiography in which the bishop writes about his life in an objective – yet movingly sensible – way. The translation was made by István Török, and appeared in the Protestáns Közlöny. One of the most important results of the present research is that – having found the original Latin manuscript – it can clear up the questions referring to the life history.

István Török, when writing the history of the College, bases the chapter about Verestói on this autobiography (translated and published by himself). He marks the facts that are quoted from this text, and separates them from the results of his own research. He completes the biography with some important events, the data and summary of Verestói’s dissertation written in Franeker, the names of his mates, who wrote congratulating poems in connection with this. He publish Ferencz Csepregi’s laudatory poem after the biography and enumerates the people to whom Verestói dedicated his dissertation entitled De Palma ardente.

---

2 National Széchényi Library, Budapest.
4 György Verestói’s son, physician.
Jakab Ferenczy’s biography-collection writes about Verestói almost in catchwords, however, his statements are correct. The Hungarian Literary Encyclopaedia edited by Ferenc Ványi, only mentions Cluj as a place of his studies, speaks about his poems and the collection of his funeral speeches (1783) – but the basic mistake is that it contains the dates of birth and death incorrectly, which are in fact the data of the younger orator.

Teodora Cosman, *The Last New Years’ Eve*, from the series „Jeux de Mémoire”, 70 x 90 cm, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 2010

The encyclopaedia edited by Marcell Benedek and the New Hungarian Literary Encyclopaedia refer to the biography and works using the results of Katalin Németh S. and Áron Kibédi Varga. (We have to mention that the György Verestói dictionary entry in the latter encyclopaedia is written by Katalin Németh S.)

It seemed to be necessary to re-examine the facts connected to the biography, to create the most complete and authentic image of Verestói. The printed source material resulted in some confusion during the research, because the speeches given in the funeral ceremonies of the bishop and the autobiography translated by Török were

different in lots of respects. Two, maybe the most uncertain facts: the exact time of Verestói’s birth and the second station of his studies. Every source had its own opinion and “truth” – so the investigation seemed to be quite difficult. Furthermore, Katalin Németh S.’s arguments seemingly clarified the misunderstandings (using the translation of the Autobiography), so the data originating from her functioned as evidence: according to this György Verestói was born in Bahnea, on January 25, started his studies also there, then continued them in Odorhei. However, it was worrying that the funeral speeches about Verestói – which can be treated as the closest reception – all mark the second place of studies as Târgu Mureş, and Péter Bod in Smirnai Szent Polikárpus also refers to this town name. It seemed unimaginable that the contemporaries, some of them friends, colleagues and the family all knew and transmitted this thing incorrectly. Because – according to Németh S. – “In the indication of the next school the contemporaries are all wrong.” Then: “Although we read at Verestói: ‘In 1710, on 21st of May, when I was studying in the grammar class, I was taken to the school of Udvarhely [Odorhei], which was not called college yet.”

The 31st footnote of Németh S.’s above mentioned study refers to Jenő Zoványi’s Encyclopaedia of Protestant Church History in Hungary, where the birth date of György Verestói is June 25: “Verestói’s birth date is June 25, 1698. – evidently misprint.” She compares this with the oration written by Bodoki, which was declaimed on Verestói’s funeral and later appeared in a composite volume which contained the texts of the ceremony. The 34th footnote – referring again to the data of the encyclopaedia – notices that: “It is interesting that Zoványi, who marks as his source Török’s college-history, knows about the improper location of Marosvásárhely [Târgu-Mureş].” It is visible how many complications these two questions have caused in the research history. It was the actual primary source that helped us in the solution of the uncertainties: the original Latin manuscript.

On the second (unnumbered) page of the document, Verestói enumerates his siblings, and writes about himself, too, as the sixth one in the row: “Georgium Verestöi, me videlicet, qui haec scribo, natum anno 1698 Die 25 Junii in Bonyha.” The name of the month can be read very clearly. It is interesting that in the translation of Török we can find January as the equivalent of Junii at another place, too (when mentioning the eighth sibling, József Verestói, very close to György’s name) – but, when he writes about the fact that Verestói became the teacher of the rhetoric class in June of the year 1718, and that on the 28th of June 1764 a synod was kept, the translation is correct. It must be mentioned that in all cases the handwriting is the same.

2 Ibid., 862.
3 József Bodoki, Halotti oratio... Verestóei György... utolsó tisztelességére... 1765. (Kolozsvár [Cluj]: nyomt. Páldi István által, 1767).
4 ISTEN JOBB KEZE’ FÉRJFIÁNAK ÖRÖK EMLÉKEZETE...Néhai TISZTELETES Tudós VERESTÓI GYÖRGY URAMNAK... mindeneck előtt nagy becsben forgó jó Hirit, Nevét; a’ meg-nevezett Halotti Tanítóskoknak ...Világ eleiben lett ki botsáttatásokban, a’ feledékenységtől meg-óltalmazni kívánta... VESSELÉNÝI FERENTZ UR... Ő EXTZELLENTZÍÁJA. KOLO’S.V. Nyomt. PÁLDI ISTVÁN által. 1767. Eszt.
5 Genealogia et vita Georgii Verestöii.
Even more questions arise in the case of the second station of studies. It’s worth quoting the affirmation of the manuscript word by word: “Deinde Anno 1710 Die 21 Maji, dum iam Grammaticae studerem, ductus sum in Scholam Agropolitanam, quae nondum Collegii titulo gaudebat.” The Agropolis town name in Transylvania marked only Târgu-Mureș (Marosvásárhely) in the 18th century.1 (The situation would have been more problematic if Verestói had written Areopolis which name – in the course of times – was used for both Székelyudvarhely [Odorhei] and Marosvásárhely [Târgu-Mureș]). Comparing this with Verestói’s funeral speeches consistently referring to Târgu-Mureș, we can state that the second place of the bishop’s studies was Târgu-Mureș.

From István Török’s translation one can deduce that it rests on a profound, prudent workflow, he translates the very meticulous genealogy in a precise and conscientious way. As he notices in the introduction, he publishes the Autobiography in “accurate translation” – only some points are different in the two texts. (It is true, however, that these are of importance.)

Although the manuscript is well legible, seems to be a clear copy, we can conclude from the additions that Verestói did not mean his text for printing or he would have rewritten it if he had had the possibility. (According to Török he composed this document “with his own hand in his latest days”, so it is conceivable that the final version – meant to be the typographical copy – was not made at all.)

In addition, the two (Latin and Hungarian) readings hide some more points of interest, too. For example, when talking about the subjects of the professor Wierus Guilielmus Muys from Franeker, the Mathessis is translated as Mathematics2. At Muys again, when enumerating the disciplines attended, the translation ignores Mathesis, it just mentions Philosophy, Anatomy and Chemistry. (This is peculiar because Verestói later taught Mathesis for 30 years – it would be quite surprising if he had not learned it during his university years.)

The title of the dissertation written in Franeker is also erroneous in the translation with the words De Galina Ardente, because the topic of the thesis is the burning palm-tree3. The closest equivalent of galina in Latin would be gallina which means hen.) On the bottom of the fourth (unnumbered) page of the Latin manuscript this is also unambiguous: “In Academia Franekerana Annos exegi quattuor, ubi Dissertatiorum de Palma Ardentia elaborari”. When talking about the first-born daughter, Erzsébet Verestói, the original manuscript (seventh page) mentions the name of her aborted child as “Susanna Pataki” – the translation does not contain the information. The last paragraph – about Erzsébet’s death – is missing, too. The last sentence in the original text also contains the exact time besides the fact that the younger György Verestói arrived home, and notes that the son came home in good health.

2 Török, “A kolozsvári collegium XVIII. századi tanárainak életrajza. (Verestói György 1728–1764 tanár s később püspök),” 123.
3 Dissertatio filologico-theologica de PALMA ARDENTE ad Exod. Cap. III. vs. 1–5. (MTAK 525. 010.)
A part of the differences may not be the responsibility of the translator: it can easily happen that they are print errors. Anyway, the mistaken data of the translation—as the facts gained from the most reliable and accessible source—have set our knowledge about Verestói’s life history.

II. The history of effect of the funeral speeches

As to the “processing”, reviewing of works, the situation of the research is misleading for two reasons. On the one hand, because—despite his contemporary popularity—Verestói has been excluded from the literary public consciousness by now, on the other hand, there are also several studies that definitely deal with him. The fact that he is ignored can originate from the interaction of the two circumstances. So it seems that the gradual fading of his figure and influence derives from the fact recognized by Katalin Németh S. in 1984, namely that those who wrote about his works, chose only one or two orations, and—unfortunately—the same ones each time. This overview is interested in the survey of the publications determining the Verestói-image, more precisely the enumeration, review of the most important texts from the bibliography referring to the orations.

Some references get a more stressed attention here because they have had more accentuated influence on Verestói’s situation in the research history and/or their presence is also more confinable. Other works are mentioned only as references—despite their importance one way or another—in order to avoid the disruption of the review. (The dissertation dealing with the topic contains their detailing.)

Several pieces of the theoretic materials deal with Verestói’s poems (for example Zsolt Alszeghy’s study: *A disciple of Gyöngyösí*, which contains lots of quotations, too), so the bibliography referring to the orations becomes even shorter. The interest towards the funeral orations was aroused by a publication of Lajos Dézsi in the *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* periodical¹, and it also fixed the character of further examinations, too. He analyzes the “fairy” oration during the examination of folk tales— as Verestói’s “indisputably most interesting work”. Dézsi’s study otherwise informs us about the orator’s contemporary popularity, furthermore, he gives an explanation of the phenomenon: “But they loved first of all his funeral orations; his fame was so great that people went even from the third county to listen to him, especially if there was a bigger occasion, a funeral. His erudition was wide-ranging, and he always used many quotations, included interesting stories not just from the saints’ or classical, but also from newer German and French history, sometimes from the Hungarian one, too—while his contemporaries remained at the two previous ones. Maybe the source of his great popularity was hidden in this fact.”² His argument unfortunately does not lean upon marked sources, beside the emphasized “fairy” oration he only names one (declaimed on Susanna Vesselényi’s funeral). He quotes from the latter to support his critical notice: “He overran even his contemporaries in loquacious jesting”.³ He also remembers Verestói’s translator skills and poems, which “were considered good in his

---

¹ Lajos Dézsi, “Népmeséink történetéhez” (To the history of our folk tales) *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* (1896): 345–350.
² Ibid., 346.
³ Ibid., 347.
Dézsi publishes a considerable part of the oration about Kristina Alvintzi to illustrate the oppression and persecution of popular poetry by the church.\footnote{Dézsi, “Népmeséink történetéhez,” 347.}

József Gulyás’s writing in \textit{Ethnographia} in 1925\footnote{József Gulyás, “Idős b. Gy. a nép meséiről” (Gy. V. the elder about the folk tales) \textit{Ethnographia} 36 (1925): 168.} does not aim at a tendentious classification, but also enhances the popular respect. Because of its determining character, it is worth examining the introduction of the article: “In György Verestói’s book of orations \textit{Friendship with the dead} (1783) there are lots of notes deserving to be mentioned about the Hungarian folk tale. For example, in the speech declaimed on Kristina Alvinczy’s funeral where “the country of fairies” was narrated (1733)”. So his selection is introduced objectively, moreover, one can notice some acknowledgement from the introductive sentence. Gulyás presents elements of tales in the further parts, however, his references are in connection with this oration (he writes page numbers beside his quotes, among these only one refers to the speech about Anna Lázár,\footnote{Verestói, \textit{Holtakkal való barátság}, 169–210.} but without noticing the title of it).

Within the framework of a treatise researching traces of tales, József Turóczi-Trostler\footnote{József Turóczi-Trostler, “Mesenyomok a XVIII. század magyar irodalmában. A racionalizmus és irracionalizmus küzdelméhez” (Traces of tales in the Hungarian literature of the eighteenth century. On the fight of the rational and irrational), \textit{Magyar Nyelvőr} 56 (1927): 6–12.} speaks – relatively shortly – about Verestói; two years after the appearance of Gulyás’s text. It is visible that the context has not changed much, the conclusions also have only tinged: “Having this world- and point of view, it is only natural that Verestói has problems with one or another of the diabolic phantoms, a form of the irrational. When talking about \textit{Country of fairs, fairies}, he always thinks of allegories, he describes the transitoriness or the changing form of the reality. But behind the allegory the concrete, demonic fairy-idea of the tales is lurking, the living symbol of the wonder. Verestói feels this, fights this, so the conflict of rational and irrational is taking place in front of our eyes, in open stage.” The longest reference this way is about the speech about Kristina Alvintzi again; and in the following parts the text does not even mark its sources among the examples.

Zoltán Trócsányi’s study published in \textit{Magyar Könyvszemle} with the title “The persecution of belles-lettres”\footnote{Zoltán Trócsányi, “A szépirodalom üldözése” (The persecution of belles-lettres), \textit{Magyar Könyvszemle} 3 (1943): 433–435.} is also based on a concrete speech, also the “fairy” one, declaimed on the funeral of Kristina Alvintzi. Trócsányi has a special point of view, which seems to be important: “On the basis of several data from the eighteenth century I could state that in the so-called “unnational” age, before 1772 the works of belles-lettres could not appear because in the eighteenth century, mainly in its first part the typographies were maintained by the church. And the latter’s position against literature, flower songs, gallant poetry, the older points of view of Sylvester, Pázmány (“nasty flower songs”) has not changed at all. The private typographies also wanted to avoid every conflict or opposition with the church.”\footnote{Trócsányi, “A szépirodalom üldözése,” 433.} The author of the study publishes some additions from Verestói’s collection of orations, \textit{Friendship with the dead}. After a short,
generalizing summary (I would risk to state that without the real reading of all the speeches) he turns to quoting and commenting the oration about the fairy country. Trócsányi in fact explains by these quotations that it is not surprising that the writings of literature were not published – if the reformed bishop influenced by the Enlightenment speaks in a reproving manner about folk tales and love poems.

It became clear how some quotations picked out by chance can draw around themselves different interpretations of literary history and create debates. General consequences are formulated about Verestói’s work while the author speaks about one single oration in an authentic way.

This text (about fairies) has been attached to György Verestói’s name, and its re-interpretation in the 21st century would be necessary mainly for other reasons. The oration is fortunately available now for the wider public, too: it is included in the collection of sermons edited and introduced by László Szelestei N.

This is how Zoltán Jékely is apologizing because his presenting-rehabilitating study chooses only a few speeches: “You can see with your eyes, that I would not have the strength and ability and you would not have the time and patience; how could I enumerate now all the 26 Orations when each of them makes us think at least half a day? My honour of orator has to content itself with the passing over of the Material in a very quick way.” Jékely in his “Verestói-oration” mainly keeps the formal characteristics of the bishop’s style – he even gives a genealogy in the last part of the speech, and there is a final poem and the closing word, ELMONDÁM – the Hungarian translation of the Latin DIXI (and used by Verestói in almost all his pieces).

Jékely, writing a style parody, does not give up the means of humour, as Verestói, too, frequently used it – not characteristically to his age. The fact that the orations are quite long and substantial is dubious for Jékely, mainly because sometimes the time between the obituary and funeral is very short. “Furthermore, I cannot really hide my hard suspicion, my Sad Audience, that sometimes when the courier arrived, he brought out a completely ready Oration, it did not even need any corrections, there was only one task: to put the genealogy part to the end of it...”

The genre which he uses to talk about Verestói makes possible for him to leave out or just mention some of the important data about the funeral speeches. It is a pity, because there is not much help for the one who wants to get informed about the topic, and Jékely was one of the very few philologists – the only one, according to Katalin Németh S. – who read the almost 1000 pages long collection.

When talking about the humour mentioned above and its contemporary reception, it is necessary to bring up Tibor Klaniczay’s study with the title The unknown

---

1 Verestói, Holtakkal való barátság, 96–127, (about Kristina ALVINTZI).
5 Ibid., 94.
6 Ibid., 89.
work of Dienes József Hermányi.\textsuperscript{1} Klániczay publishes a poem by him from 1731 which takes the side “of reality, and is against the untruth” – and Hermányi “meant to use it as a preface for the characterization of the bishops.”\textsuperscript{2} And – although the object of the irony was fundamentally coaxing, hypocrisy towards the nobility – the passion of his poem mocking at Verestói’s early oration\textsuperscript{3} can be traced back to the contemporary-professional competition, too. Hermányi’s “revolt” against Verestői is not the only one: in his collection of anecdotes he trifles long on the grounds of the humour of the above mentioned speech.

In 1993 Sándor Lukácsy publishes some parts of funeral speeches in the review \textit{Kortárs},\textsuperscript{4} but – maybe because of the section’s character – there remains only little place for comments. In other references, for example in his study entitled “The disinherited literature”\textsuperscript{5} in the volume \textit{God’s little candles}, he mentions the oeuvre in an appreciative way.

Áron Kibédi Varga is trying to explain why literary history suppresses Verestői (as we could see, Jékely wanted to rehabilitate him), with the tendency of the 19th century literary history writing: “to eliminate the literature inspired by religion from the handbooks of literary history.”\textsuperscript{6} He warns that one should not dismiss the original context, emphasizes the multimedial character and devotes a short part for the rhetoric examination. He deals with the ethical problems arisen around the ceremony, from rhetorical and psychological points of view. He raises structural questions, and he is preoccupied by the originality-problem of the speeches. It is regrettable that – apart from two entirely valorous and exciting texts – Kibédi has not continued his research in the topic of Verestői.

The most recent surprise of the research history is that in 2007 Katalin Németh S., after “almost a quarter of a century” turns back to the topic\textsuperscript{7}, contributing important and interesting supplements to the Verestői-image. Building on Gábor Kecskeméti’s latest theoretical basis, she debates the differences of sermon and oration. She completes the assumptions about the ignorance of orators: the phenomenon can be explained by the greater number of the speeches. The contemporary popularity also gains a wider context: “We have got good reasons to suppose that the funeral speeches of Verestői could become marketable in the last part of the eighteenth century in Transylvania because of their literary value and/or scientific and/or educational function.”\textsuperscript{8} When surveying the themes, she supports somehow Jékely’s idea – talking about the incoherencies between

\begin{enumerate}
\item Tibor Klániczay, \textit{Reneszánsz és barokk. Tanulmányok a régi magyar irodalomról} (Renaissance and baroque. Studies about the old Hungarian literature) (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1961), 558–566.
\item Tibor Klániczay, \textit{Reneszánsz és barokk. Tanulmányok a régi magyar irodalomról}, 563.
\item Verestői, \textit{Holtakkal való barátság}, 1–25, (about ’Sigmond Váradi; the first piece of the collection).
\item Sándor Lukácsy, \textit{Isten gyertyácskái} (God’s little candles) (Pécs: Jelenkor, 1994).
\item Áron Kibédi Varga, \textit{Szavak, világok} (Words, worlds) (Pécs: Jelenkor, 1998), 197–205.
\item Németh S.: Verestóiról – másként, 317–318.
\end{enumerate}
the people and speeches. She contradicts him at the same time, demonstrating that in some cases there really are relations between the chosen topic and the dead person’s life or character (mainly for men).

The wider research has at its basis Verestói’s posthumous collection entitled *Friendship with the dead* (1783), with an outlook to the other editions of the texts and to Verestói’s other publications, too – as far as it is possible. It cannot offer to present all of the editions connected to Verestói – this demand would slow down the course of the research.

Having surveyed roughly the results of the research history, the examination seems to be necessary in several traces. On the one hand it would be useful to review the whole structure of the oeuvre – the collection containing 26 orations and other works, too.

In some keywords I would summarize the further interests of the research: the relation between author and public, the originality questions of the works, the physical-theological respects (using the results of the literature), the international sources of Verestói’s ideas.

Naturally, these problems offer further directions for the research. Furthermore, the results can also formulate their own questions. It is very possible that some answers will narrow the possibilities of the examination – but others (seemingly insignificant ones) will open new perspectives for the survey.
“There is an hour of which I have never spoken...”¹
– Excerpts from the Diary of Queen Marie of Romania –
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*  

As an autobiographic genre, the personal journal started to gain prevalence in the Romanian literature at the end of the 19th century. The first Romanian author of the genre – in the modern sense – was Titu Maiorescu,² the creator of the vastest personal journal of Romanian literature which covers almost 50 years. Another important moment of the history of the genre was the beginning of the 20th century, when – under French influence – many political and cultural personalities left to the successive generations, besides official documents, daily entries, notes and memories. These texts represent important documents that complete official information. Such type of evidence remained from the members of the Romanian royal family, especially from queen Marie, from whom more than one hundred notebooks with memories and daily entries have been preserved.

Born on October 14/29, 1875, in Eastwell, Kent, Great Britain, queen Marie of Romania³ was the second child of Prince Alfred, duke of Edinburgh⁴ and Grand

¹ This work was possible with the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/107/1.5/S/76841 with the title ”Modern Doctoral Studies: Internationalization and Interdisciplinarity”.
² Titu Liviu Maiorescu (1840–1917) was a lawyer, literary critic, essayist, esthetician, philosopher, teacher, politician and writer, prime minister during the period 1912–1914, minister of internal affairs, founding member of the Romanian Academy.
³ Queen Marie, Povestea vieții mele (The Story of my Life), vol. I (Bucharest: „Adevărul” Publishing House, 1934); Guy Gaultier, Missy, regina României (Missy, the queen of Romania) (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2004).
⁴ Alfred (1844–1900) – Duke of Edinburgh, and after 1893 Duke of Saxa-Coburg-Gotha – was the second son of Queen Victoria of Great Britain and Prince Albert.
Duchess Maria Alexandrovna, as it is also confined in *The Story of my Life*. In the year 1892, at the age of 17, she marries prince Hohenzollern Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Romania, and in the year 1914, after the passing away of king Carol I of Romania on September 28 / October 11, she becomes queen of Romania.

Teodora Cosman, *Ah! Mamaia 4/12*, from the series “The Memories of the New Man” (now destroyed), 100 x 60 cm, acrylic on synthethic tissue, 2008

---

1 Maria Alexandrovna (1853–1920), Princess of Edinburgh, the only daughter of Tsar Alexander II of Russia and Empress Marie.
2 The first date corresponds to the Gregorian calendar used in Romania until 1919, while the second date corresponds to the Julian calendar.
After World War I, queen Marie and king Ferdinand were crowned queen and king of the Greater Romania as part of a ceremony organized in Alba Iulia on October 15/27, 1922, the choice of location being given by the fact that Mihai Viteazu’s reign of Walachia, Transylvania and Moldavia had also been established here. Queen Marie died on July 18, 1938, at the age of 63.

She manifested herself as a writer, publishing short stories and novels for children. Among the published works, her personal journal entitled Daily Entries and her memoirs edited with the title The Story of my Life, had an important role. Some of her works became known to the Romanian and foreign public during the time of her life due to the manuscripts offered to the members of the royal court by the author herself, or through the publication of the works in the country and abroad.

After World War II, the royal family’s works were subject to the censorship of the communist regime. In the paper Publications prohibited until May 1, 1948, published in Bucharest in 1948, summarizing all lists of authors and works forbidden at that time, removes all works published by the kings and queens of Romania, as well as the ones referring to the institution of monarchy.

Currently, queen Marie’s manuscripts are kept at the National Archives of Romania, as parts of the fund “Royal House”. It includes an extensive correspondence,

---

2 The work became known to the public in the time of the queen’s life, due to her readings to the close ones. The last published edition, printed in the period 1997–2007, contains seven volumes of Daily Entries, the first one beginning from December 1, 1918, and the last volume ending with December 31, 1925.
3 The book was first published in English translation under the title Story of my life in three volumes between 1934 and 1936. Meanwhile, it was translated into English, French, German, Swedish, Greek, Polish, Czech, Italian, Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian, representing a true “best-seller”. At the same time, the three volumes were also published in Romanian, at the Publishing House “Adevărul”, enjoying a real success. See: Queen Marie, Povestea vieții mele (The Story of My Life), vol. I (Bucharest: Eminescu Publishing House, 1991), 13–15.
4 On December 30, 1947, king Michael I was forced to abdicate and proclaim the Popular Republic of Romania, which marked the undertaking of power by the Communist Party. See: Mihai Bărboescu, Dennis Deletant, Keith Hitchins etc., Istoria României (The History of Romania) (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998), 480.
5 Publications prohibited until May 1, 1948, quoted in Victor Frunza, „Cartea cărților interzise” (The Book of Prohibited Books) (Bucharest: EVF, 2003), 81–82, 144, 266–267.
6 According to the information on the website of the Romanian National Archives: “After the abolition of the monarchy following the forced abdication of King Michael on December 30, 1947 and the precipitated departure of the royal family from the country, a commission was established in January 1948, whose chairman was academic professor George Oprescu. The Commission kept inventory of all the valuable things found in the buildings that had belonged to the royal family. This Commission noted that “there are books, paper manuscripts, documents in each drawer and corner.” These documents, which got to the National Archives through several stages, constitute the archive fund “Royal House” in the amount of 200 rms.” The ordering of these documents was made based on some criteria, resulting in the four major structural parts of the “Royal House” fund: Officials, Personals, Castles, Palaces and the Central Administration of
as well as plays, sketches, stories for children, and the 102 notebooks that make up queen Marie’s personal diary, written in English, during the period 1914–1938, completed by her photos and those taken of the royal family and the royal residences, made both at home and during trips abroad.

This diary is an important documentary source for completing the information given by official documents relating to the history of Romania, but also for the re-enactment of the royal court’s life.¹

*  

The collections of the “Lucian Blaga” Central University Library from Cluj-Napoca have been enriched over time, due to the valuable donations made by people of Romanian culture. Among the donations made to this institution, the documents belonging to the royal family of Romania have an important role, and are preserved in two of the mentioned funds. The first one, in terms of chronology, is the Kremnitz Mite² donation from the year 1971, which includes – along with documents belonging to the creator of the fund – documents of the royal family. Among these there are two photos of king Carol I (Mite Kremnitz Fund, Ms. 6454), the correspondence of queen Elisabeth, alias Carmen Sylva,³ (Mite Kremnitz Fund, Ms. 6457, Ms. 6469 – Ms. 6474), the manuscripts of Carmen Sylva (Mite Kremnitz Fund, Ms. 6464 – Ms. 6468). Besides these, there is a handkerchief that belonged to queen Elisabeth and a lock of hair (Mite Kremnitz Fund, Ms. 6477).

The second fund that includes documents of the royal family of Romania is the Ionniţiu Fund.⁴ This includes letters of queen Elena⁵ (Ionniţiu Fund, 23), the correspondence of king Michael of Romania (Ionniţiu Fund, 61–62), king Michael’s oath (Ionniţiu Fund, 51), speeches and agendas (Ionniţiu Fund, 52), documents related to the Crown Estates. The manuscripts of queen Marie belong to the “Royal House” fund – Personals, containing 75 mrs of documents.

² Mite Kremnitz (1852–1916) was a German writer and translator, married to the doctor Wilhelm Kremnitz. She was a court lady of queen Elisabeth, whose works she translated from German into Romanian, and they wrote together a series of plays and novels. See: Lucian Predescu, Enciclopedia României Cugetare (The Encyclopedia of the Thinker Romania) (Bucharest: Saeculum, Vestala, 1999), 469.
³ Elisabeth de Wied (1843–1916) was queen of Romania, married to Carol I Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the first king who belonged to the renowned German Hohenzollern dynasty. As a writer, she signed her works as Carmen Sylva. See: ibid., 304–305.
⁴ Mircea Ionniţiu (1921–1990) was secretary to king Michael until the year 1947. After the communists undertook power, he emigrated to the USA, where he lived until the end of his life. The Ionniţiu Fund got into the possession of the “Lucian Blaga” Central University Library through Mircea Carp’s mediation, in 2007 (Mircea Carp a journalist and director of Radio Free Europe).
⁵ Queen Elena of Romania (1896–1982), daughter of Constantin I, king of Greece and his wife Sophia, was wife of king Carol II of Romania and mother of king Michael I of Romania.
the royal strike\(^1\) (Ionnițiu Fund, 53), the king’s discussions with Andrei Vășinski\(^2\) (Ionnițiu Fund, 54) and those with the members of the Inter-allied Comission (Ionnițiu Fund, 55), documents about the events of December 30, 1947\(^3\) (Ionnițiu Fund, 56–57), speeches (Ionnițiu Fund, 58), interviews with king Michael and queen Elena (Ionnițiu Fund, 59–60).

Besides these, but not being part of neither fund, there are two manuscripts belonging to queen Marie, included in the manuscript collection of the Special Collections Department, signed by the shelf mark Ms. 6940/I, respectively Ms. 6940/II.

The manuscripts are parts of queen Marie’s diary, edited with the title *Daily Entries*. The texts are unique, not being included in any printed edition so far.\(^4\) They illustrate two dramatic moments of our history: the revocation of the I. C. Brătianu government and the royal family from Bucharest, and the beginning of the refuge to Moldova (November 20 / December 3, 1916), in the spring of 1918, respectively the week before Easter, when Romania, weakened of war, abandoned by Russian military support (during the revolution), was forced to sign the preliminary peace treaty at Buftea, with the Central Powers, which caused humiliating territorial losses and economic conditions.\(^5\)

The first text from February 23, 1917, entitled “Bucharest” represents an evocation of the events that happened three months earlier, namely the occupation of Bucharest by the German troops on December 6, 1916. The author describes the pain suffered as the sovereign of a country at war at that time, a pain increased by the impossibility of disclosing her feelings to the close ones. This moment is described as being “an hour of darkness and sorrow”. The queen confesses to her journal, given that her position does not allow her to publicly express any feeling of weakness related to this event, which she considers “unbearable”, being aware of the role she plays – “others depended upon me” – both in the affairs of her country and family and in the relations with other countries – “all eyes were turned towards me”.

The withdrawal to Iași after the moment of territorial losses had to be made “very simply, very quietly”, not to cause even more panic among the population.

We note that, although born and raised in foreign lands, the signer identifies with the Romanian nation, calling it “my people” and sharing all their suffering – “...I

\(^1\) On August 21, 1945 the “royal strike” started, through which king Michael refused to collaborate with the Communist Party, ceasing to promulgate regulations and laws issued by the government. This state of affairs went on until January of the following year. See: Ioan Scurtu, Gheorghe Buzatu, *Istoria românilor în secolul XX (1918-1948)* (The History of Romanians in the 20th century (1918–1948)) (Bucharest: Paideia, 1999), 512–513.

\(^2\) Andrew Vășinski (1883–1954), deputy of the minister of external affairs of the USSR, was sent from Moscow to support the Romanian communists’ struggle to undertake power. During the meeting with king Michael he asked him to create a government headed by Petru Groza. See: Mihai Bârboleșcu, Dennis Deletant, Keith Hitchins etc., *Istoria României*, 472.

\(^3\) See footnote 10.

\(^4\) The texts are dated February 23, 1917, respectively July 1918, but the first volume of *Daily Entries* begins with December 1918. In *The Story of my life*, volume III, a part of the queen’s notes from the years 1916–1918 are reproduced, however, the presented texts do not appear in the book.

\(^5\) See: ibid., 417–418.
have heard their cries, and hoped their hopes and feared their fears. Months in which I have struggled with them and wept with them doing all that was in my power to ease their burden and to dry their tears...”, “I want ye all to know that I have wept with you, that there are none of your grieves that I /6 have not shared, none of your desairs that I have not understood, none of your sacrifices that I have not appreciated but this message would I bring you: hearts are bound more closely together in days of sorrow than in days of joy, in days of war than in days of peace...”

The pain felt over the territorial losses as the sovereign of the country is increased by the suffering of the mother who lost her son. The death of the youngest child is portrayed as a sacrifice – “When he died, the popular belief was that the Heavens had claimed from me a sacrifice, that God had taken my child from me that in his perfect innocence he should plead [sic!] for the country he has destined to quit so soon!”

With all the pain felt, Queen Marie does not lose hope, being confident in the victory to come, imagining the moment of return – “So let it be! For I believe [sic!] in the day of return, I believe [sic!] in the hour of victory, I believe [sic!] that the blood of our heros [sic!] has not been shed in vain! One day thy arms will be opened wide to receive us oh! mother-town. Flags will fly from thy windows, thy streets will be strewn with branches, and those who return to thy embrance [sic!] will not know if their hearts are breaking with sorrow or with joy!”

The second text, entitled Sâmbăta morților (Saturday of the dead) written after almost a year and a half from the first, has a tone different from that of the previous one. While in the first part the author expresses her hope for the successful end of the war, in this text she rhetorically asks why all these sacrifices, if the dream the sacrifice was made for cannot be achieved. This dream, for the accomplishment of which Romania entered World War I. and which was shared by the queen, was the union of all local territories.

The title of the segment refers to a traditional festival during which the dead are remembered – “A day of remembrance, a day of grief, a day when flowers are carried to the cemeteries, day when little tapers are lighted upon many graves, before many altars; a day when from all churches prayers rise towards the skies, prayers for those that are no more... no more here upon earth...” This memory determines queen Marie to recall the sacrifices of the nation during the war, as well as her own sacrifice. At the same time, she describes the country ravaged by conflict, with its cemeteries where women and children mourn the deceased.

She is aware of her own weaknesses, nevertheless she wants to send people hope for a positive resolution of all issues. As if foreseeing these moments, the narrator described them in one of her earlier works in which the king asks the same questions that she asks herself in the times of suffering and despair – “Once, long ago, before the great suffering came over us, I put strange words into the mouth of a sovereign who existed only in one of the legends I then loved to create. In an hour of distress that sovereign cried aloud, asking if one heart can be large enough to carry every sorrow, if one brain can be wise enough to lead millions to their good, if one courage can be great enough to meet every foe, if one soul can be just enough to sit in judgement on others – little knowing that one day, so soon afterwards, those same questions would also be mine –
and the cry that rises from my lips at this hour is: can one heart be large enough to carry every sorrow! and that heart a woman’s heart!”

However, she expresses confidence in a better future – “Somehow I cannot think, oh! ye silent ones, that this can really be the end of our road.”, “But turning my face back from the dead to the living, this message would I cry out to those still sorrowing here upon earth: Ye are taught to believe [sic!] in the hour of resurrection, with every fibre of our beings let us cling to that faith; let not your souls be shaken by adversity, believe [sic!] me oh! ye mourners, that that hour will come, and when it comes, oh! this let me tell you, when that hour comes, it will not only be a resurrection of the dead!”

The two manuscripts have the format in-8 (22,2x15,7 cm), each one containing 14 separate pages, numbered by the author herself. The text is written on laid paper, only on the front, the first one with black, and the second one with brown ink.

The identification of the signatory was easily made in the case of the first manuscript. The author signs the text at the end with the name ”Marie” and mentions the date. Corroborating the information about her with the time of writing the text, the historical data and the information found in the text itself, we can determin that the manuscript was written by queen Marie in Iași, in the period of the retreat during World War I.1

In the case of the second manuscript, being unsigned, the determination of the authorship was done by comparing the script with that of the first one. Thus we deduce based on the identical calligraphy the common origin of the two manuscripts. The signer mentions the month and year of writing, but not the day. From the text, it appears that it was written during the refuge in Moldova.2

The manuscripts are written in English and present the linguistic peculiarities specific to this language at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Each page is numbered by the author. They became part of the collection of the Library in the year 1924, a fact determined based on the inventory numbers: Ms. 57/1924, respectively Ms. 58/1924. Knowing that in 1924 the royal family was in Cluj, where they visited the University and the Library – event recorded by the book of honour of the institution – we conclude that the two manuscripts were given to the University Library by queen Marie.

The transcription of the text was made without interfering with it. The overwritten words were lowered in line without marking them with special characters. The pages were separated with a slash [/], and the page numbers were noted with overwritten characters. Archaic word forms were kept. Where the manuscript was damaged, letters were put in square brackets added by the editor. The obvious writing

1 The Romanian army’s defeat in the fall of 1916 led to a general withdrawal and to the occupation of Bucharest by the German troops at November 23 / December 6. Subsequently, the front was established in southern Moldova along the rivers Siret and Danube. More than half of the territory of the country was occupied by the enemy. In these circumstances the government and the Royal Court withdrew to Iași. See: ibid., 417–418.

2 The royal family returned to Bucharest at the end of the year 1918, after the Romanian troops led by king Ferdinand entered Bucharest on December 1, 1918. See: ibid., 419.
mistakes were marked by *sic!* in square brackets, but without mentioning the correct forms. The abbreviations used by the author were also kept.

Contrary to expectations, in queen Marie’s manuscripts – especially in those described in this paper – we do not find much historical or political information, as we expected. Instead, they highlight the emotional and moral side of the author, her kneading as a queen of a country at war and the compromises that she had to make for the good of the country, as well as her pain as a mother who lost her son.1 However, the text of the journal is an important documentary source – knowing who its author was –, a source that complements the existing information in official documents, revealing the lesser known aspects of Romanian history. Finally, the texts represent an important source of information about life at the royal court.

Translated by Boglárka Németh

1 Queen Marie and king Ferdinand had six children: Carol, Elisabeth, Marie, Nicholas, Ileana and Mircea, the latter dying of typhoid fever during the war, in the autumn of 1916.
Appendix

Bucharest

There is an hour of which I have never spoken — an hour of darkness and sorrow that I could share with no one, an hour when I had to carry my head very high so that none should see the tears in my eyes. An hour when naught else remained to me but look beyond the things of this earth towards shadowy Futures that be long only to God.

I had to be strong at that hour, not to cry out, not to complain, but to lead the way into exile very slowly, very quietly, so as to avoid all panic, so that no one should be afraid... Others depended upon me.
There is an hour of which I have never spoken – an hour of darkness and sorrow that I could share with no one, an hour when I had to carry my head very high so that none should see the tears in my eyes, an hour when naught else remained to me but [to] look beyond the things of this earth towards shadowy Futures that belong only to God.

I had to be strong at that hour, not to cry out, not to complain, but to lead the way into exile very simply, very quietly, so as to avoid all panic, so that no one should be afraid.....Others depended upon me /2 all eyes were turned towards me to see how I would bear that which was unbearable, so I was silent; at that hour silence alone could help.

Three months have passed since then, three long months – months that could be years so full are they of anguish and pain and grief. Months that I have lived close to the heart of my people, months when I have heard their cries, and hoped their hopes and feared their fears. Months in which I have struggled with them and wept with them doing all that was in my power to ease their burden and to dry their their tears... /3

But if there are hours when silence alone can render bearable the duty one has to perform, there are others when one has a right to lift up one’s voice and to cry out one’s longing & one’s regret.

It is three months since Bucharest was taken from us, since the enemy [sic!] struck at the heart of our land! Three months... and today I want all those who love and all those who weep and all those who regret to turn their faces with mine towards that far off distance and to remember that which we have lost....

It is to me as though I must climb some very high mountain, up up till I /4 reach its summit, so that from there I might perceive at least the smoke rising from that town which once was our loved and cherished center and that now lies chained and silent ’neath the enemy’s [sic!]ntless sway.

Yes indeed, heart of our land! pulsing centre that held us together, fed our energies and filled us with pride. Who of us will ever forgot those lost days of anguish, when hope became always less when from all sides the voice of the cannon called out its fearful message, called out its warning, telling us that danger was coming ever nearer – that soon it would be flight and exile and sorrow and darkness... /5

Difficult it is to speak of one’s own sorrow when the suffering of all was so great, yet if today I speak of mine, it is because I know that it is to my country’s sorrow, that a thousand thousand voices are echo to mine when I talk of that of that for which we are mourning, of that which lies beyond the line of fire, that like a wound upon a mother’s breast cuts our dear country in two!

It is I your Queen who am speaking to you, and I wish my voice to reach every heart, to penetrate into every home, to go towards to most miserable, to search out the hero on his bed of snow, I want ye all to know that I have wept with you, that there are none of your griefs that I /6 have not shared, none of your despairs that I have not understood, none of your sacrifices that I have not appreciated but this message would I bring you: hearts are bound more closely together in days of sorrow than in days of joy, in days of war than in days of peace...
I cannot know for which special sorrow each man is mourning – I know not what house, what spot, what face he sees in his dreams, I know not to what hope he clings to what joy he desires to go back; there is a national sorrow and there is a personal sorrow, this last one each each man carries alone in his heart.

Bucarest! thy name conjers [sic!] up pictures without end in the mind of those who have been obliged to surrender thee to the hated foe. We remember thee with all thy faces in sunshine in rain and in snow, we remember thee busy yet smiling, within thy streets all seemed happy, it is to us, now that we are torn from thee, as through we had know naught but joy within thy embrace.

What is thy face of today oh! Bucarest? Most thou veiled thy self in mourning because so many of thy children have fled? or dost thou wear a smile of false acquiescence, so as not to draw down upon they trembling inhabitants the wrath of those who now call themselves masters and who perchance keep thee in better order than thine own children ever did!

Have thy proudest buildings been desecrated with flags that are not dyed in the three holy colours before which each Rumanians uncovers his head? Have the blinds of thy windows been drawn down so that those who have remained should not see men in pointed helmets marching to and fro before the house of thy King? Are the hospitals we prepared so tenderly for our wounded, filled with foreigners that speak not our language, that mock at our sorrow, rejoicing over the misery they have strewn over our land?

Oh! Bucarest I left thee without a word of farewell, I who so often have been acclaimed in thy streets! I was told I must steal away from thee in the silence, show no sorrow, say no good-bye, betraying no emotion so as to awaken no panic in the hearts of those who were to stay!

Like a traitor did I feel, like a coward to live thee thus to thy Fate! to go away to know naught of thy sorrow to leave thee unprotected to those who soon would suck thy heart’s blood!

And Cotroceni! house that I love, house that little by little I have modelled to my taste, house that knows the voices of my children, in whose garden their baby-feet have toddled about. Cotroceni! I left thee taking no leave of those who were to remain to protect thee, casting hardly a look upon the rooms that once had been my pride – I had the courage to smile into the face of the old family servants who looked at my anxiously as though devining [sic!] that my silence hid some awful truth. Yes I left thee – and from one, one only did I take leave. But that one was so small and so silent that never will he relate what his mother said to him in that hour before her flight!

As I wept there in a solitary despair, it seemed to me that I heard the tread of the approaching armies, and shudderingly I realized that it was the breasts of our soldiers that were forming a rampart around our threatened home! I thought of all those who still
must fall before the enemy could reach this sacred door! and with anguish I realized that I would no more be there to bind up their wounds, to console their defeat...

Perhaps it was so that some vital part of my being should remain in our capital even after our retreat, that I was destined to leave my youngest there beneath the cold slabs of the church. Did perchance God tear him from as a sign that all this sorrow, all this sacrifice is but a passing horror, that because Mircea lies there awaiting my return, that surely surely I must come back?

When he died, the popular belief was that the Heavens had claimed from me a sacrifice, that God had taken my child from me that in his perfect innocence he should plead for the country he has destined to quit so soon! /12

So let it be! For I believe in the day of return, I believe in the hour of victory, I believe that the blood of our heroes has not been shed in vain!

One day thy arms will be opened wide to receive us oh! mother-town. Flags will fly from thy windows, thy streets will be strewn with branches, and those who return to thy embrace will not know if their hearts are breaking with sorrow or with joy!

It lies in God’s hand if I your Queen am to share that solemn hour with you – but this one boon do I ask of my people that if my feet should not enter the dear city with you, carry all the flowers that you would have given me, to the church where my little one lies, carry them there to his grave, heap them in masses above him, in fill the whole church with flowers, so that he who so long was lonely should have share in your songs of praise!

Marie
February 23rd 1917

Sâmbăta Morților 1918

Sâmbăta Morților... the day set apart for the dead. Sâmbăta Morților. A day of remembrance, a day of grief, a day when flowers are carried to the cemeteries, day when little tapers are lighted upon many graves, before many altars; a day when from all churches prayers rise towards the skies, prayers for those that are no more... no more here upon earth...

How many today will be praying for the dead? At this time last year, we were in full action; now a heavy silence lies over our country, all excitement has died down and with it, the enthusiasm that upheld our spirits, giving us hope amidst adversity, courage in spite of the great dangers that stared us in the face.

Last years on this day the dead lay under the sod, patiently awaiting the hour when those who were fighting, should have time to remember them, time to light tapers over their graves... and they were glad thus to wait. Yes, down there with crossed hands and closed eyes, they gladly waited, for were not others carrying on the struggle that they had begun, that they had shared in, the struggle that was to bring victory, deliverance and glory....

This year the cannons have stopped their sinister calling, the trenches are being filled up, the sound of battle no longer shakes the mountain sides, no more blood is being spilt, there is silence – but is it the silence of peace?
Sambăta Morților! This year the dead may be remembered, those that had joined forces for a goodly fight, have let the sword fall from their hands; today they have time to turn their feet towards the shadowy sanctuaries, where mothers, wives, sisters and little children are praying for the dead.

I too am on my knees, praying for dead. 

I have fled into the silence of the hills, and there, not far from the battle-fields of yesterday, I pray with all my soul for those who gave their lives for a dream they believed [sic!] in, for a dream I shared with them – for a dream that faded... but that is not dead.

I have learnt to pray during those years of tribulation. In happier days I thought I understood the meaning of prayer, but since I have lived in sorrow, I think I have learnt to pray differently, that when I talk to my God, my voice has another sound.

Oh! but how I long to be in communication with those that are no more, how I long talk to the dead. In my hours of doubt, when no light seems reach my soul, I would like to cry out to them: that their share is beat – that some battles are worse than death, battles that have to be fought in silence, battles that last and last, till courage wanes and the heart becomes old and weary & sick... But I, their Queen, must send them another message, over into the silence that separates me from them – my message must not be one of discouragement but must even now be one of hope!

Once, long ago, before the great suffering came over us, I put strange words into the mouth of a sovereign who existed only in one of the legends I then loved to create. In an hour of distress that sovereign cried aloud, asking if one heart can be large enough to carry every sorrow, if one brain can be wise enough to lead millions to their good, if one courage can be great enough to meet every foe, if one soul can be just enough to sit in judgement on others – little knowing that one day, so soon afterwards, those same questions would also be mine – and the cry that rises from my lips at this hour is: can one heart be large enough to carry every sorrow! and that heart a woman’s heart!

Oh! Ye dead to whom I am talking today, can Ye realize what it means to be Mother of a torn and bleeding country, whose every child turns to her, asking for help, for food, for clothing, for encouragement, for justice, and... for hope! of a mother who has become poor herself? whose hands are tied, whose tongue is tied, who, with anguished eyes stares around her, wondering whence help can still come! And who has to stand up meeting her fate without flintching [sic!], without giving either sign of fatigue or despair.

On this day set apart for the dead, I want for a while to tear myself away from the voices of the living and seek refuge with you who have found silence and peace and rest, so that something of that peace should come to my soul from the unknown regions into which you have flown.

There are many things I want to tell you today and the first of them is: that I consider that the living have a debt to pay towards to the dead; and that because of that dept, my courage shall not fail me, that even if at times, I am poor of spirit and am tired of the voices of the living. I nevertheless shall hold on because of the dead... yes because of the dead...
Then I want you also to know that I honour your graves, your many many
graves; that I search out your places of rest, however far and scattered they may be, that
I go to them wherever I can, whenever I can.

I have climbed to solitary spots where single crosses stand, bekoning [sic!] to
me from steep mountainsides, spots where the bitterest battles were fought and when
you fell suddenly, face to the enemy, to be hurriedly buried by friend or by foe, so that
no name is carved upon the rough boards that mark the end of your road.

I have also been to big, well-tended cemeteries where in tidy rows lie side by
side, often ten of you in one grave, cemeteries, where flowers have been planted and
where small children and weeping women come to pray for the rest of your sons.

To desolate, forsaken little grave-yards /7 have I been, where bare mounds are
huddled together like sheep lost in the desert. Lonely little heaps, over which the wind
tears, chanting dirges other voices were no there to sing; melancholy, miserable little
graves, that few visit, of which the crosses look tired and depressed and that the dust of
the high roads covers with its pall of grey.

I have been to greener spots, where is sweeter to lie; where tall trees stood like
patient sentinels that neither time nor seasons can tire. And once, as the sun was setting I
came to a quitable convent, where the bravest of the brave lay beneath the shadow of an old
wooden church. A weather-beaten building it was grey with age that conferred [sic!] on
it a dignity and beauty, it had probably never possessed in its youth. It stood in a wooded
hollow, shut in by giant beeches that Spring had decked with tenderest green. Three
venerable apple-trees, bending beneath /8 the weight of their blossoms, grew close to the
church as though protecting with their drooping branches those who slept beneath them.
The last rays of the sun hovered lightly over everything like a blessing, touching with
devine [sic!] radiance forest, flowers and rustic crosses that marked the graves of the
dead.

I have sometimes come quite unexpectly upon single crosses standing like lost
souls at the side of the road, or at the outskirts of a wood, or sometimes man-high,
overlooking the plains from a bare height, like a silent watcher put there on guard. All
these crosses are of rough wood, losely [sic!] put together, gone grey beneath sun and
rain. Before each have I paused to murmur a silent prayer.

But the place I go to most often, is the grave-yard close by the hospital near the
front, where last year I used to work.

It lies high above a river that flows from bluey mountains down towards /9 the
widening plains.

From the land of my childhood, seeds and bulls had been send me by friends to
plant or sow upon those humble graves. Owing to the length of the road they had made
till they reached me many of the plants were to dry to grew, and as this year the heavens
were against us and no rain came to soften the earth, few of those flowers from that far-
distant country lived to bloom on my soldiers’ graves.

Yet a hand-full bravely pierced the dry and stony ground, shooting up in stars of
white. Pink or purple like a sweet miracle it is difficult to understand.

Four ragged shepherd-boys help me to keep tidy this small garden of rest; they
shared with me the mystery of those fragile flowers that had been send me from over the
seas. With large dark eyes full of wonder they looked up into my face when I told them
that I, their Queen, had also come from that far-far /10 country to share their joys,
sorrows and griefs, and related to them about that other people, so strong and faithful, that people that are also fighting for the same great cause...

I taught them to care for this place of peace, taught them that the dead must be honoured always above all those, fallen for their country’s sake. They understood my words, and when I am absent it is they who look after my graves.

Generally it is at the hour of dusk, that I visit my silent sleepers and I am always closely followed by my bare-footed shepherds who talk of this cemetery as of a very precious garden loved by their queen...

With them I wander about amidst the graves and remember those that lie there, many of which had breathed their last sighs into my heart.

A tall oaken cross, erected [sic!] in the center stands, huge and solid against a hazy horizon of mountains - a cross that /11 can be seen from far.... At the hour when the sun is sinking it be comes shadowy and seems to grow excessively and to stretch out it’s [sic!] arms towards the burning skies. Far beneath, the silvery river reflects the glow from above, the water becomes reader and reader [sic!], as though from secret depths the blood of many sacrifices were dying it’s [sic!] slow-flowing floods...

Often have I stood beneath the shade of that great cross, watching the mystery of the sun’s farewell to the day, drinking into my soul the sad world’s beauty whilst my lips murmured prayers for the dead...

Sâmbăta Morților... and is it not natural that on this day of all days, I should return to that garden of peace, there to ponder over the sacrifice of so many young lives that perchance may seem to have been thrown away in vain.... Why so many tears, so much suffering, so many death – cries /12 so many mourners, when the goal was not reached? What does it means? What does it mean oh! Ye dead!

Perhaps ye are wiser now than we are and ye understand, and ye do not regret. Perhaps ye are in a world where strife and hatred does not exist, in a world where you can meet your foe face to face and remember only that he too died bravely for a cause in which he beleived! [sic!]

But sorrow has remained with us and the heavy burden of the tears of those who weep; perhaps it is because their eyes are blinded by tears that those upon earth cannot se clearly what lies beyond?

Our road was long and thorny, is strewn with shattered illusions [sic!] and broken dreams but do ye think that we have reached the end? Somehow I cannot think, oh! ye silent ones, that this can really be the end of our road...

Over there in home to which I do not /13 yet dare to return, there is a small tomb that awaits me, a small tomb that others have secretly tended beneath the stares of those who were not friends, whilst I was sowing flowers on your many fold graves; but at those hours of sunset when I stood amongst you in that far-away place, it was as though from all that surrounded me, I were turning my yearning face towards that far-off waiting tomb...

He was my great sacrifice, the great “why” my soul asked of Fate! Yet perchance it was written that he should be torn for me in an hour of darkness so as to remain there as guardian, as a link with the things that had been. Lonely little sleeper in the old church in the old home, patiently he lies as ye fallen ones, scattered far and wide, also lie in perfect silence, awaiting the hour of resurrection – that hour when all shall arise!
But turning my face back from the dead to the living, this message would I cry out /\(^4\) to those still sorrowing here upon earth: Ye are taught to believe [sic!] in the hour of resurrection, with every fibre of our beings let us cling to that faith; let not your souls be shaken by adversity, believe [sic!] me oh! ye mourners, that that hour will come, and when it comes, oh! this let me tell you, when that hour comes, it will not only be a resurrection of the dead!...
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Introduction

A disease is an abnormal condition which in humans is often used more broadly to refer to any condition that causes a wide range of symptoms, first of all, pain. However, diseases affect people not only physically, but they also involve difficulties in normal cohabitation, distress for the person who suffers and for those in contact with the person afflicted, social problems, and last but not least, there is an emotional impairment because the disease can alter one’s perspective on life. For the complex interaction of biological, psychological and social factors in medical conditions, the term disorder is used.

But what can we say about lethargy, sleepiness, anorexia, depression, inability to concentrate? These terms refer specifically to the patient’s personal experience, without any objective injury. Can we conclude that it is possible for a person to be diseased without being ill and to be ill without being diseased?

Symptoms of some disease may lead to other medical, social or psychological problems which increase mortality, morbidity, financial cost etc. The impact of a health problem measured by different indicators is called disease burden. This burden is felt in many cases by the person who suffers, but when we discuss neurodegenerative diseases such as Parkinson’s or Alzheimer’s disease we have to take into account the caregiver burden as well. One of the several measures used to quantify the burden imposed by disease is the years of potential life loss, which is a simple estimate of the number of years that a person’s life was shortened due to a disease, by death or by total dependence on others. Persons with young onset PD live for many years with a disorder associated...
with old age, these patients having different treatment needs than older counterparts and a team approach (including neurologist, nurse, social worker, occupational therapist, physiotherapist) can be very effective in improving quality of life.\(^1\)

Burden in PD is due to especially motor symptoms such as hypokinesia, tremor, rigidity, painful dystonia, postural abnormalities, gait disturbances which progressively lead to falls, social embarrassment and increasing dependence on others for everyday activities. Sleep disturbances, affective symptoms, psychotic symptoms are psychological variables which as well as physical impairments affect the quality of life of patients with a chronic disease like PD.

In many cases the diagnosis is followed by anxiety or depression. In PD patients appears to be a special relationship between anxiety and depression. Risk factors for anxiety combined with depression include onset before the age of 55 and inherited disease.\(^2\) There is a variety of results regarding the cause: some authors believe that anxiety and depression are related to the underlying neurochemical changes in the brain,\(^3,4\) while others talk about a psychological reaction to the stress of the illness, to the diagnosis.\(^5\) Psychological interventions often help patients with secondary psychological symptoms of Parkinson’s disease, the strategies including relaxation and cognitive restructuring, together with situational behavioural analysis and training in social skills specifically adapted to the disease.\(^6\)

Daily routines are reduced and endangered to their elimination not only by the disease itself, by its motor symptoms, but also by the additional symptoms that very frequently exist in this disease.

When we speak of the well-being of a person, we equally mean his/her physical, mental, as well as social and professional well-being. How could we speak of the physical well-being of PD patients when they feel stuck, they experience pain or tremor which obstruct them in performing certain activities? How could we speak of mental well-being when there is at all times a possibility of depression or anxiety, especially with the aggravation of the disease or the non-response to some specific medicine, or the appearance of psychotic phenomena (hallucinations, delusions). Whereas the symptoms listed above allow the patient to lead a satisfactory life either individually or only with short-time dependence, when we speak of PD dementia, such modes of existence or functioning no longer exist, since they are completely eliminated, while caregivers take over the main role in supporting the patients. Speaking of caregivers, we mean either the family, or a person with expertise employed by the family, or asylums in cases when the family does not have the means to support the patient.


\(^4\) Matthew A.; Robertson-Hoffman Menza, Doreen E.; Bonapace, Arlene S. , “Parkinson’s Disease and Anxiety: Comorbidity with Depression,” 34(7)(1993) DOI: 10.1016/0006-3223(93)90237-8

\(^5\) K Walsh and G Bennett, “Parkinson’s Disease and Anxiety,” *Postgrad Med J* 77(2001) DOI: 10.1136/pmj.77.904.89

\(^6\) Walsh and Bennett, “Parkinson’s disease…,” 92.
Certainly, the patient’s age at the onset of the illness, the manner in which it starts, as well as the body part involved have a very important role to play in the patient’s daily routine and implicitly for the quality of his/her life. A person of old age at the onset of his disease, presenting tremor at his left hand will definitely cope better with his daily routine and adapt much better to his disease than a young adult in full professional ascent, having family duties, and experiencing beginning tremor on the right side, which will affect his motor abilities and determine his future withdrawal from professional life, and even social life due to social embarrassment felt because of his “handicap”. So we can ask ourselves: how well can these people feel on a social level? Are they stigmatized? How well can they function professionally because of their symptoms? What is the affective resonance of their condition?

The purpose of this paper is to document the impact of PD on functioning and well-being.

Methods
The study was conducted on a sample of 16 outpatients with diagnosis of Parkinson’s disease. Taking into account the number of patients diagnosed or kept under observation with a diagnosis of PD, which is around 72000 in Romania and around 2900 in Cluj County, I have chosen sampling as patient selection method. A sample – and not simply a “group” – allows for formulating conclusions about the characteristics of a whole population by interrogating only some of its members. I have used probability or random sampling since in this case each member of the population has equal chance of being included into the sample, and the sample obtained is representative, an essential feature which means that the sample is capable of reproducing as faithfully as possible the characteristics of the population it is chosen from.

The patients of the sample, with a definite diagnosis of PD, were chosen randomly from the medical files of also randomly selected general practitioners’ offices from Cluj County. They were then contacted by telephone either by the general practitioner or directly by the interviewer for setting the date of the interview.

After this step, patients with clinically significant cognitive impairment at disease onset, other neurological diagnoses, or drugs which could cause Parkinsonism, or the presence of brain abnormalities compatible with other diseases than PD were excluded. In the end, 16 patients remained in the sample, information was gathered from them regarding age, gender, age at disease onset, marital and living status, working status, information related to Hoehn and Yahr stage, and side affected; other diagnoses and treatment status were taken from medical files. The interview was taken either in the GP’s office (in case of patients from a rural environment) or at the patient’s home (for those from an urban environment). An informed consent was obtained from each patient.

The diagnosis of Parkinson’s disease was based on the United Kingdom Parkinson’s disease Society Brain Bank Clinical Diagnostic Criteria. Parkinsonian

---

2 There is also a possibility of doing nonprobability sampling, when the sample is not chosen randomly, therefore it is not representative.
disability and stage was assessed by Hoehn and Yahr stage. The test characterizes patients according to a scale of five stages of severity, from stage 1, which is mild, to stage 5, which is incapacitated.

Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39) is a tool for assessment of the quality of life in PD patients. The instrument was developed on the basis of interviews with people diagnosed with PD, being designed to address aspects of functioning and well-being. It is relatively brief and has been designed and validated to be self-completed by patients.

There are 39 questions covering eight aspects of quality of life (8 discrete scales): mobility (10 items), activities of daily living (6 items), emotional well-being (6 items), stigma (4 items), social support (3 items), cognitions (3 items), communication (3 items), bodily discomfort (3 items). Subjects are asked to think about their general well-being and to consider how often in the last month they have experienced those listed events.

Patients respond to each question on a 5-point scale: never=0, occasionally=1, sometimes=2, often=3, and always or cannot do at all=4. Scores on the PDQ range from 0 to 100, with higher scores reflecting greater problems.

In addition, Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL) was administrated in order to evaluate the activities often performed by a person who is living independently in a community setting during the course of a normal day. The IADL assessment scale allows a health professional to establish the levels at which an elderly individual functions in caring for himself or herself and performing the more sophisticated tasks of everyday life. Increasing inability to perform IADLs may result in the need for care facility placement. IADL assessment scale comprises 8 items: using the telephone, getting to places beyond walking distance, grocery shopping, preparing meals, doing housework, doing laundry, taking medications and managing money. To each item there is possibility to answer: needs no help, needs some help (for each area in which he/she can function without/some help, means that subject is independent, 1 point) or unable to do at all (subject is dependent, 0 points). Total score is 8 points, and it gets lower with the patient’s increasing inability to manage his life on his own.

Results and Discussions

The subject group is made up of patients with average age of 74.6 years (SD 8.35), lowest age of 58 years and highest of 87 years. Regarding the environment, the distribution is equal, 8 subjects coming from an urban, and 8 from a rural environment; however, women are slightly predominant: F/M=10/6.

We are speaking about an aged population, all pensioners, in various stages of evolution of the disease, from Hoehn&Yahr stage 1 (2 patients) to stage 4 (2 patients), and another 11 in intermediary stages, 7 subjects in stage 3 and 4 subjects in stage 2.

---

There were also intermediary stages 1.5; 2.5; 3.5; 4.5. There was one single patient in the group in stage 2.5. The average duration of the disease was 10.7 (8.7) years.

In what regards the initial symptoms of the disease, 14 of the 16 subjects experienced tremor at the outset, therefore they visited a specialist sooner. They are all under medication (levodopa, dopa decarboxylase inhibitor, dopamine agonists, amantadine, or combinations of these).

The analysis of the sample on the basis of gender and considering the total scores for questionnaires of daily routine (IADL), the quality of life (PDQ-39), and cognitive screening, the total score obtained for men was 4.83 (SD=1.7) for IADL, 26.5 (4.3) for MMSE and 53.6 (14.8) for PDQ-39, while the total score for women was 5.4 (4.6) for IADL, 23.8 (4.8) for MMSE and 57.7 (13.6) for PDQ-39. Next, the patients were sampled according to the duration of the disease: under 10 years of disease – this group included 9 patients with average age of 72.6 (8.8) years, and over 10 years of disease – this group included 7 patients with average age of 77.1 (7.5) years. The IADL, MMSE, and PDQ-39 total scores were identified for each group.

As regards daily routines, it was observed that, regardless of the years of disease, shopping is equally deficient, the average IADL score is the same for both groups (both under and over 10 years of disease): 0.4 (0.5). This is therefore one of the most rapidly affected daily routines, the patients are either only able to do their daily shopping (bread and milk), or need to be accompanied, or are completely incapable of shopping on their own. Preparing meals (IADL=0.3 for <10 years of disease and 0.5 for >10 years of disease) is another item that deserves attention since the patients are also incapacitated in preparing their meals, needing help for this activity as well as for having their meals served to them. It can be observed that IADL score is lower for the group with less years of disease. In this respect the men/women difference must also be taken into account. The difference derives from the double number of men in the first group compared to the second (group I: 4 men, 5 women; group II: 2 men, 5 women). For the “doing laundry” item (IADL=0.5/0.2), although there are modern methods for washing clothes, patients cannot cope with sorting out the clothes or setting a certain program. For those who have no modern means for doing their laundry, the intervention of caregivers is necessary. The scores prove that it is a daily routine which is affected at an early stage of the disease.

There is a substantial difference in using transportation means, as long as patients with under 10 years of disease are able to use their own car or city transportation, either independently, or with someone’s help (average IADL=1 for the whole sample), while those with over 10 years of disease use taxi or car for short distances, but always with someone’s help (average IADL=0.5).

The patients are only able to use the telephone for dialling some familiar numbers, or answering the phone, but they cannot use it spontaneously or in a regular way. For both categories of the interviewed, the average total score was 0.8 (0.3) for this item, close to the highest possible score. As regards housework and money management, the average score of daily routines is 0.8 and 0.7 respectively, for both sub-groups. This means that they either need help for doing housework, or only do some easy things (making the bed, washing the dishes); in case of money management, they either manage their money independently, or need help for banking and important shopping, but manage their money for daily shopping.
However, neither of the groups can be seen to be responsible for their treatment. The reasons vary from memory disorders due to the disease as long as it is a known fact that cognitive impairment to dementia has high frequency in PD, or to old age, or to a mixture of these two factors. Average total IADL score for this item is 0.5 (0.5) for both group of patients (longer or shorter duration of illness), which means they only take their medication if the dosage has been prepared beforehand, or they are incapable of taking their medication even if it has been prepared beforehand, making it the caregiver’s duty to administer the treatment.

Taking into consideration the average score for cognitive screening, there is no significant difference between the two sub-groups: the group with shorter duration of disease (<10 years) obtained a score of 25.3 (SD 3.8), the other group (>10 years) obtained a score of 24.1 (SD 4.8). The scores are high as related to the average duration of the disease: 4.2 years (SD 3.0) for the first sub-group, and 19.1 years (SD 5.7) for the second sub-group. It could be expected that the second group suffered much more significantly of cognitive impairment, considering that the difference in number of years of disease is almost five times higher in the second than in the first group; however, there is contradictory evidence regarding the relationship between duration of disease and cognitive impairment. Some authors think that duration of disease is an important determinant of the presence of cognitive deficits in PD patients,\(^1\) while others had not found any correlation between cognitive disorders in Parkinson’s disease and duration of disease.\(^2\)

In terms of quality of life according to PDQ-39, it can be said that it is the same for the two sub-groups of patients depending on the duration of their disease, since although the group of <10 years of disease has a higher score (57.2) it is the case because the sampling resulted in a higher number of subjects (9) for this group comparatively with the other group (>10 years) of 7 patients, with an average PDQ score of 54.7. Possibly, if there were the same number of patients in both sub-groups, the average score would be approximately the same, which means that practically the life impairment of these patients starts with the onset of the first motor symptoms, that is, the first months of the disease, being preserved or accentuated later on, and being directly responsible of the individual’s quality of life.

With a total PDQ-39 score of 100, the maximum scores to be obtained for each scale are as follows: 26.4 for mobility, 15.7 both for activity sub-scale and the emotional element, 10.5 for the patient’s feeling of being stigmatized, and 7.9 for each sub-scale of support, cognition, communication, and bodily discomfort.

---

The table below shows the scores of the interviewed patients correlated with the maximum value of the sub-scale.

**Table 1.** Average scores for sub-scales of PDQ-39 depending on duration of disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mobility (SD)</th>
<th>Activities (SD)</th>
<th>Emo-tions (SD)</th>
<th>Stigma (SD)</th>
<th>Support (SD)</th>
<th>Cognition (SD)</th>
<th>Communication (SD)</th>
<th>Bodily discomfort (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10 years of disease</td>
<td>16.8 (5.7)</td>
<td>9.4 (3.7)</td>
<td>8.9 (2.8)</td>
<td>6.2 (2.3)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.7)</td>
<td>4.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 years of disease</td>
<td>14.0 (7.1)</td>
<td>9.6 (4.8)</td>
<td>8.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>5.8 (2.4)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.8)</td>
<td>4.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.6 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cognitive impairment was determined with the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)\(^1\) using a total score of 24 (30 maximum) as cut-off, as usually chosen in clinical studies on PD patients.\(^2\) The MMSE was used only for describing the sample, not for classification of dementia cases.

Considering that those with MMSE < 24 present cognitive impairment, statistical analysis shows significant difference in the ability to use the phone and money management between the groups with MMSE score \(\geq 24\) and MMSE score < 24 (p<0.001). Other daily routines are also significantly influenced by MMSE scores, such as: housework, shopping, or using city transportation (p<0.05).

Subjects with cognitive impairment have higher scores for 4 out of 8 sub-scales of PDQ-39: mobility, activities, communication, and physical discomfort; this means lower life quality for these from the point of view of their independence in doing necessary activities (housework, shopping) or other activities which imply mobility (walking for a certain distance). At the same time difficulties in expression, the feeling of inappropriate communication with others is more stressed in persons with cognitive impairment, with a possible subsequent appearance of the feeling of neglect and abandonment. The same difference appears in case of physical discomfort caused by muscular or bone pain, involuntary muscular contractions, pains at various places, or modified perception of body temperature, more common at patients with cognitive impairment, causing lower life quality.

As regards their emotions, they all experience feelings of sadness, anxiety, irritability, or concern for the evolution of their disease, regardless of their cognitive status.

The situation is different when speaking about stigmatization or social support (of the family or other close people). Stigmatization is felt primarily by patients who are not affected or only slightly affected in their cognitive abilities; they think they have to conceal their disease from people, avoid situations which imply socialization with unknown people (including eating or drinking in public) because they feel embarrassed or concerned by the reaction of others on seeing or being told about their disease. Therefore the support of family and close friends is much more frequent and significant in the case of younger patients, or they feel this support to be more significant. In order to shed light on the network of social support, the subjects answered questions about support from the family, spouse, or close friends in the difficult times when their help was needed. In the same respect, the possible problems in the subjects’ close relationships caused by the disease were also taken into consideration.

In the next phase, the analysis focused on the differences in quality of life for subjects in various stages of the disease.

---


Table 2. Average score of PDQ-39 sub-scales depending on the stage of disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDQ sub-scale</th>
<th>Stage 1 HY N=2 subjects</th>
<th>Stage 2 HY N=4 subjects</th>
<th>Stage 3 HY N=7 subjects</th>
<th>Stage 4 HY N=2 subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>10.5 (SD 5.9)</td>
<td>13.4 (SD 8.0)</td>
<td>17.6 (SD 5.2)</td>
<td>16.0 (SD 9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>8.9 (SD 2.9)</td>
<td>6.3 (SD 4.2)</td>
<td>11.0 (SD 3.5)</td>
<td>13.5 (SD 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>9.4 (SD 1.4)</td>
<td>8.6 (SD 2.9)</td>
<td>8.6 (SD 2.5)</td>
<td>8.6 (SD 0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>4.7 (SD 1.4)</td>
<td>5.3 (SD 3.8)</td>
<td>6.8** (SD 1.1)</td>
<td>5.0** (SD 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.5* (SD 0.0)</td>
<td>2.6* (SD 1.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (SD 0.5)</td>
<td>2.1 (SD 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>5.2 (SD 1.4)</td>
<td>3.2 (SD 1.2)</td>
<td>5.0 (SD 1.0)</td>
<td>5.2 (SD 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.2 (SD 0.7)</td>
<td>2.6 (SD 1.1)</td>
<td>3.0** (SD 1.1)</td>
<td>5.0** (SD 0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily discomfort</td>
<td>5.2 (SD 1.4)</td>
<td>5.0 (SD 1.3)</td>
<td>5.3 (SD 1.0)</td>
<td>6.3 (SD 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ-39 total</td>
<td><strong>50.0 (SD 11.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.6 (SD 19.2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.9 (SD 11.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.8 (SD 9.6)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.001
**p<0.05

Comparing the four groups, one may observe that the statistically significant differences between patients in stage 1 and stage 2 of the disease only exist on the level of social support, the lower score meaning that they have “never” or only “occasionally” had problems in their close relationships because of their disease. At the same time, they did not experience lack of support of their spouse when they needed it, and neither of their family and close friends.

However, there are differences for other items between patients in more advanced stages of disease; those in stage 3 HY experience a stronger feeling of embarrassment because of their condition, which they would want to conceal from other people since they are worried by the reaction of others on seeing or hearing about their suffering. Communication of patients in stage 4 is significantly more affected than those in stage 3, meaning that verbal expression is much more difficult, it is much harder for them to make themselves understood, their dialoguing is poor. In this stage we can speak about both qualitative and quantitative impairment (thematic pauperization).

Whereas many items score higher as the disease advances, not the same can be said about the emotional element. As the table shows, emotional disorder with feelings of sadness, anxiety, irritability to anger, tension, concern for the future are much higher in stage 1 than in any other stage, perhaps because patients in this stage do not yet know how they will cope with this disease, what the evolution of the disease will be, and many of them socially isolate themselves. In parallel with the evolution of the disease the emotional reaction is slightly reduced but is not eliminated, since the score for the emotional sub-scale is high in all stages. In other words, any passage to a different stage brings with it an emotional reactivation which is, in fact, completely normal. However, at the time of the survey not all patients have been recently diagnosed with a certain stage, therefore we cannot claim that emotional reactivation has been produced by passage to a superior stage of disease. Therefore one might think of the presence or absence of other symptoms of the disease that would determine emotional activation or, on the contrary, one might assume the persistent presence of feelings of anxiety, concern, subliminal sadness.
I have also proposed another characterization related to the stage of disease, regarding the ability to perform daily routines, and I observed that those in stages 1 and 2 had no problem in using the telephone, city transportation, managing money, or doing housework. Other activities or abilities, such as those connected to prepare one’s own meals, shopping, clothing, and responsibility for one’s own treatment begin falling under the “previous” level.

When speaking about stage 3 patients, one may observe that all daily routines are affected and cannot be optimally completed, but patients need help from other people (family member, caregiver) for completing that particular action.

Comparing the performance in daily routines of stage 2 and stage 3 patients, there are differences in what regards their ability of doing housework, using city transportation, or using-managing their financial resources in an adequate way (p<0.05).

While stage 3 patients can be observed to perform all their daily routines with the help of others, the case is different for certain activities in stage 4: in case of shopping, preparing their meals, or eating alone, doing their laundry, or taking their medication, they are completely dependent on others. For the remaining items (using the phone, doing housework, using money or city transportation) they can handle these if they have someone to guide them. The survey shows that, whereas in stage 3 shopping, medication, feeding, and hygiene (laundry) could be handled by the patient with someone’s help, in stage 4 there is a major difference as long as patients are completely dependent on another person in completing these activities (p<0.001).

Parkinson’s disease is often associated with mild cognitive impairment and dementia, PD patients have an almost 6-fold increased risk of developing dementia compared to healthy controls.1 It is important to predict which patients with PD will develop dementia for planning patient management and treatment.

In case of my patients, it can be seen that the differences in cognitive screening between patients under 10 years and over 10 years of disease are not very great (25.3 and 24.1), but there are differences between patients in Hoehn&Yahr stage 1 and 4, meaning that stage 1 patients have an MMSE score of 26.5 (SD 0.7), corresponding to a slight cognitive impairment, while stage 4 patients suffer from more serious cognitive impairment, supported also by their MMSE score of 22.0 (SD 4.4). Although we do not know the risk factors for cognitive impairments in PD, old age and severe Parkinsonism2 are predictive factors for later dementia.

Performance in daily routines is strongly correlated with cognitive status; the better it is, the more independent patients are, and the less need they have for the help of their family members (p<0.05).

Whereas the tables above represent the average score of PDQ-39 depending on the duration and stage of the disease, in the table below one may follow the average score for the entire sample in comparison with the maximum score obtained in case the patients met no difficulties because of their disease, their affective state raised no problems and their social integration were satisfactory.

---

2 Ibid.
The average value of the total PDQ-39 index was 56.1 (SD=13.7), considering that the score 100 means the most serious impairment of the quality of life. The aspects most affected in what regards the quality of life for the sample studied are, in a descending order: physical discomfort, daily routine, and mobility. Stigma and emotional comfort follow close behind, while communication and support, although reduced as well, are not as affected as the motor element.

For the whole sample the PDQ-39 score is higher for women than men.

**Final considerations**

We can conclude that women are more affected compared with men regarding activities of daily living and quality of life perhaps because the number of women is higher or because demoralization at disability, loss of autonomy, the prospect of a chronic progressive neurological disorder, abandonment of life goals and long-term plans are more strongly felt for women.

We also saw that patients are emotionally affected in all stages, often only for a limited period and secondarily to adverse psychosocial circumstances such as stress and loss, or to disappointment for failing to live up to one's own expectations. Quality of life starts to be affected at the very beginning, initially due to the motor disturbances which cause impairments in daily activities or negative feelings. We should have in consideration that the diagnosis and the fact of having a progressive and disabling disease may be sufficient to cause deterioration in quality of life. Later in the course of the disease decreased communication skills, progressive deterioration of cognition, bodily discomfort and increasing dependency give a poorer quality of life for PD patients.

Regarding the Hoehn and Yahr stages, those with Parkinson’s disease stage 1 or 2 have a better quality of life, a better capacity to perform in daily activities compared with those in the final stages. But, at any stage, a rapid deterioration from any level, or the development of treatment complication, or the worsening symptoms cause a lower quality of life.
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In traditional Romanian communities, especially in the rural areas, crime (theft, murder) is perceived as a form of disorder, an offence against the order of a cultural system. In the terms of Mary Douglas, the British anthropologist, crime represents a form of “symbolic pollution”: “Dirt offends against order. […] Eliminating it is not a negative movement, but a positive effort to organise the environment.”2 Order and disorder are interdependent concepts, because “there is no ‘symbolic pollution’ except if and to the extent to which there is a ‘symbolic order.’”3

“Each culture must have its own notions of dirt and defilement which are contrasted with its notions of the positive structure which must not be negated.”4 Thus, the crisis triggered through pollution involves, necessarily, a ritual for restoring order and for re-establishing the social and moral equilibrium. “Any ‘pollution’ of order, whether cosmic or social, major or merely accidental, is followed by sanctions or

---

2 Ibid., 2.
4 Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger, 196.
purification rites, designed to reaffirm the communal order, and every society will equip itself with such sanctions and rites in order to maintain the order they deem to be good.”

This study examines a mechanism of psychological, moral and social cleansing, which has been updated for crisis situations. This mechanism is manifested through a rite of elimination, pertaining to the category of scapegoat rites, and may be subsumed within the system of pollution and purification. This is a custom of considerable antiquity, which is also currently practised in several localities from the counties of Cluj, Alba, Bistrița-Năsăud, Sălaj, Mureș, Sibiu, Brașov, Covasna (and sporadically in Vâlcea); however, Romanian ethnology has not inventoried it yet. The ethnographic material under analysis here has been collected during personal field research.

The custom is called *bucket divination* (a form of water-in-basin divination, or *lecanomancy*) and consists in organising a séance for the purposes of fortune telling, gaining insight or receiving revelation, followed by building a narrative around a bucket of water, and by disseminating this narrative amidst the community.

In many – especially rural, but also urban – localities from Transylvania, in cases of theft or murder, a woman from the victim’s family will invite several clean children, mostly girls (their number, gender and age vary from village to village and from one period to another), on a Sunday morning, under ritual purity conditions (abstinence from food and drink). They are led by an old woman, who is also ritually clean: she is a widow, absolved from sin (fulfilling, thus, the condition of ritual cleanliness) and well known in the village as an extremely devout woman. In many places, there is even a specialist in these matters. Sometimes, several elderly women – up to seven – participate in the ritual, which most often takes place in the victim’s house, while the Sunday liturgy is celebrated in church. The children kneel around a bucket filled with water, in which various symbolic objects (basil, a cross, a ring, etc.) are immersed. A mysterious atmosphere is created, conducive to revelations: the windows of the room are covered, the participants hold lighted candles in their hands, they are covered with blankets or sheets, etc. There follows a period of intense concentration,

---

3 In the specialized Romanian bibliography, there is a single study on this practice, authored by the undersigned: *Explorând un ritual* (Exploring a Ritual) (Cluj-Napoca: Limes, 2007). On the other hand, there are two outstanding contributions on this topic in Hungarian ethnography, signed by Professor Vilmos Keszeg, “A Cseberbenézés (Egy mezőségi hiedelemelem eredete és szemantikája)” (Bucket divination (The origins and semantics of a belief)), *Néprajzi Látóhatár*, I/1–2 (1992), and “Egy látomás. Az esemény, a reprezentáció és az ítélkezés” (A vision. The event, the representation and the judgement), in Keszeg Vilmos, *Homo narrans. Emberek, történetek és kontextusok* (Cluj-Napoca: Komp-Press, 2002).
4 This study proposes a different perspective from that suggested in the volume entitled *Explorând un ritual* (Exploring a Ritual). This is a reflection on the bucket divination custom, seen through the lenses of the anthropological grid formulated by Mary Douglas in the aforementioned study. It also valorises suggestions derived from René Girard’s theories on scapegoat mechanisms.
actuated by prayers and incantations, which are uttered almost incessantly. During all this time, the children stare at the water until they “see” faces or movements in it – these will identify the circumstances of the theft/murder and the portrait of the thief/murderer. The phantasms detected in the hallucinatory obscurity of the water are then defined and outlined, through verbal explicitation, by the entire group. The vision is guided through the questions posed by the adults and is pieced together, like a puzzle, from bits of images the participants claim to glimpse in the bucket, from the participants’ words and from later additions. The narrative built in this context is then voiced throughout the village by the injured family, their neighbours and relatives. The story spreads rapidly and is invested with the force and credibility of the truth that has been revealed by divine miracle: the interlocutors claim that everything that “is revealed” in the basin comes “from God.” Thus, the suspect, whether guilty or not, is known and stigmatised by the community. The psychological, moral and social balance is restored in this way.

By way of exemplification, I shall transcribe a fragment from an interview with M. S., from Pianu de Sus, Alba County:

“Let me tell you about a case: someone, a neighbour had her money stolen. That was several years ago. [...] She had a certain amount of money stolen. And there was this friend who kept coming by their children. And they thought of him, they thought he might have done it, but if you didn’t see him with your own eyes, you can’t be sure. And they did this thing with the bucket. And the girls who were there said that a starry sky appeared, they could see the stars in the sky in the bucket, and after a time, he appeared. She says: ‘There’s Laie!’ That’s what the boy was called. ‘There’s Laie!’ And they showed him, how he went to the cupboard, how he took the money, how he put it in his pocket, and so then, it’s a real thing, it proves to be true. After they found out, the rumour spread, sure, and he wouldn’t admit it, not the first time. He wouldn’t admit it. And then they told him: look, we did the bucket thing and you were seen. And then, eventually, he confessed. I don’t know if he gave her the money back, but he admitted: yes, indeed, it was me. That’s a case that I know for sure it happened, 15 years ago.”

The custom has a rather widespread distribution area and unexpected vivacity: it is still performed at present (though not in all the localities where it used to be practised in the past). As a result of the research undertaken, we found evidence of bucket divination in 85 localities – villages and towns – from nine counties. The highest frequency of the ritual was encountered in Bistrița-Năsăud County (33 localities). Next, in descending order, came the following counties: Cluj (20 localities), Alba (11 localities), Mureș (eight localities), Brașov (7 localities), Sibiu (2 localities), Sălaj (1 locality), Covasna (1 locality), Vâlcea (1 locality).

It is important to note that, over time, this ritual has undergone some surface changes, which have enabled it to survive and adapt to new realities: the use of plastic buckets, instead of the old, wooden basins, as well as a decrease in the number of children participating in the ritual, from 9 or 7 in the past to only 5 or even 3 at present, because of the aging rural population and the difficulty of finding enough children, but also for reasons related to the changing mentality of the young.

1 Field information, Pianu de Jos, Alba County, 8 February 2007 (interviewee M. S., 72 years old).
The ritual is built on several levels: a symbolical level – involving symbols, meanings and practices; a social level – including social roles and statuses, relationships between the individuals of the community, etc.; a psychological level – concerning, on the
one hand, the pressure exerted on the suspect (who is denounced as the culprit) and on the other hand, the injured party’s regaining their psychological balance; and a mentality level – built on the belief in the power of absolute justice, of divine essence, entrusted with making the truth surface and with restoring the individual (psychological, social, moral) and collective balance. These functional levels communicate amongst them within a whole, unified as they are by shared cultural perceptions on symbolical practices. It is such a perception that has been able to maintain the ritual and nurture its metamorphoses.¹

This study proposes a five-point analysis of this custom, by placing it in the category of symbolical mechanisms that regulate intra-community crises (of the scapegoat type).

1. The ritual of bucket divination is a symbolical practice,² capable of reversing the pollution caused by a crime. This must be its main stake, since in most cases, its performance lacks visible efficiency either on the concrete-material level (most of the times, the stolen goods are not recovered), or on the legal-official level (it is not accepted as evidence in court or as proof, by the police authorities).

2. The violence that crime unleashes is experienced in terms of a crisis by all the community members, who rally together in the face of evil. Many of the localities that have been investigated are multi-ethnic, comprising Romanians (they represent the majority population), Hungarians and Roma. The ritual under analysis is performed by all, with no ethnic restrictions or conditioning, even though there is the assumption that its origins are Romanian, having been borrowed by the other ethnic groups during their long-term cohabitation.³ A consistent pattern of thinking may be detected: there is one single type of response to crisis, to the evil that comes from outside and, hence, cannot be kept under control. From a confessional perspective, the ritual participants are mostly Orthodox. There are, amongst them, Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Pentecostals, etc.: regardless of their denomination, in the event of theft or murder, some people try to find the culprit with the help of the bucket. Even when the ritual is polarised around the personality of an Orthodox priest, the fact that the performers belong to another religion is not an impediment. Girls or women of another denomination (Reformed, Pentecostal, Catholic) can also participate in the ritual. In certain localities, the Orthodox priest recommends the parishioners to gaze at the basin and look for the culprit therein, and women from the victim’s family will appeal to this ritual, regardless of their confessional affiliation.⁴ This is an expression of the need for solidarity in the face of aggression, which disregards ethnic or religious boundaries. It also evinces the fact that people belonging to various denominations share the same culture and interpret events through the same cultural code.

3. The identification of a culprit – whether symbolical or not – tends to isolate the polluting element from the social body, marking the first step towards the resolution of conflicts engendered by violence, the cleansing of the group and the restoration of order. The ritual examined here represents the very mechanism for intra-community equilibrium adjustment.

¹ Eleonora Sava, Explorând un ritual, 24.
² “A symbolical practice represents a process of constantly granting meaning to symbols in and through daily interactions” – Vintilă Mihăilescu, Antropologie, 43.
4. The perpetrator identified within the ritual context is not necessarily the real culprit, but a symbolical offender, a scapegoat. This expression simultaneously designates the victim’s innocence, collective polarisation against the victim, and the collective goal of such polarisation. In order to fulfil this role, the suspect must be vulnerable and must lack the support of the social body. In addition, the group must unanimously consider him guilty of something and regard him/her as a pariah, as a persona non grata. This means that action may be taken against the scapegoat, even in a violent manner. When the victim is symbolically classified as marginal, violence is considered to be legitimate. In the localities investigated, most of the reports concerning theft presented cases in which the culprit – real or symbolical – was a stranger to the village (marginality through exteriority), had recently arrived in the village (territorial marginality), or occupied a fragile social position, negatively connoted by the community (social marginality). This last category included addicts (alcoholics); the needy, who did not have sufficient land or livestock, and had to perform various jobs for the other villagers (the village shepherd, day-labourers or temporary employees); or those afflicted by psychic abnormality (for instance, kleptomaniacs).

Although not all these accounts refer to such thieves, the most commonly encountered narratives during this research outline a polarisation between identity and alterity: guilt is often assigned to the latter. Identity comprises most of the villagers; they are defined by a common space (they have been here for a long time, unlike those who have recently settled in the area); by a common past; and by kinship relations (closer or more distant). These elements configure a cultural identity, involving a common ethical and behavioural standard. Those who do not belong to this cultural “field” are likely to have violated the rules of conduct: they simply become prime theft or murder suspects. Drawing a typological outline of otherness throughout history, Helene Ahrweiler\(^1\) shows that alterity may be confused with: a) ignoring the other (the one who is different in terms of ethnicity, religion, or skin colour); b) abnormality (the insane, the abnormal); c) a minority (underground movements) and deviance; d) barbarity (cultural otherness, oral societies); and e) alienation (slaves and the poor).

Corroborating this outline with the personal narratives recorded during field research, one may notice that the image of the thief largely overlaps with that of otherness. For several categories, such as the foreigner, the kleptomaniac, or the alcoholic, a prominent role is played by the perception of the person involved – an important issue in the field of social cognition. From this point of view, there is a certain standardisation of mentality concerning thieves and a recurrence of various stereotypes. “Clichés and stereotypes are statements and assessments that circulate in the individual’s socio-cultural environment; they are usually adopted by the latter without being analysed critically.”\(^2\) One may distinguish here several categories of individuals: foreigners or outsiders, the deviant (kleptomaniacs), and marginal individuals (alcoholics). They are opposed to the people who are integrated within the group. “An
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integrated person identifies with the community and endorses its norms and values, supporting them against any foreign group or internal deviance. [...] A deviant individual will not comply with the common rules, but is guided by personal or borrowed standards. [...] A marginal individual is situated on the outskirts of the community and only sporadically participates in collective activities. Finally, a foreigner is outside the group [...], yet actively enters into contact with it.”

Some accounts collected during field research indicate an overlap between the image of the foreigner and that of wrongdoers in general. “They’re strangers to our village! They keep coming and putting us to shame. With evil things! They’re thieves, drunkards, scallywags, and tramps! ‘Cause we used to have a decent village, as the Lord is my witness! And now these wanton good-for-nothings are here!” One may detect here the scheme of – the foreigner’s – social role; this represents role-related expectations, i.e. “a body of knowledge regarding the manner in which an individual who has a particular social role will behave (verbally and nonverbally).” In the interview excerpt quoted above, the interlocutor is certain that the foreigner will behave like a wrongdoer: “thieves, drunkards, scallywags, and tramps.” The personal narratives recorded in the field reflect a dense network of often tense social relations, which are woven by and around the performers of this ritual, as well as the mechanisms for generating such networks.

The culprit – whether real or symbolic – is sometimes not a stranger, but a relative or a friend. In most situations of this type, the conflict is settled through the reconciliation of the parties. Order is restored only when the one who is contested assumes guilt publicly and “redeems” himself or herself, returning the stolen goods, and possibly also finding other forms of compensation: covering the drink or food expenses of the injured party.

It is often the case that the narrative coagulated during and after the symbolical practice spreads throughout the village, but the victim does not take visible action. The victim does not openly accuse the suspect (who has meanwhile turned into a defendant) and does not alert the police, but simply declares that after the ritual, they feel “at peace” because they know who stole from them. Still, with the endorsement and support of the entire human group, the injured party resorts to various means of marginalising the culprit. If the latter is a stranger who is temporarily hired in the village, he will not be given any more work, being forced to leave the place and seek work elsewhere.

Sometimes, after performing the ritual, the victim’s family will resort to strategies of accusing and publicly shaming the offender, for example, by shouting on the road, “Hey you, the girls have seen you in the bucket!,” or “Hey you, they’ve seen you in the bucket, you’re the one who stole from us!” In certain exemplary narratives, following the public accusations, the indicted individual will resort to self-punishment through exile. One text recounts how a man, who was suspected of stealing a horse and
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1 Ioan Radu, Psihologie socială (Social Psychology) (Cluj-Napoca: EXE SRL, 1994), 118.
2 Field information, Dezmir, Cluj County, 23 July 2006, interviewees (M. S., 76, and R. D., 70).
3 Petru Iluț, Iluzia localismului, 70.
4 Field information, Sadu, Sibiu County, 27 September 2005 (interviewee E. P., 51).
5 Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee V. T., 78).
was threatened by the aggrieved owners, simply left his home and his family, and went into the wide world.¹

The personal narratives recorded during field research describe a range of punitive procedures, aimed at marginalising and shaming the culprit. The latter would often be isolated through silence: the villagers would no longer greet him or speak to him when they met.² At the opposite pole of silence, there was marginalisation through words: the culprit would be called “the Evil One,” his guilt becoming thus his alias (or nickname): Ion the Evil, or Ion Evil.³ At other times, he would be taken out of the house and walked by force through the locality, under circumstances suggesting social downgrading: for instance, he would be led through the village with the stolen goods and made to wear a moralising inscription: “That’s what awaits those who steal!”⁴ In some cases, there would be a public presentation of the act of justice, through theatrical forms, such as dancing: the culprit would have to dance in a Hora.⁵

These measures aimed to stigmatize perpetrators by exposing them to the social group, together with the corpus delicti, and discrediting them in a public or festive environment. Punishment had ethical, educational and psychological dimensions: its effect was to isolate the criminal from the social group, so that he would no longer repeat the wrongdoing. For the other members of the community, the punishment had the value of an exemplum: “That’s what awaits those who do what we’ve done!”

The status of each individual within the human group depended heavily on social relations and was conditional on the others’ opinions: “the village gossip.” In this context, being publicly discredited or berated, as well as no longer being greeted in the street were harsh sanctions, involving the culprit’s symbolical elimination (through words or silence) from the social body.

This kind of punishment was not restricted to the Romanian tradition alone: “The group’s opinion was often expressed by way of ridicule and ostracism. Before being punished, a recalcitrant individual was derided or avoided by his peers. Having to comply with such attitudes, expressed by family and community members, was, for this individual, a heavier punishment than being subjected to certain tortures.”⁶ Even today, public opinion and public humiliation may be sources of self-control.

In other cases, divine punishment was expected, out of the conviction that superhuman justice would work without fail and punish the offender in an exemplary manner. Illnesses, accidents, tragic deaths, and family rifts are commonly “translated” by traditional communities in terms of punishments that are imposed on culprits by the absolute legislator. Here are some examples collected during field research:

   a.) God punishes thieves through family problems (tension, strife between family members): “Before, I never used to lock the doors, I would leave them open [...].

¹ Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee N. T.), 74.
² Field information, Sadu, Sibiu County, 27 September 2005 (interviewee I. L., 51).
³ Field information, Rodna Veche, Bistrița-Năsăud County.
⁴ Field information, Fundătura, Cluj County.
⁵ Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee V. T., 78).
Once I had a wallet [...] And I [...] put a thousand lei in the closet, wrapped it in some coat. And it vanished [it was stolen]. My oh my, the money was gone! [...] Since then, I have never left the door unlocked. And they searched [in the basin] but they couldn’t see his face, only his hands and the wallet in his hands and... no money, they didn’t find the money. He was a neighbour from around here [the thief], and he didn’t pay me back, he paid... millions... the many fights he was involved in and... all the scandal there was in their house. God punished him!“

b.) God punishes thieves through paralysis: “He could only walk with great difficulty, really great difficulty.” According to popular belief, punishment for guilt will reverberate upon the culprit’s entire family: “one brother [...] had an accident,” “his mother died on the spot.”

“When there was a vineyard here, the man who worked there, at the vineyard, stole. You know there were many tractors and many machines there. There was a man guarding them. And he was the guard [...]. And a lot of his tools went missing. And now, the guard, they said he should pay for them! And he said that ... look, he would put an anathema on whoever stole them, that there were a whole lot of things that had got stolen and he simply couldn’t pay for them! No, he wouldn’t say. Then, he threw a few things back, but he had already... [the anathema] and it so happened that he went to see a brother of his, I don’t know where, in the army, and he had an accident, the car wasn’t even his, his mother died on the spot, and he remained a cripple for as long as he lived. He was no longer able to walk, except with great difficulty, really great difficulty. ‘Cause I asked that man. He said all he knew was that the guy had used the dough to get a car.”

c.) God finds the guilty and punishes both them and their families, through death, injury, and illness: “God discloses the truth! It makes you shudder! But there are cases that do come true!”

“At Pianu de Sus there was another accident. A man had come to visit his sister in our village, in a cart driven by a horse. And was driving the cart back home. Now, it is true that he was drunk. And there were some people who were driving a car – there were three people: a - forester, a local police officer and the third one – a citizen. All three of them were friends. And they came – whatever they did – what happened was that they drove into that man’s cart and killed him on the spot. They left him there and disappeared from the scene of the accident. The horse didn’t die. And the horse carried the dead man back home. And I don’t know where they were heading. ‘Cause ... they were going somewhere, I can’t really say where and how ... to some witches, to those people who read in ... and people said that there had been three people in the car, they had injured the man, but no one found out who they were. But they were soon to be discovered. The first to die was the forester – also from an accident: a horse-driven cart ran over him. The second one didn’t get in trouble himself, but he was in the woods with a cart pulled by some oxen and I don’t know how it happened but the cart started moving from up there and his wife, as she was standing in front, before the oxen,“
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1 Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee V. T., 78).
2 Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee V. T., 78).
3 Field information, Tritenii de Jos, Cluj County, 20 July 2006 (interviewee V. T., 78).
was slashed through by the cart rudder, it went right through her. And it was stuck inside her. His wife is still alive today, but she’s in a wheelchair. So his wife was punished. But it also wasn’t easy on him. He cast her out of the house, ‘cause, well! She wasn’t good for work any more and ... what can I say ... He was thirty something, he was young! And he brought another one and had a child with her. And now, my child’s mother-in-law tells me, she says, “Listen, Nelu is dying!” I say, “What on earth is wrong with him?” And she says, “He got paralysed, he went mad, after that he got paralysed, he’s in hospital, in a coma, he doesn’t know anything any more. And the local police officer also got paralysed and for the past 12 years he’s hardly been able to move his feet. So God punished them for killing that man and if only they’d said something about it! If only they’d taken him somewhere! They left him there and ... that’s what I mean, God discloses the truth! It makes you shudder! But there are cases that do come true!”

5. Given the fact that the ritual has been updated, there is a symbolical transfer of certain ills or sins (theft, murder) affecting a family or a community onto an individual. As a consequence, the individual will be isolated or expelled from the area inhabited by the group, or punished by the divine, supra-human justice, in which the members of folk communities have never ceased to believe. The removal of the polluter, who is considered impure, leads to restoring both individual balance and intra-community order, ensuring the purification and solidarity of the social group.

Thus, the custom of bucket divination brings up to date a system for the expression of public opprobrium and for sanctioning deviant behaviour: through the manifestation of collective hostility, it aims at eliminating the (real or symbolic) culprit from the group. As a ritualized form of popular justice, seeking the restoration of moral and social order and the consolidation of intra-community life standards, traditional rights and appropriate conducts, bucket divination represents an elimination and purification rite, falling within the category of scapegoat rites.

A final observation concerns the central role that women play in the ritual of identifying and punishing the offender. The symbolical practices investigated here evince a gendered ritualistic specialisation, since they are almost exclusively initiated or enacted by women. Thus, they reveal the women’s powerful status, in the sense that through all their undertakings, it is women who apply a (transcendent) law or hasten its enforcement. The field research indicates that women play an important role in regulating the intra-community social, moral, and psychological order, actively contributing to the moral cleansing of a wider social group than simply that of the family. Clearly, the ritual analysed here intersects with magical practices, especially disenchantment scenarios – in the case of love and disease – targeting comparable goals. Like the ritual of bucket divination, disenchantment is, in traditional Romanian culture, a predominantly feminine practice. Women’s fundamental role in solving individual predicaments (through the ritual of disenchantment) and social crisis situations (through bucket divination) emerges quite clearly in the rural communities from Transylvania.

---

1 Field information, Pianu de Jos, Alba County, 8 February 2007 (interviewee M. S., 72).
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The term „Photography” is now so well known, that an explanation of it is perhaps superfluous  

William Henry Fox Talbot, The Pencil of Nature

The name of photography – “writing with light”

Names are the first metaphorical expressions given by man to certain things or phenomena at a particular moment. Most names were given in immemorable, ancient times, and that is why philosophers first interrogate the original meaning of words in order to get to the essence of things.

Incidentally, in the case of photography, its “ancient” times happened to take place relatively recently, hardly two centuries ago. There were enough witnesses at its birth, capable to give us an account of the events. These primordial documents are now – to photography – equivalents of founding myths and legends that sketch the understanding and build the sense of the phenomenon.
The term photo-graphy, i.e. “writing with light” contains, on a metaphoric level, what to its inventors appeared to be the essential condition for the existence of this new type of image. This term – which then became the generic name of any method of creating images using light and photosensitive substances without human intervention – appeared around June 1839, photography’s official date of birth. However, this is not the only name of photography at the beginning; depending on the inventor, it was named heliography, skiagraphy, daguerreotype or calotype.

Despite this multitude of methods and terms, we can say that, in essence, the term used to refer to photography contains two elements which are fundamental for its description and functioning. The first one is light (or its opposite and the absence thereof: shadow and darkness) which can lead us to its metaphysics and the metaphors of mystery and revelation. The second key element is the act of writing, tracing, that of the visible mark – graphein, or that of signing, printing, carving in depth – tous: imprint-gestures involving an intimate contact with the support as well as with the thing whose trace remains visible. Therefore, in the case of the “dematerialized” images of today we always feel compelled to make the specification “digital” or “analogue” in order to clarify what type of photography we are talking about. This denotes the fact that something essential has changed in our understanding of this phenomenon, that the name of photography, that of “writing with light” does not entirely correspond to the
manner of existence of the digital images. As André Rouillé affirms, «la mal nommée «photographie numérique» n’est en aucun cas une déclinaison numérique de la photographie. Une rupture radicale les sépare: leur différence n’est pas de degré mais de nature.»

Having mentioned the origins, we should also note that the first process of “writing with light” happened, according to the Bible, at Mount Sinai when God himself wrote the letters of the Ten Commandments on the tables of stone held by Moses. This probably explains the rage shown by the commentator of a German newspaper against photography: “The wish to capture evanescent reflections is not only impossible, as has been shown by thorough German investigation, but the mere desire alone, the will to do so, is blasphemy. God created man in His own image, and no man-made machine may fix the image of God. It is possible that God could have abandoned His eternal principles, and allowed a Frenchman in Paris to give to the world an invention of the Devil? [...] If this thing were at all possible, then something similar would have been done a long time ago in antiquity by men like Archimedes or Moses. But if these wise men knew nothing of mirror pictures made permanent, then one can straightway call the Frenchman Daguerre, who boasts of such unheard of things, the fool of fools.”

Photography seems to bestow divine powers upon man, as Nadar himself tells us:

“How could such brilliant new ideas not fade compared to the most surprising and disturbing one among all – that which seems to offer man the power to finally be able to create through the materialization of the intangible spectrum, which disappears in a moment as a pale swirling of the water in the tank, without leaving any shadow on the crystal of the mirror?! Was man entitled to think that he was indeed creating as long as he captured and fixed the intangible, preserved the passing vision, the flashing of lightning engraved by himself in the most concrete copper?”

It has been said that photography – such as it was originally conceived, as a combination of optics and chemistry – had no premise in science, not even in literary imagination. With few exceptions, there are no texts anticipating an image that could “fulfill the millenary desire of mankind to stop time, to grasp the passing moment, to capture a little part of the real image of the world,” as was naively stated in a manual popularizing photography.

Therefore, it is not surprising that photography appeared to its contemporaries as one of the most surprising and mysterious inventions of the prolific 19th century, engendering countless controversies. As Nadar noted 60 years later: “the discovery of 1839 was suspect from the beginning: this mystery smelled strongly of witchcraft and was tainted
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3 Félix Nadar, *Când eram fotograf* (When I was a photographer) (Bucharest: Compania, 2000), 12.
with heresy [...]. Nothing was lacking for a good witch hunt: sympathetic magic, the conjuring up of spirits, ghosts. Awesome Night-dear to all sorcerers and wizards-reigned supreme in the dark recesses of the camera, a made-to-order temple for the Prince of Darkness. It only required the slightest effort of the imagination to transform our filters into philters. 

Nadar was right, the mechanisms of photography, its ways of functioning and capturing images gave birth to the most surprising and phantasmagoric theories and myths, from Balzac’s and Oliver Wendell Holmes’ “spectrum theory” to that of the “optogram” – the retinal photography of the last image seen before death.

But beyond these unrealistic hypotheses stemming from the photographic imaginary and – in a wider sense – the scientific imaginary of the 19th century, even the “serious” affirmations on the nature of photography are tainted by the metaphorical projections surrounding it. This photographic “imaginary” that characterizes the common ideas about photography was maintained throughout the 20th century mostly by the theory of photography itself. It was preserved through the notions of index, trace, imprint, or by identifying photography with some of its functions, those of souvenir, relic, etc. 

Most photographs are considered dull images having no qualities except for those of capturing and delivering, respectively, a small fragment of reality. This way the lack of aesthetic qualities is compensated by the “truth” contained in a photograph – a truth that does not belong to the image but to a so-called unalterable and irreducible reality, presumably bound up with its origins – the “ça-a-été” of Roland Barthes. As Régis Durand states, “A partir du moment où elle est considérée comme un art mnémonique (quel que soit le sens exact que l’on mette derrière ce terme), on a affaire à un dispositif instable, un dispositif de captation et de projection imaginaires, dont les termes mêmes sont en variation constante.”

According to Lucian Blaga, “the direct expression of a fact is always a more or less dim abstraction. Herein lies the congenital deficiency of direct expression. The plenitude of the fact calls for a compensation due to the deficiency of the direct expression. This compensation is achieved through indirect expressions, through the transfer of terms, through metaphors.”

Photography is often presented as a visual translation of the “direct expression”. Compared to the richness of metaphoric and stylistic content of a painting, for example - an image constructed from the beginning in a symbolic “language” and filtered through the subjectivity of its creator, no matter how “realistic” it may be - photographs seem to
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1 Nadar, Când eram fotograf, 13.
suffer from an ontological deficiency in the eyes of those who consider them as being the simple capturing of reality (notwithstanding any construction that might be present in the photograph). “I wasn’t sure that Photography existed, that it had a «genius» of its own”, says Barthes. “The event is never transcended for the sake of something else: it always reduces the corpus I need to the body I see.”

The discourse about photography (the one that reproduces the standard ideas about photography) often uses a metaphoric language in order to compensate the shortcomings of photography as “direct expression”, the originary deficiency resented about the nature of photography. Therefore, due to its ontological precariousness, to its lack of substance, the photograph is a transparent image that often does not allow us to talk about its very self (as an artistic, aesthetic and mostly fictional object!), but only about a certain reality behind it, surrounding it or being even in front of it, within a dialogue between the viewer and the subject of the image. In short, because of the apparently non-fictional content of the photographic image, its verbalization always gives way to metaphors and fiction.

Among the most frequently used metaphors about photography are the ones related to memory – either by taking into account its function of preserving a disappeared / absent / presumably disappearing reality, its function of personal or family souvenir, its role in the process of mourning, etc., or through analogies between the mechanisms of photography and the mechanisms of memory.

Metaphors of photography and metaphors of memory: memory as an imprint.

In order to be able to represent and explain this mysterious and fundamental capacity of the “human soul”, i.e. that of memory, people have used various metaphors. For example, “I would have you imagine, then, that there exists in the mind of man a block of wax, which is of different sizes in different men; harder, moister, and having more or less purity in one than another, and in some of an intermediate quality”, says Socrates in Theaetetus, and continues: “Let us say that this tablet is a gift of Memory, the mother of the Muses; and that when we wish to remember anything which we have seen, or heard, or thought in our own minds, we hold the wax to the perceptions and thoughts, and in that material receive the impression of them as from the seal of a ring; and that we remember and know what is imprinted as long as the image lasts; but when the image is effaced, or cannot be taken, then we forget and do not know.”

Aristotle also employs the metaphor of the imprint: “One might ask how it is possible that though the affection (the presentation) alone is present, and the (related) fact absent, the latter – that which is not present – is remembered. (The question arises), because it is clear that we must conceive that which is generated through sense-perception in the sentient soul, and in the part of the body which is its seat – that affection the state whereof we call memory – to be some such thing as a picture. The process of movement (sensory stimulation) involved the act of perception stamps in, as
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it were, a sort of impression of the percept, just as persons do who make an impression with a seal.”

Even the terminology related to memory employed by modern science preserves the traces of these metaphorical definitions: the notion of *engram* designating the hypothetical change having occurred in the neural tissue that accounts for the persistence of memory, or that of the neural *pattern*, call to mind the “impression with the seal” or the *trace* left by memory (*memory trace*).

The photographic discourse also uses the metaphor of the imprint in order to explain its functioning: “Dans la chambre obscure se reflètent les objets extérieurs avec une vérité sans égale; mais la chambre obscure ne produit rien pour elle-même; ce n’est pas un tableau, c’est un miroir dans lequel rien ne reste. Figurez-vous, maintenant, que le miroir a gardé l’empreinte de tous les objets qui s’y sont reflétés, vous aurez une idée à peu près complète du *Daguerotype.*” Photography is conceived through an analogy with memory, as an “external memory”, more reliable than the natural one: “Si je n’ose en ce moment vous parler de ces lieux, j’en emporte avec moi l’empreinte précieuse et incontestablement fidèle, que le temps ni l’espace ne peuvent affaiblir”, notes Joseph Philibert Girault de Prangey.

In the 19th century, research on memory began to emphasize that this is a biological fact carried out independently of man’s conscious capacity of remembering things: “Écartons pour le moment l’élément psychique, sauf à l’étudier plus loin; réduisons la probléme à ses données les plus simples, et voyons comment, en dehors de toute conscience, un état nouveau s’implante dans l’organisme, se conserve et se reproduit: en d’autres termes, comment, en dehors de toute conscience, se forme une mémoire.”

Contrary to tradition, which considers memory a psychic fact or a “faculty of the soul”, the assumption of it being external to human consciousness allows for analogies with other organic processes (e.g. the latent image formed on the retina) or even inorganic ones. For example, “les vibrations lumineuses pouvaient être en quelque sorte emmagasinées sur une feuille de papier et persister à l’état de vibrations silencieuses pendant un temps plus moins long, prêtes à paraître à l’appel d’une substance révélatrice.”
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The researchers investigating the functions of the brain and memory, similarly to many scientists from the middle of the 19th century, introduce photography (as a new “imaging” technique) in their researches. Thus, the neurologist J. Bernard Luys used photography to create an iconography of the nervous centres, applying it not only as a tool but also as an experimental and analogic model of the functioning of memory: “D’un autre côté, la pratique journalière de la reproduction photographique par le collodion sec n’est-elle pas une démonstration péremptoire de l’aptitude qu’ont certaines substances, douées d’une sensibilité élective spéciale, à conserver les traces persistantes des vibrations lumineuses qui les ont sollicitées pendant un certain temps? – Que fait-on en effet quand on expose aux rayons lumineux une plaque de collodion sec et que plusieurs semaines après l’exposition à la lumière on développe l’image latente qu’elle contient? – On fait surgir des ébranlements persistants, on recueille un souvenir de soleil absent.”

Like memory, photography seizes, preserves and reproduces for the present an image from the past. According to this mechanistic thinking (which ignores the fact that memory is composed of dynamic relations that have the logic of living things), photography appears as a perfect analogue of memory, and this way an inversion of terms takes place: photography, a recent invention, becomes a functional model of memory: “in the case of young children, the impressionability of the brain substance has such a nature that it is able to preserve, motu proprio, all the asalting impressions as passively as a sensitized photographic plate which, once exposed to light, captures all the images reflected on its surface.”

Within photography’s theoretic discourse, its “official” status as an imprint was established at the end of the 1970s, through the notion of index, adopted by Rosalind Krauss from the semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce. Krauss states that “Every photograph is the result of a physical imprint transferred by light reflections onto a sensitive surface. The photograph is thus a type of icon, or visual likeness, which bears an indexical relationship to its object. Its separation from true icons is felt through the absoluteness of this physical genesis, one that seems to short-circuit or disallow those processes of schematization or symbolic intervention that operate within the graphic representations of most paintings.”

In recent years the notion of index and implicitly that of the imprint have lost currency, particularly when confronted with the evidence offered by digital photography (the functioning of which having no more to do with the physical imprint of a given reality on the photosensible surface) and with the new techniques of processing images (which occur in the text of an image, creating it as a painting but without changing its nature).

As obsolete as this notion may now be, the undisputed fact is that for a long period in photography’s history, from its beginnings in 1839 until the 1990s, the imprint metaphor played a fundamental role, thus having its rightful place in the history of the ideas about photography, whose echoes are still pervading contemporary discourse. Thus, if the advent of digital technology may have generated a new array of image-related metaphors and myths, contemplating photographs from the pre-digital age, such as the family album photographs, is still able to foment an imaginary of memory, of the luminous imprint, of the touch, and of the temporal overlapping of past and present.

1 Ibid., 106.
2 Ibid., 126.
Memory as archive: the family album

As Endel Tulving points out, the notion of memory designates both in everyday speech and in scientific jargon not only a way of “imprinting” information but various other concepts as well, for example: memory as the neurocognitive capacity to encode, store and display information, memory as a hypothetical depository where information is kept, memory as the information itself kept in this depository or as property of this information, and finally, memory as the individual’s conscious capacity to remember things.¹

One of the most important purposes of photography is to preserve “in the archives of our memory” all “precious things whose form will disappear.”² Baudelaire’s metaphor used here is that of the photographic archive as global memory, a potential store-house of the knowledge accumulated by mankind.

A special type of archived memory is that of family photographs: being the most widespread and popular practice of photography, they have, quantitatively, the largest share in the whole photographic corpus.

As Roland Barthes stated, “To see oneself (differently from in a mirror): on the scale of History, this action is recent; [...] Odd that no one has thought of the disturbance (to civilization) which this new action causes.”

Before the advent of photography, mankind had no other means than the mirror and, of course, the reflections on the water, for contemplating their own image. Between the viewer/subject and the conventional portrait (to which only a small number of privileged people had access) came the always imperfect and subjective hand of the artist. Nevertheless – and paradoxically, because a whole tradition foreshadowed this vocation – the very inventors and promoters of photography considered it unlikely to be able to capture the human figure.

Due to the long exposure time required in taking a photograph, people and their movements seemed impossible to capture. With the subsequent upgrades of the photographic process, it was possible to reduce exposure time to 1–2 minutes. This and the use of devices for holding heads in photo studios, made the human figure become the most privileged domain of photography. The daguerreotype portrait remained, nevertheless, a “luxury item”, a unique and fragile piece, with its precious, relic-like aspect, which played a special role from the perspective of early family photographs:

“It is no accident that the portrait was the focal point of early photography. The cult of remembrance of loved ones, absent or dead offers a last refuge for the cult value of the picture. For the last time the aura emanates from the early photographs in the fleeting expression of a human face. This is what constitutes their melancholy, incomparable beauty.”

It was only when the use of photographic processes on paper became widespread, in the second half of the 19th century, that photographs became cheaper and easier to obtain: from cult images they became objects of consumption.

“A partir de ce moment, la société immonde se rua, comme un seul Narcisse, pour contempler sa triviale image sur le métal” – asserts Baudelaire disdainfully, and continues – “des miliers des yeux avides se penchaient sur les trous du stéréoscope comme sur les lucarnes de l’infini. L’amour de l’obsénité, qui est aussi vivace dans le coeur naturel de l’homme que l’amour de soi-même, ne laissa pas échapper une si belle occasion de se satisfaire.” Nevertheless, his manifesting contempt for photography did not prevent Baudelaire from becoming the subject of some very successful portraits!
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1 Barthes, Camera Luminoasă. Însemnări despre fotografie, 17–18.
3 Baudelaire, Le Public moderne et la photographie.
4 At this point, where those fond of photography could have formed a rather negative impression about the “poet of modern life”, seeing in him the main enemy of photography, we have to specify that he did not have a unilateral opinion about photography. In a different famous passage of the text, he also enumerates its merits. Additionally, he was a good friend of Nadar and he frequently visited his studio, where – as we know – the first impressionist exhibition took place in 1874. Baudelaire’s aversion was not specifically adressed against photography, but against the
The two forms of photography incriminated here represent the first great commercial successes: the carte-de-visite portrait and the stereoscopic photograph.

The first form of photography, mass-produced and accessible to the large public, was the carte-de-visite, patented by Eugène Disderi in the year 1854. It was a photo-portrait of small dimensions, easy and cheap to produce, destined to be collected in albums (even the portraits of contemporary personalities were collected).\(^1\)

Stereoscopy, which was very popular from the 1850s to the beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century, is a photo-viewing technique similar to that of the 3D movies today. Two photographs of the same scene – taken from slightly different angles – are used and introduced into a device called stereoscope, which imitates binocular vision, thus resulting in a three-dimensional effect. In this period stereoscopy was often associated to pornography because erotic images were also made using this technique.

Eventually, the replacement of metal plates with paper photographs made them accessible to the less wealthy strata of the population, to such an extent that by the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century almost anybody could afford a photographic portrait. In 1889 Kodak launched the first rollfilm camera destined for the use of amateurs.

Similarly to Baudelaire, Walter Benjamin saw a “decline of taste” in popularizing and trivializing photography:

“This was the time photograph albums came into vogue. They were most at home in the chilliest spots, on occasional tables or little stands in the drawing room—leather-bound tomes with repellant metal hasps and those gilt-edged pages as thick as your finger, where foolishly draped or corseted figures were displayed: Uncle Alex and Aunt Riekchen, little Trudi when she was still a baby, Papa in his first term at university . . . and finally, to make our shame complete, we ourselves—as a parlor Tyrolean, yodeling, waving our hat before a painted snowscape, or as a smartly turned-out sailor, standing rakishly with our weight on one leg, as is proper, leaning against a polished door jamb.”\(^2\)

This text, written in the 1930s, shows that photography was already a common reference, an experience generalized at the society level, especially in urban areas. Moreover, Walter Benjamin includes in his (short) “history of photography” his own experience related to family photographs.

Before the 1930s, cameras were big and unwieldy, and this is why studio photography was prevalent. A particularly popular genre was that of the “postcard” destined to be sent to distant relatives or given to people as a gift.

World War I caused an increase in photographic activity: the photographs of those who had gone into the line were the proof that they were still alive; the wives and children were also photographed – perhaps for the first time – in order for the father to have a reminder of them.

\(^2\) Benjamin, *Petite Histoire de la photographie.*
Beginning from the 1920–30s, cameras became more accessible and user-friendly, so wealthy families could now make their own family photographs. Children began to have an increasingly important place in the parents’ photographic activities.

The real democratization of photography began to take place in the 1960s, when cameras got into almost all (Western) families, becoming a real consumer product.¹ The sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, states in his classical study on the social uses of photography (published in 1965):

“...It appears that there is nothing more regulated and conventional than photographic practice and amateur photographs: in the occasions which give rise to

¹ I took over this chronology from Sylvain Maresca’s article, “L’Introduction de la photographie dans la vie quotidienne. Éléments d’histoire orale”, Études Photographiques 15 (2004), 61–67, the study being realized in France. Even though in Romania there are no studies of this type, by simply studying some collections of family photographs we can note that the evolution is similar in our country, as well.
photography, such as the objects, places and people photographed or the very compositions of the pictures, everything seems to obey implicit canons which are very generally imposed and which informed amateurs or aesthetes notice as such, but only to denounce them as examples of poor taste or technical clumsiness.”

The study coordinated by Bourdieu influenced the artists of the period in their quest for models outside the artistic canon, due to the fact that it was the first one treating photographs not from the aesthetical point of view but from that of the social artifact, the expression of regularities and standards accepted and shared by society. Boltanski, for example (who knew first hand the ideas presented in the study through his brother, Luc Boltanski, one of the authors), carried out with his partner, Anette Messager, The wedding trip in Venice, mimicking the typical touristic photographs of this kind of trips.

Other artists, such as Allan Sekula, were interested in “reading” different registries of this type of archive in order to extract the generally valid principles regulating it. In Meditations on a Triptych he uses photographs taken from his own family album, attributing them the value of archaeological documents, based on which the author tries to rebuild the family background and social context that motivates their existence and to which they serve as a sign.

“Years later, the photograph reappears in an almost archaeological light. What meanings were once constructed here? What ideas and desires directed this project? Who spoke, who listened, who spoke with a voice not their own? I want to give what was once familiar an exemplary strangeness.”

In all these “sociological” approaches which, starting from a fragment, tend to draw conclusions about the whole social corpus, we can observe the discrepancy between the impersonal and distant way of treating photographic documents and the strong emotivity of the real encounter with the actual person’s own family photographs. This is one of the paradoxes of vernacular photography: that of being extremely personal souvenirs and, at the same time, the expression of some social and domestic conventions.

Regarded as a social practice, family photography is nothing more than a set of stereotypical images that infinitely repeat attitudes and situations. This is due to the discrepancy between the two types of memory invested in them. According to Endel Tulving, there is a disjunction between episodic memory, the memory of autobiographical events, and semantic memory, the memory of general knowledge. Thinking from the perspective of the analogy between photography and memory, we could make the distinction between family photography as personal, autobiographical (episodic) memory and the rest of photography as public (semantic) memory. Thus, for example, the knowledge that Robert Capa was a great photographer and that he documented the Spanish Civil War is generally shared information, related to the semantic memory; similarly, his famous picture of A confederate soldier dying is a photograph that became part of the collective memory. In turn, the photographs that record private events, from the domestic or private life, like those of anniversaries, holidays, etc. (e.g. the photograph in
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Tyrolean costume described by Walter Benjamin, or our own childhood photos) correspond to the autobiographical or episodic memory.

According to Endel Tulving's definition, “episodic memory is a recently evolved, late developing and early deteriorating, past-oriented memory system, and probably unique to humans. It makes possible mental «time travel» through subjective time, from the present to the past and to the future, and it allows re-experiencing, through autonoietic awareness, experiences as such.”

Thus, when we treat family photographs from an external perspective, as a type of anthropological documents, only semantic memory, the memory of general and shared knowledge is implied. This explains the indifference, or at least the “scientific” interest towards the photographs of others. Thus, just as our own photographs – however trivial – may appear significant to us, so can other people’s photographs leave us completely indifferent. This is so because we invest in them the second type of memory, the autobiographical memory. This is what Roland Barthes does in his book Camera Lucida published in 1980 and written shortly after his mother’s death. Barthes offers here a profound meditation on photography and implicitly on family photographs, on the way they touch us and “puncture” us. There is a real labour of mourning sublimated into text, the discovery of the “true” image of his mother having the value of a revelation. Here is one of the most famous readings of the family album:

“There I was, alone in the apartment where she had died, looking at these pictures of my mother, one by one, under the lamp, gradually moving back in time with her, looking for the truth of the face I had loved. And I found it.

The photograph was very old. The corners were blunted from having been pasted into an album, the sepia print had faded, and the picture just managed to show two children standing together at the end of a little wooden bridge in a glassed-in conservatory, what was called a Winter Garden in those days. My mother was five at the time (1898), her brother seven. [...] I studied the little girl and at last rediscovered my mother. [...]”

Here photographs clearly become “instruments of time travel” through the regressive reading of the photographic archive, a subjective time that exceeds the author’s own biography.

As “episodic memory is the only memory system whose explicit function is that of allowing the individual to re-experience (to remember) the subjectively experienced time,” the family archive allows us to subjectively experience a past that is not our own but which we “appropriate” by the means of memory and fiction.

A beautiful metaphor related to the internalized and fictionalized perception of family memories was created by the American artist Anthony Goicolea, through his diptych of a family reunion (Supper Diptych), painted in the form of a black & white photograph and its negative. In fact, this “reunion” is realized by processing several different photographs representing all the relatives of the artist, whom he rounds up and
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2 Barthes, Camera Luminoasă. Însemnări despre fotografie, 28.
3 Tulving, Origins of Autonoiesis in Episodic Memory, 17–34.
places at the same table. This is an enactment of how the photographic family archive “brings together” different people, temporalities and places, connected by the unseen strings of memory and blood.
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Fig. 4. **Teodora Cosman**, *Monumentum*, from the series *Jeux de Mémoire*, 50 x 70 cm, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 2010

The metaphors of memory in the personal artistic project

In the following, we propose an original “reading” of the photographic archive, filtered through our own experience related to the family photographs, and pictorially thematized throughout several years within the personal artistic practice. It is a meditation achieved by various means – texts, images – on the family photographs, how they work as an archive and the types of memory that they trigger.

The analogy between photography and memory, based on the metaphor of the imprint, was the starting point of this artistic exercise begun in 2006, with the series of works generically labeled “photograms”. These paintings, based on family photographs, were the “visible and tangible traces of these persons and things, of their existence on this earth.”¹

The word *photogram* actually means two different things. First, it is a cameraless photographic process, the image being obtained by placing objects directly on the photosensitive surface: the result is a kind of bright shadow of things on a dark

¹ Teodora Cosman, “Amintirea locuiește într-o cutie de pantofii” (The memory lives in a shoebox), in the catalogue of the exhibition *Photograms* (Sibiu: Galeriile Passe-Partout, 2007), 2–3.
background. The first photographic specimens obtained by William Henry Fox Talbot were such \textit{skiagrams}, as he called them, that is “writing with shadow”. Experimental and avant-garde photography rediscovered this proto-photographic technique during the period between the two world wars. Among those who used it, claiming the paternity of the invention, are Christian Schad, as “schadograms” and Man Ray, as “rayograms”.

In the second sense, borrowed from the language of cinema, photograms are the still sequences caught on film that, run very quickly and side by side, reconstruct the fluidity of movement. The name “photograms”, which I have chosen to describe my paintings, holds both meanings of the word.

First, photograms, as real imprints of objects that left their “shadows” on the photosensitive surface, are images that work by analogy with the engram, with the trace of memory, an imprinted image that can be reactivated by recall. The notion of imprint is a paradoxical one, because in it the ideas of uniqueness and multiplicity are equally found: on the one hand, it is the unique mark of something that cannot be repeated (as the fingerprint), and, on the other hand, it is a generating matrix that can produce multiple copies. As a method, the imprint is present in many reproductive techniques, such as printing and engraving techniques, negative–positive photographic processes, serigraphy and even ceramic or metal casting.

Initially, our “photograms” were designed as image sequences, usually unfolded horizontally in the manner of photographic film frames. The series \textit{Fuga după umbră} (Chasing the shadow) (2006) and \textit{Prinderea umbrei} (Catching the Shadow) (2006) are designed to reproduce the same image 20, respectively 12 times, noted with 1/20, 2/20, 3/20 etc. (Fig. 1, 2.), in the manner of the graphic works, reproducible in series. Their horizontal exposure suggests a temporal reading, in an apparent contradiction with the repetitiveness of the images. In fact, this kind of unfolding only stages one of the basic memory processes, namely the retrieval\textsuperscript{1} or, in a more poetic sense, the “eternal return” of the Same.

Our way of processing the photographic material is reminiscent of memory’s selection and synthesis processes. The initial image, a photograph of a child at the beach, for example, is modified by increasing the contrast and brightness, thereby producing an emaciated image, reduced to the essence, a “shadow of the image”. The outlines of the new image is reproduced manually on surfaces of the same format, but prepared differently. The original picture is therefore used as an image-matrix generating a chain of successive images evoking recollections in memory of the experienced event.

Formal similarities between these “photograms” and mechanical reproduction techniques lead inevitably to the Andy Warhol serigraphs. Screen printing is a method of impression similar to the stencil, involving in its preliminary stages the use of photographic processes. There is an intentional dialogue between our method and Warhol’s serigraphs, especially the early ones (1961–1964), when he adopts serious issues that do not resemble the “glamorous” path his work takes later, issues such as death and mourning, hitting celebrities (the series \textit{Marilyn}, \textit{Jackie}) and anonymous individuals as well (\textit{Tuna fish disaster}, \textit{Saturday Disaster}). Since 1962, Warhol has exclusively adopted this photomechanical reproduction technique in which the intervention of the artist’s hand is not necessary. Unlike Warhol, our works, though

\textsuperscript{1} See Miclea, \textit{Psihologie Cognitivă. Modele teoretico-experimentale}, 228–230.
repetitive, are made exclusively by manual means, moreover, each of them is as much the result of chance as that of conscious construction, which renders them unique and unrepeatable.

We would like to emphasize the image character of these paintings, as opposed to the object called tableau, the traditional support for painting within the common conception of art. The painting, as a rectangular object to be hung on the wall, has a precise genesis in the history of art, and coincides with the birth of the modern conception of art, as it was developed in the Renaissance by Leon Battista Alberti, and triumphs within the modernist meditation on the flatness of the picture plane and its limitations. Any deviation from the “canon” is implicitly a questioning of traditional pictorial representation. Indeed, the form of the “tableau”, as we know it, is not a culmination but a phase in the development of human creativity. The very special nature of the photographic material constituting the source of our work allows us to subtract them from the hegemony of the picture plane as an autonomous, self-sufficient object, functioning by its own laws in the rectangular space within its frame, regardless of the context in which it was created or set.

Photographs, family photographs in particular, resist the common conception about the artistic image, as they are never entirely pure aesthetic objects, fully constructed and fictitious. They always remain in touch with the subject represented by their function of souvenir, of monumentum of a person or thing.

The material used as support for our paintings is not the traditional linen stretched on the chassis, but a synthetic fabric, very thin, transparent, requiring special preparation prior to the application of the drawing. Thus, random accidents due to prior surface preparation are combined in an unexpected and felicitious way with the almost mechanical application of the motif. The result is a fragile object, an almost floating image, suspended midway between painting and hologram, an image-object that depends heavily on how it is manipulated. This image-object refers, by its materiality, to relics obtained by miraculous impressions, like the veil of St. Veronica and the Shroud of Turin, and is reminiscent of the cult of the unique image, of the image-object that characterizes family photography. (This contradicts the common idea that the specificity of “modern” photography would be its reproducibility. In fact, in many cases, as for example the family photograph, the image is preserved in a single copy, often damaged by handling and more permeated with sentimental value – take for example, the photographs of the loved ones we keep in our wallets.)

The redundant repetition of the source image (its false reproducibility) – a family photo album – is only apparent. We actually create a chain of similar images, but not equal to each other, suggesting memory’s retrieval and corrections made on the event once lived, whose coloring changes depending on the context of remembering. A unique event is thus recreated with each layer of remembrance, and the resulting image obtained by superimposing all these “sheets”, becomes a self-fiction, a story that we tell about ourselves. The unfolding of these sheets metaphorically represents a “sampling”

---

of memory, as if the infinitesimally thin sections of gray substance that the image is printed upon could be removed and offered to sight, as a microscope slide.

The matricial image can be understood symbolically and not only procedurally. Our painting work is organized around several themes, which could be called archetypal: childhood – *Running from the Shadow* (Fig. 1.), *Catching the Shadow* (Fig. 2.), *Prolongation of a thought*, *Untitled (Harlequin)* (Fig. 3.), etc., birth as the beginning of life but also “nativity” as an iconic theme in the history of art – *Triptych* (Fig. 5.), *Photograms*, *Monumentum* (fig. 4.), the “eternal feminine” – *The Three Graces* (Fig. 6.), *Triptych*, *Ah! Mamaia*, and happiness – *The Last New Years’ Eve* (Fig. 7.). Each of them represents one typical aspect of human life, but also a cultural and social aspiration that is reflected in vernacular photography.

So the presented “stories” are not mere biographical accidents but general human issues, a reflection on our singular existence which is however repeatable on the level of the species, bearing the imprint of our mortal condition. Family photographs, by their stereotypical representation, highlight the similarity of gestures and poses, of situations and moments, lived and relived in the same and yet different ways by each generation, its particular themes including especially wedding photography, childbirth, childhood and growth, family reunions, vacations and trips, etc.

The matricial image that is most often present in our creation, perhaps the most fertile in memory, the source of creativity and of generating new images, is that of childhood. This is what Durand says: “That is the aesthetic «halo» which adorns childhood, childhood being always and everywhere a memory of childhood, being the archetype of the euphemic being that ignores death, because everyone was a child before becoming a mature man… [...] The nostalgia of childhood experience is consubstantial to the nostalgia of existence. While childhood is objectively anesthetic, because it does not need to resort to art to oppose a mortal destiny it does not know about, any childhood memory, due to its double power and prestige that is conferred by the lack of primary concern, on the one hand, and on the other by memory, is from the beginning a work of art.”

It is interesting how childhood is fictionalized in the case of those artists who did not have a “normal” childhood, such as, for example, Christian Boltanski. This artist, marked by the neurosis of his family, was a special child, almost autistic, and a total social misfit (he did not even attend school) until the early years of maturity. Thus, many of his works, especially the early ones, are attempts to recover the lost childhood by the “reconstruction” of gestures, objects, contexts, with the fervor of a collector of trivia. In reality, all these are auto-fictions, the references to the artist’s childhood being total fantasies, the documents are often illegible and an obvious hoax. The mechanism of constructing a fictitious childhood, fitted into the accepted and standard rules through photographs, is exposed by the artist himself, who thus deconstructs the so-called “evidence” of photography.

In a sense, any autobiography is fictitious, “as memory, allowing the return of past hardships, partly authorizes the repair of the difficulties of that time. Memory is

---

really part of the domain of fantasy, because it appoints aesthetic memory.” Memory selects and classifies, synthesizes and simplifies, reconstructs the event starting from a mere fragment (picture), it returns and corrects, illuminates some trite moments with the aura of nostalgia, and gives them a mythical tint. The same thing happens in “reading” family photographs: there is a fictionalized reconstitution of the real event, colored with affection present towards the contemplated subject. In this respect, the whole “work of memory” reflected in our creation project is essentially an autobiographical and genealogical fiction in which family photographs participate in a “memory game” wherein each viewer is invited to find herself or himself.

Another layer of memory considered in our artistic project is the “genealogical” one, or an extension of the personal memory, which includes not only autobiographical events but appropriates family memory, transmitted from generation to generation, the “stories” contained in the photographic album, recounted by elders or hermetically sealed forever in a small rectangular space of a small enigma in black and white. Through the Triptych from 2007, I created such a metaphor for genealogical memory, joining three photographs of the same event (the birth of the first child), each made from one generation away. (Fig. 5.)

As stated by professor dr. Negoiță Lăptoiu, in the catalogue of the exhibition Photograms, this “ingenious Triptych” is an “opportunity to stress the individual specificity seen through the prism of the succession of generations, which is the obvious symptom of the perpetuation of the hereditary dowry generous in beauty, nobility, and personalized distinction.”

This triptych structure, form of art with religious connotations, reveals not only the “sacred” nature of the represented scene, but also the presence of triple layers of memory.

The first layer is the autobiographical memory: the miracle of birth repeated on the level of three successive generations: the left panel is modeled after a photo from 1948, the middle one after a photo from 1978, and the right one after a photo from 2006.

A second layer of memory is the genetic imprint transmitted from generation to generation: the newborn of every image becomes a mother in the following image. This succession of generations suggests an infinite continuity both in one sense and in the other, the hallucinatory vision of the chain of being eversince the beginning of mankind until the end of time. One’s emplacement in a lineage gives one a feeling of security from the torment of existence, a feeling of temporal continuity that goes beyond the boundaries of our individual life.

Just as the being is generated and also generates other beings, so can we talk about a “generation” of images. In our case, each image makes the next one possible, just as every human being makes the next one possible.

---

1 Durand, Structurile Antropologice ale Imaginarului, 401.
2 Negoiță Lăptoiu, “Misterul unor fascinante dezvăluiri” (The Mystery of Some Fascinating Revelations), in the catalogue of the exhibition Photograms (Sibiu: Galeriile Passe-Partout, 2007).
Fig. 5. Teodora Cosman, *Tripthych*, from the series *Photograms*,
3 pieces 70 x 50 cm each, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 2007
A third layer of memory is that of cultural stereotype, the custom of mother and newborn photography in the early days of its existence. Studying several family albums, I found that there is a pattern of photographing this eternal situation which is repeated (with minor differences) from generation to generation. Moreover, most family albums begin with this iconic, inaugural image of childbirth and the chronicle of its first years, which provides the occasion for creating the album.

In terms of a “history of iconography” the image of “nativity” repeated in millions of photo albums could be considered as the “spontaneous generation” of the same archetypal mother: the icon of the Virgin and the Child. As one of the sacred stories most commonly shown, the figure of the Madonna with Child is one of the most popular and famous figures of the history of art, which explains the persistence of this image-archetype, this imprint-image and its iconic value in the family album.

The triptych of The Three Graces from 2010 (Fig. 6.) takes on the persistence of the image as a cultural archetype, this time through the eternal theme of the “eternal feminine”. The series title is borrowed from a famous theme of art history, which represents the three goddesses embodying feminine grace and beauty: Aglaia, Euphrosyne and Thalia, represented by artists since Raphael or Canova to Antonio Botero and Nikki of Saint Phalle. Neverheless, the emblematic figure that inspired this triptych is not this image of beauty divided into three, but the very archetype of beauty, Venus, by a not less archetypal image, that of the Birth of Venus by Sandro Boticelli.1

Fig. 6. Teodora Cosman, The Three Graces, from the series Jeux the Mémoire, 3 pieces 90 x 60 cm each, acrylic on synthethic tissue, 2010

Besides Leonardo’s Gioconda, Michelangelo’s Creation of Adam from the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel or Andy Warhol’s Marilyn, Botticelli’s Venus is one of the

1 See Umberto Eco, Istoria Frumuseții (The History of Beauty), (Bucharest: Rao, 2005).
most well-known and reproduced images in the history of art. From cosmetic companies to contemporary artists, everybody exploits this symbol of beauty – that has thus become a commercial cliché – multiplying and reinterpreting it, so that we can say that this work of Boticelli has become one of those images that imprint collective memory.

The idea of this triptych came after noticing the similarities between Boticelli’s *Venus* and one of the family photographs used as a source. Among the other representations of Venus, most of them in a reclining posture, this version creates a special figure maintaining a statuesque dignity, common, rather, to the representation of the Three Graces. The particularity also resides in the way in which the delicate silhouette appears against the bright backdrop of the sea and of the sky – which is a common occurrence in the holiday photos taken on the beach. Based on this observation I speculated, by visual means, the similarities between the posture of Boticelli’s *Venus* and the typical pose from the photographs representing female characters at the seaside.

The child is the most photographed character in the family. The photographs from holidays spent at the seaside begin from an early age and are repeated year after year, each summer. Thus it happens that the same person gets photographed every year, in approximately the same posture, over a period of time, and this way it becomes possible to observe the changes occurring during the child’s growth, his/her transformation into a teenager, then into an adult.

The insistence of capturing these summer moments, in which the release from the professional duties – obtained through the ten days of vacation – is doubled and accentuated by the freedom of the body, freed of clothes, feeling at ease in the water and in the sun, which – beyond the cliché of social validation – is the expression of the nostalgia of a natural state, of a “golden age” symbolized by the age of childhood.

Besides this nostalgia of the age of innocence, the photographs representing female characters are chaste and clumsy attempts to achieve the ideal of feminine beauty, in the only situation when it is socially accepted for it to be presented nude or thinly clad. Thus, the idea of the triptych of *The Three Graces* consists of the belief that all these photographs of young people, having the sea in *arrière-plan*, photographs that family albums abound in, are the embodiments of the same search for the ideal beauty, doubled by the search for archetypal innocence, the same aspiration that inspired Sandro Boticelli’s *Birth of Venus*.

Accordingly, the title *The Three Graces* has to be read in reality “the three ages of grace” of the same triple, archetypal, Venus.

The project *The Memories of the New Man* from 2008 is the most complex one from the point of view of its implications, because it not only discusses photography and family memories, but also the space of habitation, the space in which these memories are accumulated and persist at least for as long as the consciousness perceiving it exists.

This project took place in Hoyerswerda, former East Germany, in a residency for artists, in a block abandoned by the former tenants, where 37 artists from 20 countries lived together for a month, having the mission of creating artistic projects in which their living/creation space was implied. At the end of the residency, an exhibition was organized where the projects were presented, and where, in fact, each artist had an apartment available in/with which to realize the art project.¹

¹ See the website of the project European Postgraduate Residency, „Art Block”, http://www.art-block.blogspot.com/.
The project I created there, titled *The Memories of the New Man*, refers to the commonly shared Communist past of Eastern Europe: the creation of the “new man”. This demiurgic project implied modeling both the conscious and the natural, urban, social and even familiar environment; a prefabricated environment like Hoyerswerda, for example, reconstructed after the war according to the design of the new social order, meant to be inhabited by industrial workers. The failure of this ideology clearly took place after the fall of the Berlin Wall, when the New Man, not adapted to the new economical and social conditions, found himself forced to leave this town built for him, searching for new jobs. Consequently to this migration a vast area of blocks was abandoned, nature overtaking little by little the land vacated by the people: trees, grass, wild flowers and even wild animals now occupied the playgrounds previously filled with children – an atmosphere calling to mind Tarkovsky’s Zone\(^1\) or the towns abandoned after the Chernobyl disaster.

The local authorities finally decided for these abandoned buildings to be demolished in order to bring the area back to nature, but only after permitting the artists to inhabit these places for the last time.

*The Memories of the New Man* is inspired by the imaginary of ghost towns, or of dead cities like Pompei, the place that incarnates all Romantic phantasms.\(^2\) Similarly, our project was meant to be a last resurgence of the memories that impregnated the interior of the living space, as if the walls had the gift to “photographically” capture the scenes of the lives spent there. Therefore, all original works were pasted on the walls of the apartment, as some spontaneous imprints, latent images able to come to the surface (like damp or sweat) for one last time before the physical destruction of the building. In the *artist’s statement* published on this occasion, I made the following statement: “These are the memories of the New Man, ghost like images haunting an abandoned apartment block, coming to surface for the last time before the building is gone. And, like a captain who won’t leave his ship, they will stay here until the end…”\(^3\)

The central part of this project was the series *The Last New Year’s Eve*, an emblematic image of the passing happiness, taken over and amplified in subsequent exhibition projects, as well.

The theme of *The Last New Year’s Eve*\(^4\) (similarly to other famous titles, e.g. Christian Boltanski’s *The Last Dance*, Camil Petrescu’s *The Last Night of Love, the First Night of War*, or Bernardo Bertolucci’s drama, *Last Tango in Paris*) suggests the very idea of the fragility of this moment of happiness, an eternal aspiration of man, never fully achieved and always overshadowed by the threat that it might be the last one.

---

4. The series from 2008 is now destroyed, simultaneously with the demolition of the buildings from Hoyerswerda, so we refer here to the series from 2010, created for the exhibition from Fribourg, Switzerland.
In the Romania of the 1960–70s, when the working week was of six days, when holidays were inevitably taken at “resorts”, and during the summer there were 10 days in Mamaia, when the travel opportunities were few and the possibilities to leave the country were almost inexistent, the opportunities for having fun were rare and standardized (this does not mean that there were no ways of entertaining oneself in Communism). As celebrating Christmas was officially banned, New Year’s Eve parties were particularly prestigious in the “high society”. It was a unique opportunity for ladies to show off their elegant clothes, and for men to drink alcohol without the usual restrictions from their wives. It was the party of parties, the crowning and well deserved reward of the “professional activities” of the year, it was, in a way, the “official” occasion to be happy.

The end of this “happiness” was sudden: the construction collapsed with the downfall of communism. We are in the year 1965 and this is a lost generation, a sacrificed generation. These people whom we see smiling and laughing in the photographs, were born in the effervescence of the period between the two wars, survived the disaster of the war and the atrocity of the inauguration of communism, of Stalinist terror. They managed to put themselves together and adapt to the new conditions just to be destroyed again, for good. For our parents or grandparents, whose whole adult lives were lived during the communist period, this time sometimes rhymes
with happiness (despite experiencing real vicissitudes) because it overlaps with the period of their youth.

The series *The Last New Years’ Eve*, consisting of paintings made after snapshots of these famous parties, and exposed in a cinematographical manner of “film noir”, emphasizes the idea that the end of a moment of happiness is – if not imminent – by all means inevitable, and that the New Year’s Eve is always the last.

**Conclusion**

Indisputably, recent years have brought radical changes in the practice and perception of photography, and implicitly of family photography. The old shoebox in which photographs were kept has been replaced by online social platforms, while photography’s discursive space has moved from the field of preservation, imprint and memory to that of global communication and virtuality. Family photographs, as we knew them, have become archaeological objects to an even larger extent, their “age value”\(^1\) increasing with the distance from the memory of the experienced event.

Among the debris left behind by the 2011 tsunami from Japan, photo albums were found, which the cameras highlighted persistently. This cruel metaphor is meant to remind us (despite the false promises of the indestructibility of the digital archive) that at times the *only* reminders of ourselves are our photographs.

Translated by Boglárka Németh

---

\(^1\) In the sense of Alois Riegl’s *Le Culte moderne des monuments. Sa nature, son origine* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2003).
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Modestly and briefly formulated, this is the title of the second edition of Elena Chiaburu’s comprehensive study,¹ which is in fact the first general research on old Romanian books in a well defined geographical area. As a historian by profession, author and co-author of an impressive number of studies,² Chiaburu offers in this volume a synthetic overview of the amount of manuscripts and printed texts in the Moldavian geographical area throughout the whole period of the principality’s existence³ (the end of the period being – as it appears in the notes contained in the manuscripts and books, published in collaboration with Professor Ioan Caproșu – 1859, that is, the union of the principalities).

With an ambition of doing the first synthetic study on the topic, and building the study on the western (especially French) model of similar works, Elena Chiaburu’s book

² Among the ones used by the author in the presented work, we mention the following: “Aspecte economice al producției tipografice medievale din Țăriile Române” (Economical aspects of medieval typographical production in the Romanian Principalities), Agora sau despre Cetatea Cârților 1 (2005): 23–24; “Teorii și ipoteze cu privire la influența artei caligrafice moldovenesti din secolul XV asupra tiparului chirilic” (Theories and hypotheses about the influence of the Moldavian calligraphic art of the 15th century on Cyrillic typography), Biblioteca 4 (1972); “Meșteri tipografi în Țara Moldovei” (Professional typographers in Moldavia), in Ion Neculce (new series) 4–7 (1998–2001); “Modalități de analiză și datare a cărții vechi românești” (Modalities of analysis and dating of old Romanian books), in Ion Neculce (new series) 4–7 (1998–2001); “Tehnică și organizare atelierul tipografic din Țara Moldovei până la 1829” (Techniques and organisation in the, typographies of Moldavia until 1829), Cercetări literare (new series) 17/2 (1998); “Tipografia din Moldova și lumea ortodoxă în secolul al XVII-lea” (Moldavian typography and the Orthodox world in the 17th century), Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie A. D. Xenopol 38 (2000); and Ioan Caproșu and Elena Chiaburu, Însemnări de pe manuscrise și cărți vechi din Țara Moldovei (Notes on old manuscripts and books from Moldavia), Vols. 1–4 (Iași: Editura Demiurg, 2008–2009).
³ Because of the historical alienation of some Moldavian territories – as Bessarabia and Bucovina – from the principality, and in order to avoid potential confusion with the Republic of Moldova, the author has correctly chosen to use in her book the generic term of Țara Moldovei (The State of Moldavia).
opens with the chapter *Tehnica tipografică și legătura de carte* (Typographical technique and book binding) which uniquely systematizes information from the syntheses about the history of books adding to them an impressive quantity of information from a remarkable diversity of sources, from different documents and from the books themselves. All information is, however, placed into a well clarified historical context that provides depth and previously not considered dimensions. Even though there are many more of them, here we give a unique example of this practice, namely the information about the beginnings of letter casting during the reign of Vasile Lupu:¹

In Moldavia letter casting was done from the beginning of the typographic production even though molds were imported in the first half of the 17th century. Based on the topic-related correspondence between Vasile Lupu and Sofronie Poceatki, the head of the typography from Iași and the Orthodox Brotherhood from Lviv, the literature has frequently made the assumption that the first letters were imported into Moldavia from abroad, especially from Lviv. In a letter from January 12, 1641 the prince thanked the guild from Lviv for casting letters for him in their typography and promised to give donations to the church. Vasile Lupu sent Sofronie Pociatki, the former head of the typography of the Lavra, later Abbot of the Monastery Trei Ierarii, to bring materials from Lviv. Although – as it was stated in the letter – the Brotherhood accepted the order of the Prince of Moldavia, Sofronie Poceaţki had a rather cold reception,² probably because of the disagreements between the Brotherhood from Lviv and the Kiev school. The Metropolitan Petru Movila wanted to establish his absolute authority on the Brotherhood which, on the other hand, claimed an autonomous organization. There was a conflict of principles as well: the theologians from Lviv did not approve of Petru Movila’s Latin reforms, Sofronie Poeaţchi addressed the Brotherhood again on February 17, 1642 preferring “the Greek stifle” who was paid by Vasile Lupu. Two more letters sent by the Brotherhood to the prince and to Vasile Leonvoci, the emissary of the Lavra from Moldavia, suggest that the French term *caractères* in the letter would be translated as *moulds*.

The actual obtaining of the letters, Letter casting, The graphic aspect of books and illustrations, The printing-press, Typographical corrections, and The book-binder became topics of subchapters in which, removing the printed text from under the sole incidence of the craft, the author offers the reader many opportunities of taking complex trips in political, cultural, social, economic, etc. history.

¹ Chiaburu, *Carte şi tipar*..., 26. (We removed from the quote the bibliographical references in the fragment.)
² A certain inconsistency in the transcription of the names, in this case the occurrence of both *Pociatki* and *Poceatki*, will have to be set right with the occasion of a possible revision of the work.
The second chapter, Organizarea activității tipografice (The organization of typographic activities), is intended to establish the institutional coordinates of typography. The first subchapter is entitled Acte legiuitoare de înființare a tipografiilor (Legislative founding documents of typographies). In the cases when the first founding documents of a typography were relatively late (1812, Iași; 1813, Chișinău), the author’s starting point was the logical assumption: “Certainly, Vasile Lupu, founding the school and typography from the Monastery Trei Ierarhi, gave a charter to both of them, even if only the one given to the school is known to us. The following princes who founded or organized typographies (Gheorghe Duca, Nicolae Mavrocoardat, Constantin Mavrocoardat), naturally, did the same thing.”¹ While studying typographic activities through administrative, economical or even legislative documents has only been possible since the beginning of the 19th century, the attempt to integrate typographical activities into the context of cultural politics and even actual political visions of some princes has been possible from the beginnings of typography in Moldavia. Given the fact that it was only in the 19th century when typography became an economic enterprise designed to bring financial benefits to those who patronized it, to the editors and typographers, and given the fact that paper production in Moldavia also dates back to the 19th century, we are obliged to consider each book as a “cultural object” that necessarily has to have a political, religious or cultural justification. Elena Chiaburu makes similar observations through the whole text of the book, but, unfortunately, she

¹ Chiaburu, Carte și tipar..., 56.
fails to systematize them in the volume where they should be systematized – perhaps in a subchapter preceding the presented one. Since the imperial ambitions of Vasile Lupu are depicted in *Cartea de învățătură* (The book of learning) (known as *Cazania of Varlaam*, printed in 1643) by Varlaam – a close associate of the prince –, it is addressed to all Romanians. The same ambitions can be captured in the fact that out of the *Nomocanon*, translated and adapted by Eustroatie the Logothete, only the part dedicated to civil law was printed – *Pravilele împărațești* (The royal rulings) or *Carte românească de învățătură* (Romanian book of teaching), Iași, 1646 –, while the religious text remained in manuscript,\(^1\) only some of its fragments being published by Varlaam with a completion by his texts in *Șapte tâine* (Seven mysteries) (Iași, 1646). The same beneficial broadening of the context of typography can be done for the typography in Gh. Duca’s or the two Mavrocordats’ time, or even for cases where we have documents related to the establishment and functioning of typographies. This fact definitely exceeds Elena Chiaburu’s initial research options, therefore we emphasize that our observations should not be considered as criticism, but only as suggestions regarding further research.

The first document that Elena Chiaburu dwells on is a typographic project of some Romanians settled in Russia near Kiev. They wanted to print in their future typography “various divine–religious books and books of natural sciences – NB: we are in the middle of the Enlightenment! – for our children’s education and for inland external selling without any toll payment, and until the founding of this typography, it should be commanded the mentioned books to be printed in our language at the typography of the Pecerska Monastery from Kiev, and the typography should expect payment from our congregation only after the books would be sold.” \(^2\) Even if not achieved, this project indicates some characteristics of the modern typography, where the aspect of being an economical enterprise – that expects a benefit from the editorial activity – is obvious. Unlike, for example, the atmosphere of the anti-protestant ideology and the assertion of a state and church authority that we can sense during the period of Vasile Lupu’s and Varlaam’s leadership, in this case springs of a merchant-bourgeois type of thinking reveal themselves, in which, in addition to the cultural and religious benefits of the printed books, financial profit is not neglected at all.

The economical dimensions of the printing, poorly investigated so far, turn out to be particularly interesting. The author shows that printing, at its beginnings, required large amounts of money for the initial investment in the printing press, tools and letters, but it was also costly during the period of functioning because of the paper – imported to Moldavia until the 19\(^{th}\) century –, consequently it was much beyond the possibilities of a private initiative. By the end of the 18\(^{th}\) century it was supported by the church or the sovereign (most of the times by both institutions) in a cultural and political programme consistent with their interests. Therefore the phenomenon of censorship should also be understood from this perspective: texts which contravened or exceeded these programmes were not printed, and as a consequence, many texts remained manuscripts having no chance to get printed in the 18\(^{th}\) century and generally in the whole period. The exceptional translating activity of Alecu Beldiman is exemplary in this respect: he

---

1 We are currently preparing a modern edition of the manuscript *Pravila alesă* (Selected rulings) of Eustroatie the Logothete.

2 Chiaburu, *Carte și tipar...,* 57–58.
translated an impressive number of dramatic texts, but only a few of them were printed, moreover, most of these were published outside Moldavia.¹

The author exploits the scarce information offered by the documents and manuscripts available for the beginnings of printing,² and amply develops the information we have regarding the 19th century. In the first half of the 19th century there were, however, two different dimensions of printing: a traditional one of spreading books necessary for religious worship or Christian teaching at Neamţ³ and Chişinău, representing the religious line, and a modern one primarily supported by private initiatives, where the printing of secular texts was predominant. Without trying to generalize, we consider that the first direction fits within the old dimension of printing, through which primarily the spread of faith was sought and material benefits were secondary. In opposition to this, the second one – beyond the fact that it supported a coherent cultural programme (dissimilar in the case of Asachi and Kogălniceanu) – did not exclude financial benefits at all. Printing the Regulamentul organic (The Organic Regulation); the Buletin. Foaie Oficială (Bulletin. Official Print) in Moldavia; or the Buletin. Gazetă Oficială (Bulletin. Official Gazette) in Wallachia, proved to be – both in the case of Asachi in Moldova and in the case of Heliade in Wallachia – a good business with the state. The same observation is valid for Kogălniceanu, for the period when his relations with the monarch and the Russian administration were good.

Evolution makes the typographer change his status from an individual owner of some exceptional professional knowledge, also having a status of expert on books, i.e. “grămătic” (scholar), to that of guild (unfortunately, so far we have scarce information about the existence of such a guild) and finally to that of an employee (craftsman) paid for his work. Regarding this aspect, the author presents in her book a rich variety of materials, mostly unknown until present. We also witness a diversification of functions from an individual with both professional and economic tasks in the enterprise of printing a book to the typographer and economic administrator of the typography. Differentiation within the profession (such as caster, setter, etc.) occurred only after the studied period.

An interesting discussion is brought by Elena Chiaburu through the subchapters Tirajul (Circulation) and Editie vs. tiraj (Edition vs. circulation). The author gives a correct solution to the problem, showing that “For a new edition another printing composition is needed than that used in the execution of the previous edition. If using

¹ Salmon Gessner, Moartea lui Avel (The death of Abel) (Buda, 1818); Voltaire, Tragedia lui Orest (The tragedy of Orestes) (Buda, 1820). Nevertheless, his translations of Florian, Istoria lui Numa Pompilie (The history of Numa Pompilie), Vols. 1–2. (Iaşi, 1820) and Învăţătură pentru facerea pâinii (Lessons on making bread) (Iaşi, 1818, 1829) got published in Iaşi.
² Given the fact that the author does not compare the situation of typography in Moldavia to the situation of typography in Wallachia and Transylvania, the polemical observations referring to the work of Doru Bădară, Tiparul românesc la sfârşitul secolului al XVII-lea şi începutul secolului al XVIII-lea (Romanian typography at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century) (Brăila: Istros, 1998) would be better placed in footnotes rather than in the main body of the text.
³ The more exceptional seems to be in these circumstances the printing of the translation from Dimitrie Cantemir, Scrisoarea Moldovei (The letter of Moldavia) (Mănăstirea Neamţ, 1825).
the same typesetting, that is not a reprint, but a new circulation of the same edition.”\(^1\) She illustrates this statement with Metropolitan Varlaam’s *Cartea românească de învățătură* (Romanian book of teaching) (1643), where on page 280, as a clear mistake of the typographer, the Evangelical pericope was shortened (which flagrantly violates the prohibition of adding to or subtracting from a biblical text). In order to save the rest of the printed text, a reprint of the page in question was made with the full text of the pericope, but with an obvious abridgement of the text of the homily. Noting the many other differences between the studied copies, our personal experience leads us to state that we are in the paradoxical situation of a single edition in which there are randomly assembled circulations of various pages. None of the modern editions of *Varlaam’s Homily* have taken into account these particular differences so far.

The chapter *Prețul cărților* (The price of books) is dedicated to the economical dimensions of typography. Unlike in previous research, the author discusses both the production costs of books and their selling price. While related to the latter aspect we have many notes in the books themselves where the owners noted the amount of money given in the moment of the purchase (or, if it came to bartering, they testified the object of the exchange), in the case of the former aspect no systematizations or theorizations have been made until present. Regarding books from the perspective of economic history, Elena Chiaburu clearly differentiates the two aspects, one of them being the result of an economic calculation based on production costs, the other one resulting from the value achieved through the aspect of demand and supply and, especially, by the cultural value of the book in question. This is definitely a fundamental contribution to the history of Romanian books.

According to the author, the practice of selling books with predetermined prices in Moldavia dates back to the middle of the 18th century (Iași, 1753, Huși 1751), while this had already been practiced in Transylvania since the middle of the 16th century. An entirely different image is offered by the book prices during the transactions after the printing. The author notes a variation of space and time depending on the rarity of the books. At this point, a geographic principle manifested itself, the prices being generally much higher in the peripheral areas than in the typographic centre. The situation of Transylvania seems to be a good example in this sense: in addition to a remarkable circulation of Moldavian books, we notice here at least the doubling of the circulation of Moldavian books by copying. Based on their price, books became economical goods besides being cultural possessions: as any other valuable product, they could be sold, bought, exchanged, pawned, redeemed, etc. They had, however, a particular value – most printed books being religious – so they were associated with the taboo of disposal or theft.

Being well established values, books were constantly parts of estate inventories of churches and monasteries, and, on the level of particular possessions, they could be left as inheritance, or be parts of dowry lists.

The chapter *Acte și foi volante imprimate* (Printed documents and leaflets) treats aspects of economical and political history rather than cultural history. The diversity of these documents leads Elena Chiaburu to propose a classification and follow the development of each category. This is especially appreciated since the diversity of the
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1 Chiaburu, *Carte și tipar...,* 90.
information they provide caused inherent confusion in previous inventories. Due to their special status, documents show some differences with respect to economical characteristics: some of them – being means of an economic practice (e.g. the seals) – were paid by the issuer, while others were paid by the beneficiary. The political pamphlets which in most cases presented political manifestos, were distributed for free being means of exercising political and military authority or means of accessing authority (e.g. the manifestos of Eteria).

The chapters Distribuția cărților (The distribution of books) and Aria de răspândire a cărților din Țara Moldovei (The distribution area of books in Moldavia) study the ways of book distribution through selling or donation, or through migrant merchants who took the individual copies of some prints to the most remote regions of the Romanian territory. Especially since the 19th century, many books were distributed for free either through the institution of school or through that of the church. These books depicted consistent cultural or religious politics of the authorities. Elena Chiaburu studies the circulation of books both from the perspective of economical activity (attempting – to the extent the documents allow her – to identify its financial mechanism), and from the aspect of supporting a cultural programme either declared or inferential based on the contents of the books, the latter case being closely connected to the phenomenon of censorship.

The multiplication of texts by copying became a significant aspect of the circulation of prints due to the following facts: on the one hand, typographies – which were among the first victims of wars or violent political changes – were characterized by an intermittent existence, and on the other hand, until the end of the 18th century typography was far from covering the book needs of the Romanian territory, which was caused by the necessity of importing paper from abroad and by the censorship required by the administrative and religious authorities. Duplication gained impressive dimensions in Transylvania where, due to the customs censorship imposed by the imperial authorities in the middle of the 18th century, the Moldavian copyists – a very important fact in my opinion! – crossed the principality from the East to the West multiplying books printed in Moldavia. All texts multiplied by Moldavian copyists were profoundly Orthodox (among these we mention Cazania lui Varlaam (Varlaam’s Homily), Sapte taine (Seven mysteries), and Interpretarea liturghiei (The interpretation of the liturgy). Since in the same period an orthodox book was printed in Iași (under the false indication that it was printed in Timișoara), the question arises: to what extent can this be considered a spontaneous phenomenon, and moreover, was it part of supporting Sofronie’s anti-

---

1 We mention a lesser known copy of Viețile și petrecerea sfinților (The lives and diversion of saints) kept at the Cluj Branch of the Romanian Academy, donated by the great metropolitan to the people of Satmar.

2 Îndreptarea păcătosului cu duhul blân dételor precum dohunicești așa și celor ce să dohtoresc de la dânsii păcăușilorce să pocăiesc întru folos aezată (The guidance of the sinners, displayed for their benefit, with the spirit of piety, as for the spiritual fathers, also for those who are comforted by them, and for the sinners who are in penitence.), published in Timișoara Banatului, in the year 1765 (a book in fact printed in Iași by Monk Evloghie and Ilie the Collector.)
Catholic movement, the implication from abroad into the development of the movement being a known fact. This remains a question to be answered by future research.

The purpose of the printed books and especially the establishment of libraries offer a compound social response to the act of printing, completing the circuit author–editor / typographer–reader, the latter becoming a potential creator of texts that can also be integrated into a new similar circuit. The establishment of libraries represents a very important research field which is amply sketched in the present work.

In the logical construction of the demonstration, the next chapter, Meșteri și meșteșug (Craftsmen and craft)¹ is dedicated to the profession of typographer itself. The chapter – with its subchapters Însușirea meseriei de tipograf (Learning the profession of typographer), Meșteșuguri înrudite cu tipografia (Crafts related to typography), Legătoria de cărți (Book binding), Tipografi – oameni înstăriți (The typographers – wealthy people), Tipografi – cărturarăi ai vremii lor (The typographers – scholars of their time), Tipografi implicați în politică (Typographers involved in politics) – treats the professional, economical and cultural status of those who were working in this field.

In a future edition of the work or as an extension of the research, we believe, the introduction of the notion of corrector would also be welcome. This function was unique in comparison to the status of western typographers, the notion referring to the person who had the complex functions of translator, editor, proof-reader and even typographer (or only some of these), his main purpose being that of “the one who is assuming the theological responsibility for the printed text.”

The last chapter, Relația dintre tipar, biserică și școală (The relation of typography, church and school), studies the connections between typography and different institutions through the subchapters Tiparul din Țara Moldovei și Ortodoxia (Typography in Moldavia and Orthodoxy), Tiparul din Țara Moldovei și Ortodoxia orientală (Typography in Moldavia and Eastern Orthodoxy), Tiparul din Țara Moldovei și românii din Transilvania (Typography in Moldavia and the Romanians from Transylvania).²

The presented work – which would be impressively rich in material even without additional documents – is completed by various Annexes containing documents and prices, a list of printed leaflets and prints from Moldavia (the first complete list, as far as we know), a research on the circulation area of Moldavian prints, and others.

Being based on an extensive research and having a systematic and homogeneous character, Elena Chiaburu’s work proves to be a remarkable synthesis on the treated topic. Even though it is explicitly dedicated to Moldavia, it allows for many generalisations on the level of the entire Romanian territory, calling for future regional researches to follow a similar scientific path. The greatest merit of the book is that it sets the history of Romanian typography out of the cone of accidental casuistry offered by many other Romanian works. The “Leporello’s list” we got used to by other works becomes for the first time an argument within a logical demonstration.

Translated by Boglárka Németh

¹ Chiaburu, Carte și tipar..., 268–302.
² Although after the separation of Bucovina and Bessarabia from Moldavia special researches on the relation between Moldavian typography and the Romanians from this regions, the printed text being one of the vectors of preserving the national unity.
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With a coverage of four years, the present art album sums up Teodora Cosman’s artistic creation, outlining at the same time a creational biography of her entire pictorial work. The subject of the album is the exposure of the author’s artistic vision, both through paintings and through the explicative texts auxiliary to their interpretation. Combining various methods of expression, from the figurative and plastic one to the objective-subjective vision exposed by means of words, this volume marks the apogee of the work of the artist who is also its author.

If we take the author’s aim as a starting point for our analysis of this album, we can discover a set of complex substrata. The words of Roland Barthes, “la nécessité du Monument”, are quoted in this sense in the introductory part of the album. But what does the above expression actually mean to the author/artist?

Presenting her motivation the artist states that she does not create art work for art’s sake – paintings are “oeuvre de mémoire” for her, meaning that they are not independent objects, but they each have a past and a future. “This is the Monument”, clarifies the author. At this level of interpretation various problems are raised, among which I comment on the following: what is the justification of her creation? and most importantly what are its sources? A specification of the sources of the artistic creation would be required in the first part of the album, from which the full meaning of the paintings derives, and without which these works would be simple exposures, simple reproductions. The sources of the paintress are implicitly revealed by the texts and

I note here that for reasons of beliefs and artistic and existential intimacy, this album was printed in an extremely small number of copies, thus it has to be considered from the time of its appearance a rare book.

*This study was possible due to a Ph.D. scholarship, project co-financed by the Sectorial Operational Program for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, Priority Axis 1. “Education and training in support for growth and development of a knowledge based society”; key area of intervention 1.5: Doctoral and post-doctoral programs supporting research; contract no: POSDRU/88/1.5/S/60185 – “Innovative Doctoral Studies in a Knowledge Based Society,” Babeș–Bolyai University.
explicitly shown by the illustrations when we get to browse through the pages. She relates to the family photographs as to primary sources, offering through them a meaning and a story to each work. The aim of this practice is to achieve concentration and meditation on family photographs and on the different types of memory implied by them.

From an organizational point of view, there is no rigid method of exposing the ideas and the paintings. A strict division would have caused a monotonous narration, but some guidelines, either chronological or thematic, could have been drawn. The motivation, which should have to be present on the first pages, only comes at the end of the album. The author mentions that the texts are fragments of her doctoral dissertation. This statement justifies this organizational pattern of the work, and for a deepening and detailed understanding of the subject, the author’s dissertation is clearly the indicated source. Besides the art works and the additional texts, the album also includes some photographic sources of the paintings. The target audience is a very small one, a feature also emphasized by the very small number of copies of the book.

The album includes 39 illustrations, among which there are reproductions of paintings by Teodora Cosman, their photographic sources and some photographs taken at the artist’s exhibitions. Mention must be made of the illustrations of the works consecutively exposed, similarly to a photographic film, on the occasion of the exhibition at APC Fribourg in the year 2010, and the photographs taken at the Matthias Corvinus House Gallery at the exhibition held in the year 2011, organized on the occasion of the artist’s PhD-defence.1

The generic title, Jeux de Mémoire, under whose auspices the pictorial compositions are placed, is borrowed from the gallerist Pierre Eichenberger, who organized the exhibition with the title Jeux de Mémoire/Jeu de Mémoires at the APC Gallery and Atelíer Fribourg-Nord from Fribourg, Switzerland, in 2010. This exhibition, in which Teodora Cosman also took part, represents the top of her work carried out in Fribourg during the year when she conducted there a research stage on art history.

Representative works of each stage of Teodora Cosman’s artistic creation are gathered under the title Jeux de Mémoire. Her works are thematically categorized, and among these thematic categories we mention here: childhood (Chasing the Shadow, Catching the Shadow), birth (Triptych, Photograms, Monumentum), the eternal feminine (The Three Graces, Triptych) and happiness (The Last New Year’s Eve).2

Intercalated among the reproductions, the text comes to guide the viewers’/readers’ perspective on the works, in order not to allow for a free distinct interpretation for each of them. The artistic description designating the painted “objects” is explained, and, at the same time, the origins of the “reproduction” procedure applied over the history of photography are presented as well.

Analogically speaking, Teodora Cosman’s works have an imprint of the photographic character, which calls for their association with memory. Using the generic name of “photograms” given to the paintings realized based on photographs, has

---

1 The exhibition had the title Memorie și Reprezentare (Memory and Representation) and it was organized at the Matthias Corvinus House Gallery from Cluj-Napoca, in September 2011.
the aim of recovering the “visible and tangible trace of these people and things, and of their existence on the Earth.”

The eight overexposures from the period 2009–2010, which are placed in the first part of the album, are followed by a compact representation cycle. Bearing the generic title The Three Graces, the works included here compose one single triptych. After noticing the similarity between the attitude of a person from the family photographs and the counterpose of Venus from Sandro Boticelli’s Birth of Venus, then translating this plastic representation – emblematic of beauty – into the posture from the source image, the artist uses the photograph in the creation of the triptych. Even if we are not talking about the three goddesses, the embodiments of feminine grace and beauty, raised to another level of perception, the triptych is about “the three ages of grace” of the same Venus. In order to enhance the reader’s beliefs, the author places, comparatively to the work, the photographic sources that were the bases of the painting.

The Last New Year’s Eve, the title of the following series that includes six reproductions, originates from the archetypal idea referring to the perishable nature of happiness, also present in the domain of movies, art or literature. The artist goes back in time to the moment of capturing the event in the source photograph.

Teodora Cosman, Over-exposures, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 90x120cm, 2011

1 Teodora Cosman “Amintirea locuieşte într-o cutie de pantofi” (Memory lives in a shoebox), exhibition catalogue Photograms (Sibiu: Galeriile Passe-Partout, 2007), quoted in: Cosman, Jeux de Mémoire, 34.

2 Cosman, Memorie și reprezentare. Surse fotografice în arta contemporană, 121.
The significance of the idea of spending New Year’s Eve in the communist period inspired the whole semantic content of developing the subject.

Inserted after the presentation of the two series, the texts bearing the title *In the name of photography* and *The metaphors of photography and the metaphors of memory* familiarize the reader with subjects from the history of photography, and with the work method used by the artist. The artist’s theory referring to the choice of naming her works “image-objects” instead of “tableau”, is very important and also well justified. This explanation is vital to the reader regarding the understanding of Teodora Cosman’s artistic belief and vision. The well-founded justification refers to the material used as support, which is a totally unconventional one, supporting the intentional deviation from the name given to the paintings. The specific method of preparing the surface of the material results in a variety of models which differentiate the works that use a mechanical presentation of the same theme. Repeating the theme results in several images that are not equal and have a profound meaning, namely that of correcting the memory of the experienced events. All reproduced works of this album were painted with acrylic on synthetic tissue.

The Triptych of Birth and the sequences from childhood are materialized in the series *Catching the shadow* which concludes the album. Both the idea of the triptych in itself, and the idea of birth offer the work a sacred aspect, as the artist herself claims. The additional text that refers to the different levels of interpretation of images, guides the reader towards the true sense of her vision, towards what she aimed to represent. Using here a stereotype well-established in the collective mentality, referring to family photographs, she implies a meaning that goes beyond the simple presentation, the real goal being to achieve a social and cultural recovery.

The reproductions of the works and the information complementary to their understanding, not only do not introduce us into the universe of autobiographic memory, but they invite us to meditate on the documentary value of photography and family albums, which have lost their initial valences in the era of digitalization.

Through its undeniable value imprinted by the exceptional quality of the graphic condition of this album, to which we can also add the small number of copies, makes this book – as the Teodora Cosman correctly suggests – a “bibliophile rarity”.

Translated by Boglárka Németh
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Translation and culture are most fashionable and highly used terms of today. The concept of translation implies first and foremost a linguistic operation, and it becomes necessary for interaction between people speaking different languages; however, it may also have other interpretations, depending on whether it is directed to the translation of our own thoughts, texts, or culture. If all languages carry a particular worldview, then, provided I want to understand the thoughts of another person who speaks a different language, I must not only learn that particular language, but I must also familiarize myself with its worldview or culture. A fundamental and overall feature of human life in general is that it has a culture. It is precisely their culture that distinguishes territorially and historically separated human communities.

The verb fordít [to translate] is the Hungarian correspondent of the Latin verbs traduco or transféro. The meaning of the words traduco and transféro1 is “to carry over, to transfer,” so they suggest that they carry over the text from where it is to a different place but meanwhile the text stays the same. In most European languages the verbs expressing translation have preserved the semantic structure of the Latin verb: for example, the German übersetzen, the English translate, the French traduire all mean: “carry over, transfer”. However, the Hungarian word fordít contains the root for-, which is also the root for the verbs fordul, forog (to turn, to revolve). The verbs fordul [turn], forog [rotate], fordít and its prefixed versions, like kifordul, kiforog, átfordul, lefordít, megfordít, etc. all show the direction of the action. That is to say, the Hungarian verb comprises a change or indication of direction in its meaning, it transposes the text to another direction, to another language. It is an accurate interpretation of the operation: the same texts, turned into a different direction.2

In the sense of *traduco, transfero* the texts are included into a world of transportation, whereas the Hungarian term faces one with the problem that something may stay in place while it changes direction. Despite the semantic differences, the Latin and Hungarian verbs refer to the same operation; the Latin verb implies that we take the words or sentences from one language to another, and the Hungarian verb implies that the old text changes its direction in the new words, when it steps from one language to another.

Apart from the semantics of words, the great problem of the 21st century will most likely be how one can succeed in translating, transposing the different cultures, the texts of different cultures to the direction of another language or culture.

The two volumes of studies entitled *A fordítás kultúrája – szövegek és gyakorlatok* (The culture of translation – texts and practices) present different segments of a wide range of researches. The papers were delivered at the departmental conference of the Department of Hungarian Literary Studies, Faculty of Letters of the Babeș-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, organized on 8–9 January 2010. The volumes are edited by Csilla Gábor and Ágnes Korondi, and were published by Verbum and Láthatatlan Kollégium in Cluj-Napoca, in 2010. The texts are authored by professors and doctoral students of the Department, who face the problem of translation on a daily basis on account of their profession, and their historical and cultural embeddedness. The 27 authors all approach the issue of translation from their own fields of research, thus the discussions of literary theory, translation theory, and literary history from the Middle Ages to the 20th century are simultaneously present in the book.

The first volume contains nineteen studies, the second one contains eight.

In the first study *Attila Benő* treats the problem of intranslatability as the central problem of translation theories. Generally speaking, it is dangerous to speak about intranslatability since the text as the phenomenon of a manifestation can be transposed to a different language, and the concepts specific for a language or a culture can also be made meaningful in any target language. The variation of linguistic and cultural sign systems can rather be regarded as partial problems which do not interfere with the text to be translated as a whole. Despite the difficulties of translation the conditions are given for the birth of similar translations, having identical function with the original text.

Four authors place the concept of translation into a philosophical perspective. *Andor Horváth* offers an etymological analysis of the word *fordít* and discusses the Heideggerian concept of truth, the meaning of which at Plato is non-concealedness. Starting from Plato’s allegory of the cave, there is truth, and it reveals itself to man if the conditions for seeing are given. Leading man to light means nothing else than the turning, the transferring, the translation of the soul to the right direction. *Gyöngyi Orbán* sketches the hermeneutical situation of understanding, the hermeneutical dialogue by way of Averroes’ translation of Aristotle’s works into Arabic, productively misinterpreting them. Translation means interpretation, and even misinterpretation, the acceptance of failure, openness to the dimension of the Other, a dialogue for overcoming temporal and cultural distance. *Judit Pieldner* also places the activity of translation into a hermeneutic light, as the triad of understanding–interpretation–application. *Zoltán Nagy* develops the historical-philosophical aspects of the search and construction of identity of minority existence, reclining first of all on the work of Sándor Makkai.
István Berszán presents two kinds of translation-practices, the practice of cultural economy and that of artistic translation. By the translation examples of “animal-analogies” of Ádám Bodor’s novel Sinistra körzet (Sinistra district), the author draws attention to the fact that in a good translation there is always a gesture that bolsters the translation is made authentic by a sophisticated skill, the translator does not take something over “from there”, but invites us “there” by its resonating gesture.

Translation as a problem of literary theory forms the subject of three studies. Péter Demény compares Romanian and Hungarian national literatures, with an eye to differences in life conduct, as well as Hungarian and Romanian cultural differences. The literature of every nation represents the particularities of the given nation: Hungarians take Imre Madách or József Katona as their authentic symbols, while Romanians regard Ion Luca Caragiale as theirs. Humour is of central importance in Caragiale’s works, for Romanians it equals a way of life, while for Hungarians it is a gesture. Orsolya Tőkés examines the metamorphosis scenes and character types of Mihály Vörösmarty’d drama Csongor és Tünde (Csongor and Tünde), as generic conventions of the burlesque. Ágnes Klára Papp investigates the liminal situation of Hungarian minority literatures and cultures, and their relationship with the literature and culture of the mother country. The central concept of her article is the border, which not only separates, but also opens up the way to what is new. Culture is situated on borderlines, every instance of it lies at the intersection of borders.

Enikő M. Bodrogi’s translation enterprise is a very interesting attempt. She has been researching the condition of Finno-Ugric minorities living in Fennoscandia for almost a decade, from the perspective of several disciplines. During the last two years she has been focusing on the situation of the people living in Torne river valley in Sweden, speaking the Meänkieli language; she started learning the spoken language, which lacks a unitary norm, and received its status as an autonomous language in 2000. The author’s main aim is to translate Meänkieli literature and culture in general into Hungarian, to represent it in Hungarian culture. This task is a major objective, since it is a highly responsible affair to translate from a language which has never been translated into Hungarian before. At the same time, these efforts are facilitated by the motivations of this endeavour: cultivating the Hungarian and Finno-Ugric linguistic relations, experiencing Meänkieli minority literature and culture in another, Hungarian minority existence, as well as a tribute to the extensive work of writer Bengt Pohjanen, the most conscious organizer of Meänkieli language and culture.

Erika Kommer is the translator of the German texts of the multilingual electronic magazine entitled Tus. This periodical is a magazine for children, the Romanian texts are also published in German, English, French etc. translations. In her study, Erika Kommer discusses the linguistic and cultural obstacles one must face when translating children’s literature, whether or not the translation of texts for children depends on children’s culture. Comparing the Hungarian, German, French, and English translations of Valentin Marica’s poem for children, entitled Mâini de alint - E marți (Hands for Spoiling – It’s Tuesday), she concludes that, besides the general problems of translation, the rendering of tale motifs, expressions, symbols is also very much dependent on culture.

Imre József Balázs’s article reveals that the two surrealist magazines edited by Imre Pán, entitled Index Röpirat (Index Pamphlet) and Vitairat Könyvtár (Pamphlet
Library), tried to convey values and ways of thinking unknown for Hungarian culture, by the translations of Imre Pán, Árpád Mezei, Béla Hamvas, Katalin Kemény and others. Their translations played a role in reconstructing Hungarian cultural life.

**Levente T. Szabó** analyzes Pál Gyulai’s speech against a law on education restricting the teaching of Greek, and intending to eliminate it, detailing the preliminaries of this law on education, and the arguments of both those who supported it and were against it. Pál Gyulai’s motivation was to point out that the teaching and learning of the Greek language meant in fact the understanding of what a general education, its nature and culture-shaping role really meant.

Nine authors analyze the translations of literary works in various languages, according to a given point of view. **Ildikó Varga P.** proposes to answer the question why, of the five Hungarian translations of the Finnish poem *Kalevala*, the fourth one belonging to István Rácz can be regarded as the most successful ever since its publication in 1976. Ildikó Varga P. compares the Hungarian translations with each other and with the original from a philological point of view. As a result of this comparison, it is revealed that the secret of the success of Rácz’s translation lies in the use of alliteration and common language. **Tímea Berki** examines the first Hungarian translations of the poems of Romanian national poet Mihai Eminescu and the translators themselves, with regard to their profession. The keyword in the approach of these early translations of Eminescu in Hungarian literature is their reception. Analyzing the early translations, the author presents the changing of theories of translation from the concept of equivalence to the concept of translation as a mediation between cultures.

**Orsolya Antal** rereads a text translated into Hungarian in the 18th century, attributed to Sándor Szacsavay, entitled *Zakkariásnak levelei* (The letters of Zechariah). The Hungarian translator managed to create an entertaining reading in a genre previously unknown in Hungarian literature: the satire. **Emese Egyed** presents the circumstances of the translation into Hungarian of the scandalous Voltairean work *La Pucelle d’Orleans* (The virgin of Orleans). The Hungarian translator was Count János Fekete, he also disseminated the translation in manuscript form, and sent it, albeit unsuccessfully, to the *Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvővédő Társaság* (The Hungarian Society in Transylvania for the Cultivation of Language) with the hope of being published in print. In addition to the practice of translation, János Fekete also formulated the conditions of a good translation, the task of a translator, which betray a lot about the translation practices of the age. Namely, three things are important: empathy between the author and the translator; expressiveness, the translator must pay attention to the target language audience; and the translator’s advanced level of language knowledge both of the native and the foreign language. **Anita Széll** compares the use of set phrases in Gáspár Heltai’s translation of *Ponciánus császár históriája* (The history of Emperor Poncian) and its German original. The use of set phrases as idiomatic expressions prove a highly advanced level of the knowledge of a particular language. The comparison makes us conclude that the Hungarian text translated by the German native Gáspár Heltai is richer in set phrases and more varied in its expressiveness than the original German text, therefore we might have the impression that Heltai’s native language is actually Hungarian, and not the Transylvanian Saxon (that is, German) language. **Anna-Rózsika Szilágyi** analyzes the legend collection of ecclesiastical writer András Illyés from Csíkszentgyörgy, more precisely its part dealing with saints and apostles, focusing
on how the meaning of biblical places, the translatability of their meaning changes from age to age. **Franciska Kónya** examines the work entitled *Jó akarat* (Good will) of the 17th-century Jesuit writer István Tarnóczy. The writer used very many Latin citations, almost all of which he also translated into Hungarian, completing and explaining them. This bilingualism within one work is due to the fact that the Hungarian language was subordinated at that time to Latin. **Júlia Demeter Volkán** investigates the translating, interpreting, and coding operations of Mihály Szatmáréméti in the preface of his collection of sermons entitled *A négy evangélisták szerint való dominica* (Sunday sermon according to the Four Evangelists). **Ágnes Korondi** compares translations of Bonaventure in late medieval Hungarian monastic codices. Several parts of Bonaventure’s work *De perfectione vitae ad sorores*, written for nuns, were translated in the Weszprémi, Lebkowicz, and Debreceni codices. Translations of the *Regula novitiorum* appear in the Vitkovics and Érsekújvári codices. The translators and copyists of the texts were probably nuns. The Hungarian translations differ to a lesser or greater extent, translations of other texts were also included next to Bonaventure’s texts. The language and concepts used in the translations were greatly influenced by the target audience, the aim of the translation, and the translation practices of the age.

Four authors dealt with a chosen writer’s translation activity. **Hedvig Dáné** analyzed the correspondence of Péter Bod, 46 published letters, of which 43 were written in Hungarian and 3 in Latin. Hedvig Dáné gives a detailed account of the addressees, the subject of the letters, and their language. The functions of letterwriting are information, culture mediation, contact, and at the same time they offer insight into Péter Bod’s private life, placed in the service of public affairs. **Zsombor Tóth**’s case study examines the main acts of Mihály Cserei’s use of literacy: writing, reading, and translation. By these acts Cserei connected the assimilated mass of knowledge with his experiences in such a way that the subject, the I assimilating and perceiving the experience was perpetuated in a narrative way. **Kinga Papp** proposes to highlight, by the correspondence of Antal and Lajos Kálnoki, father and son, both at the son’s young age and maturity, the function of writing in family roles and discourses, and the mediation or solution of family conflicts. **Csilla Gábor** summarizes the lessons of the juxtaposition of two texts, the third part of Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae* and his hymns for the Office of Corpus Christi. Thomas Aquinas presents the mystery of the Eucharist in the two texts with a different purpose and in a different language: the *Summa* uses firstly the fundamental categories of Aristotelian philosophy, while the hymns use a biblical language and a set of biblical motifs, imposing a conduct of wonder and worship.

**Gergely Tamás Fazakas** analyzes early modern prayers.

The authors of the volume wish to answer timely questions of our age. An up-to-date approach to the theory of translation cannot be separated from the interpretation of the concept of culture. Translation is not merely a metaphor of the mediation of another culture or a linguistic problem to be solved, but it is a more complicated issue than that. In the absence of a historical and cultural understanding, not even a philologist can be successful in understanding the meaning of texts. Literary texts abound in symbolic information sources, which are models of reality, cultural patterns. These cultural patterns create meanings, as long as they yield objective concepts about social reality. If we ignore and fail to understand the operative intention of symbols, these
hidden pieces of information, and if we cannot make abstractions, then we shall not be able to understand the message of texts.

“Because whatever they may say about the insufficiency of translation, this is and will be one of the most important and respectable things in the world of the universal spirit”\(^1\) – Attila Benő quotes Goethe.

Translated by Emese Czintos
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