Explorations in Eurolexicography
On the pains of the lexicographer
as seen from his laboratory

Introduction
Many thanks indeed to the organizers of this international symposium on eurolinguistics and to its president, P. Sture Ureland, for inviting me to speak on the subject of the forthcoming vol. 1 of my European Dictionary. To our friend Sture I am indebted for introducing me to eurolinguistics, and for encouraging me to cultivate a field of studies in which I had no particular training.

Obviously, I have to justify myself, for attempting to compile a dictionary, since, as you know, I am not a philologist but an historian of social and political ideas, and since a serious scholar cannot presume to plough a field which is not his own, and in which, in any case, he is not supposed, from a purely scientific point of view, to have much to add.

But let me reassure my European colleagues, and the linguists and philologists, in particular. I am not poaching in a field that is not my own. I have conceived my dictionary with a social and political aim, i.e., with the aim of influencing European society and civilization, as we say in Italian, con il fine di agire sul piano della società e della civiltà europea, and if you prefer French, avec le but d’agir sur le plan de la société et civilisation européenne. This represents a severe limitation to our capacity of expression, but the world has been dramatically changing during the last fifty years, and the world of learning plods along with difficulty. This shows, once more, that philosophy is like the owl of Minerva in Hegel’s philosophy, the owl that begins flying only at sunset, when the events have already taken place (meaning that it is the consciousness of the past, and not an active intervention on the present).

In sum, European and Western civilization must be considered in their entirety, in the Hegelian category of Gesamtheit. Not to understand this, means not to understand both modern civilization and the world in which we live. Therefore, ours is a worthwhile effort, even if it doesn’t add much to the science of linguistics itself. Nevertheless it adds much, very much, to European civiliza-

Need for a European lexicon
Having become familiar, throughout my career, with so many texts and with so many languages, I have obviously reached my own conclusions.

The first, and most important, is that European, not to say Western civilization, must be considered as a unified entity, as I have repeatedly maintained in my papers, delivered in international symposia. And, regretfully, I have to admit that this idea, this concept, is still in part alien even to a large part of the world of learning.

We are certainly the heirs of our national histories, and all of us have a mother tongue, that has been shaped through the centuries within our nations, when there were very few contacts in our continent. This represents a severe limitation to our capacity of expression, but the world has...
tion, to the training of young generations, to the ‘advancement of learning’, as Lord Francis Bacon would call it, or to the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, as the title of Lessing’s work states, or to the ‘avancement, i.e. civilisation, refinement,’ to cite from the Italian of the eighteenth century. And this is exactly my aim: i.e., *Das Bestimmung des Gelehrten, or the Vocation of the Schollar*, in J. G. Fichte’s words. Whether my efforts are to be successful or not, only time will tell.

As Hume said of Ferguson’s *Civil Society*, which he severely criticized, and whose publication he even tried to prevent, “we shall see, by the Duration of its Fame, whether or not I am mistaken”. So we will eventually see whether, in compiling this work, a bold endeavour “that hath made/ Both heaven and earth co-partners in its toil/ And with lean abstinence, through many a year”*, I have been mistaken or not.

A difficult work

In the meantime, while working hard and systematically, I have had to face numerous problems. At a certain moment I have felt myself “like a man struggling through many a year”**, I have been mistaken. Its first edition sold only 2,500 copies, its second, sixty three editor-years. And Noah Webster’s *Dictionary*, which represents the 20% of the total, needed nine years, working with the help of the six ‘harmless drudges’. In total, thirty six editor-years. And Noah Webster’s *Dictionary* (1828) took eighteen years to complete, but was poorly received. Its first edition sold only 2,500 copies, and Webster had to mortgage his house to develop a second edition (1840). When he died (1843), plagued by debts, his efforts were still unrecognized. And the “Webster’s third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged (commonly known as Webster's third, or W3), 1961, was edited by Philip Babcock Gove and a team of lexicographers who spent 757 editor-years and 3,5 million”**.

But, still, the question is: why attempt such a difficult work, why commit your-
substantial unity of our past history), and ‘cultural’ and ‘political’ (of helping to create it), is nevertheless intellectually challenging, although, admittedly, not particularly appealing to the general public which provides the market for this work.

**Summarizing**

Summarizing, a few points can be made.

a) As I have said above, my main aim is that of influencing European civilization. Samuel Johnson had a purely linguistic aim, i.e. that of codifying the English language, since the concept of social sciences was alien to him and to his century. When he published his *Dictionary*, in 1755, Adam Ferguson was just thinking of European history until the separation that the ordinary reader could believe. Russian language presents us with deep similarities, deeper than the Cyrillic character Russian language presents us with, for example, beyond the origin of the social sciences. For example, beyond the years later (1767), offered insights into the concept of society, and marked the 

b) European languages are substantially similar, in the sense that they have a common history. For example, beyond the Cyrillic character Russian language presents us with deep similarities, deeper than the ordinary reader could believe. Russian history was in fact no more than European history until the separation that ensued after the tragic events of the early 20th century, and that lasted some generations, but that the present generation is rapidly overcoming.

c) In order to influence European society and the world of learning, I had obviously to conceive a dictionary which is ‘marketable’. In no case it will in fact exceed 1,500 pages, to which 300 pages of translations into Russian could be added. In sum, the size of an ordinary dictionary. And one should consider that in Europe, including Russia, there are 600 million people, among them a large percentage of knowledgeable people. A sophisticated world of learning even in America could not ignore such an instrument of consultation, of communication and of training. And the problem is how to train intellectuals to be authentically European, beyond a nationalistic mentality that many, unfortunately, still retain. This could be facilitated by a new, systematic dictionary, that will boost the idea of the unity of European languages and tradition.

In Europe, not to say in the West, people need understand each other, and it is illusory to think that in the future, i.e. in three or four generations, people will still speak in their own elaborated national languages. The phenomenon of cultural unification is moving forward relentlessly, and one cannot ignore it. And a dictionary like this is substantially something that European civilization needs more than ever.

d) Therefore, it is a first step towards more complex dictionaries, that will be compiled and come into use for the future generations. It is a forerunner, no doubt, its aim being that of systematically considering affinities and diversities in European vocabulary, of helping to find, and save, what is shared in common. Hence its social and cultural relevance, in the widest possible sense.

e) The title of my paper, suggested by our distinguished colleague and friend P. Sture Úrneland, is *Explorations in Eurolexicography*. And European lexicography is certainly a new science, which presents us with very few studies.

National philologies are, in fact, still predominant, and there remains a lack of real studies on Europeanism. It is in fact extremely difficult, even for the few, outstanding scholars, to take into account the whole of European history and tradition. Nevertheless we should now consider Europe as a unified entity, since the ‘century of nations’ is over, and we are at the dawn of a new world. And national philologies can underlie only in part such a dictionary as ours, for which an extensive knowledge of European civilization is nevertheless essential, while we need to look beyond, not behind, ourselves.

f) Are we trying to elaborate a new language of learning, or are we simply recognizing the movements of the spontaneous, uncontrollable forces of society, in the sense that we limit ourselves to record the vocabulary current today? Both answers could be justified, we believe, although the second alternative is more plausible. We are in fact trying to compile an instrument of consultation, whose aim is that of accompanying the process of unification of the European languages, that is on its way, boosting the consciousness we have of it, rather than that of creating a purely literary language, or an artificial one, as Edmund Burke would call it.

**Editorial policy**

Along with a particular aim, there must be, especially in a dictionary, an editorial policy, whose main lines I will try to explain here.

The first enemy, in such a kind of work, paradoxically is the computer, that has, by contrast, the incomparable merit of rendering it possible. Had Samuel Johnson had a computer, he would have achieved much more, no doubt. Nevertheless, even to the most skilled scholars it becomes sometimes complicated to make it work properly.

So, how many times have I written the Italian adjective *maturo*, and the software, that is, needless to say, American, has changed it into the English *mature*. As for the French word *dépendance*, the computer automatically corrects it into English *dependence*. When writing the Spanish *favor*, the computer corrects into *favour*. So for Italian *futuro-future*, etc. And so *centre* and *center*, and countless words.

And still, I confess, I don’t know whether it is possible to switch the orthographic corrector off, since a word in English, for example, is followed by a Spanish or by a German word, and this changes the rules. Therefore, I have had to accept the risk, recording each word as soon as writing it, and repeatedly checking the spelling. The publisher, I am sure, from a technical point of view is much better equipped.

As for Latin, as I have explained in the preface to the forthcoming vol. I, I have followed the Oxford method, replacing the Georges method, that is current in Italy, Germany, Spain and France. This is justified by the fact that I am compiling a dictionary on the basis of English as langue de départ. And both for Greek and Latin my strategy has been that of giving the essential information, because I am not compiling a dictionary of Greek or Latin, in which each accent or quantity of the syllable must be marked. This is, obviously, also the method of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, that I have consulted in the CD-ROM, second edition, version 4.

As for the etymologies, mine is a work of compilation, and cannot be based on original research, which is impossible, quite impossible, for one man. No one, in fact, would be able to consult the scientific literature in the five principal European traditions, adding his own personal conclusions. Therefore, I have had to rely upon the current instruments of consultation and, over the years, texts like Chantraine, Ernout-Meillet, Glare, Liddell-Scott, Kluge, Pokorny, Barnhart, and many others, have filled my shelves. Often I have been able to consult the most recent literature, but this has taken place unsystematically, as I willingly admit, and as any serious scholar well realizes. Somebody could observe that, while I was compiling this first part, an ‘historiographic revolution’ has silently taken place, in this field as in all the other fields of learning. My answer is that hopefully after me, if not necessarily with me, somebody will resume, or rather continue, this work with the help of a team of expert etymologists, each of them trained in his own field of study. Nevertheless today learning advances so rapidly, that subsequent editions are necessary for many books, this being the case, in particular, for dictionaries.

Last. This is a work of minute details. But, how much attention can be expected to be at the command of one man? How much can an ordinary scho-
lar, working without any help, be reasonably expected to achieve and to do? And how many scholars, let me ask, would be able to compile a dictionary like this, without any faults, if not without any errors? Certainly, as I have told you, a number of distinguished colleagues and friends have given me their help and advice, but the ultimate responsibility lies with me. And I am sure that my dictionary marks the beginning of a new series of dictionaries and the end of bilingual dictionaries that will become less and less useful, and will be committed to the history of lexicography, to the history of linguistics.

Therefore, to the reviewers I have the following say. The problem is not that of the details, where they will find much to object to, and maybe even errors. The problem is that of the real aim of the work, whether it has been achieved or not. And I am confident that future generations will recognize my efforts towards giving my own contribution to the world of learning and to European civilization. And I remain convinced that my work has great potentialities and, for that reason, cannot be doomed to failure.

Real languages
Editorial policy means also, first and foremost, how to render into the four principal European languages the English entry, which is the basis of the dictionary. And more than once I have been told, for example, and by a native speaker, that “this word exists only in the dictionaries”, in the sense that it is not in frequent use and, consequently, is scarcely understandable for any ordinary speaker. Since I am advocating not only a language of learning, but also a dictionary of real European languages nowadays, I have had to reconcile opposite requirements. For example, consider the entry ancillary. I have translated it into Spanish as anciliar, dependiente, the first being a literary word, scarcely understandable for the ordinary Spanish reader, who understands better auxiliar, adicional, subsidiario/a, etc. I have rendered it into Italian as ancillare, into French as ancillaire, in both cases with a literary word. If by not recording the Spanish ancilar, and replacing it, e.g., with auxiliar, I would render the concept more readily understandable, but I would also discard a word that is actually shared in common. And this is far from being my aim. Furthermore, auxiliar better renders auxiliary, adicional renders additional, and so on.

Therefore, I have chosen first of all words that are as similar as possible, although one may object to their real use in a particular language. Nevertheless languages evolve, and in Europe we need to know, and are led every day towards knowing, a vocabulary which is as much as possible common to all of us. An approach to the problem, that would not respond to this essential need, would be meaningless. I could continue with the same subject, giving countless examples of the way in which I have translated a word, but it would be pointless, since I would have to scrutinize each entry. But, in this field, much is a matter of personal judgement, and an agreement on particular points is often difficult to reach.

Dictionaries
Needless to say, while working I have become an expert on dictionaries, and, more than once, on subsequent editions of the same dictionary. So that I could now review several dictionaries, that I have consulted with a professional eye. See, for example, the Collins Spanish Dictionary second ed. (1988, repr. 1991) and the ninth ed., Collins Spanish Dictionary. Complete & Unabridged (2009). It is somewhat surprising that in eighteen years the publisher has been able to publish seven editions of the same dictionary, but this is perhaps due to the miracle of computers, thanks to which, with a few minor changes, a publisher can boast of giving to the market yet another edition. But the so called new editions are, in the reality, no more than the reprints of previous editions, to which a few entries have been added, while a few errors have been corrected. So, for example, Le Petit Robert, which appears every year with the year, 2011, 2012, 2013, etc, marked in red colour on the hard cover. Quite the opposite is the case of the Webster third. Unabridged (1961), since the publisher reprinted the text every ten or fifteen years with only minor corrections, while the staff of the Merriam-Webster has been working on a fourth edition (W4) since 2008 but, this November 2012, a publication date has not yet been set. As for the ninth ed. (2009) of the Collins-Spanish, I wonder whether it was really necessary to change so many translations in comparison with the second ed. For example, the English word brasserie, now in use in English, but of French origin, is translated into Spanish with brasería, no longer with cervecería. But for brasserie there is no entry at all in the Diccionario de la Lenga Española de the Real Academia Española (2001), as there is no entry at all in some other dictionaries that fill my shelves. The editors nevertheless render brewer with cervecero, and brewery with cervecería. Under breath they give aliento, but respiración, the word which is better understandable to the European speakers, disappears. Extensamente is rendered with en línea, and broadly, de amplias miras, becomes de minus amplas. In the name of the equality of sexes the ed. 2009 never misses the feminine genus. So with carpintero m, is given also carpintera f, and so on for many names and professions that are typical of men. The same with carrier that is rendered with transportista m/f, while cartographer becomes cartógrafo.

I am not engaged in social engineering, but the rendering centre-half, centrehalves, as <medio m/f centro>, appears rather curious to me. Certainly women can also play football, but somebody may judge it unhelpful, or unnecessary, to indicate the feminine genus in such a sport as boxing, where boxer is rendered as boxeadora, for example. After all, some minor but essential difference will continue to exist between men and women, hopefully at least during this our present generation.

Similarly, charlatan is rendered with charlatan/ana, and clown with payaso m/f and clown m/f. But we are kind to women, and we have found surprising an adjective that we find hard to apply to the ‘kind sex’, because we are cavalleros, to borrow from Edmund Burke’s vocabulary.

I have translated the English adjective conniving as conivente, cómplice, but the Collins 9th ed. translates it with intrigante, mañoso, neither of which, in my judgment, renders the meaning, and mañoso is not recorded in the Diccionario de la Real Academia Española and in other dictionaries.

As for cut-off, the entry considers only the verbal/verb as verb in the current English Dictionaries record just the noun, clearly because, in real English, this word is mostly used as a noun. Although it has been impossible to consult the intermediate editions, a conclu-
sion can still be drawn, i.e. that the policy of the editors has been not that of updating, but that of renewing radically the product. And the editorial policy of the present author recalls to mind the exhortation of Chancellor Ferrer, in Manzoni’s *The Betrothed*, ‘adante, Pedro, con juicio. Si puedes’, i.e., ‘go forward, Peter, prudently. If you can’.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* The *Oxford English Dictionary* is certainly a major work, that commands respect, although the saying *aliquote dormit Homerus* can be applied to it, as to any great work. The general public in Great Britain is, or was, convinced, until recently, that the Romans were not really settlers, but just guests who, at a certain moment, left the country with their light luggage, leaving nothing, or nearly nothing, behind them. But archaeological discoveries, most of them recent, show the contrary, while the English vocabulary itself, currently in use, is at least 70% of Latin origin, and it is certainly much more so, if we consider the vocabulary used by more educated people.

Each of us is somehow the product of his own national history and training, and risks being partial towards his own origin. So, since I am from Rome, and I have spent thirty three years of my life teaching at the university ‘La Sapienza’, I have spent thirty three years of my life teaching at the university ‘La Sapienza’, and this last meaning becomes apparently clear, but the Italian *laurea* or *lauream* flesh and to Greek *kérrh* cut short; *carnival*: according to OED the MedL forms ‘appear to originate in a Latin “carne-levare or Italian carne levare … meaning “the putting away or removal of flesh (as food)” …’. We must therefore entirely reject the suggestion founded on another sense of levare ‘to relieve, ease’, that *carnelevatum* meant ‘the solace of the flesh (i.e. body) before the austerities of Lent’.

This conclusion is highly disputable, because the word *levare* in Latin means ‘to lift or raise up’, but it had not necessarily reject the suggestion founded on another sense of levare ‘to relieve, ease’, that *carnelevatum* meant ‘the solace of the flesh (i.e. body) before the austerities of Lent’.

Therefore, it gives no etymology at all, considering as superfluous any such attempt. No doubt the etymology remains unclear, but the Italian *caccio*, adj & past part. *caotto*, and *F caccione*, literary words meaning obligation, deriving from L *cogere*, *caccio*, to oblige to do something, appear as cognate with *coccio*;

*cochinal*: ignores entirely Greek *kókōkos*; grain, seed, of the pomegranate, and *kókōkous* scarlet. It is unclear whether Greek is ignored by the etymologists who have compiled the entries under c, or whether ignoring Greek is the policy of the OED;

*codeine* (1881); curiously, strangely, gives Greek *kókōkia* not earlier French *cédine* (1832), which is its immediate antecedent; a sudden conversion to Greek, such that the etymologist forgets, or neglects, even French?

*compassion*: stops at French *compassion*, late Latin *compassi-ōnem*. Should be added that the Latin word is a loan translation of Greek *συμπαθεία*;

*compatriot*: gives French *compatriote*, Lat *compatriota*, not Greek *συμπα- τριότες*, but refers to *patriota*, where it gives nevertheless Greek etymology; *complete*: according to OED first occurs in 1530, in Psalms 491/2; according to Barnhart (1988), ‘about 1384, in Wycliffe’s writings’;

*complex*: gives stem of Latin *complecti*, *com + plectere*, but omits Greek *πλέκω* plain;

*complicate*: gives Latin *com + plectere*, but should refer to *plecere*, *plecto*, Greek *πλέκω*
concatenation: according to OED it is from Latin concatenatio, a word which does not occur at all in Glare, but in Niermeyer as Late Latin, instead; concern: gives con+cernère, not Greek κόψω, separate, distinguish; concomitant: ignores French concomitant, records Latin concomit+-ānem, but Latin conames-conmiti should be added; condescend: again a confusion between Latin and late Latin; OED writes that it is from Latin condescéndere, and that this word first occurs in Cassiodorus. Since Cassiodorus lived 485–580, it is clearly late Latin, or medieval Latin; in fact, the entry is ignored by Glare, while it occurs in Niermeyer as late Latin, instead; condition: indicates Middle French condition, from Latin conditionem spice, from condire to season or flavour; should add that condire is a variant of condère store up for future use; condolence: according to OED condolē re is Latin, but it is recorded by Niermeyer as Late Latin; condominium: indicates modern Latin con+dominium, but a more complete etymology should be given, adding late Latin condimentum, Latin dominium, da minus, domus, Greek δόμος and δῆμα house; condor: records Spanish cándor and Persian cintar, but, strangely, omits the accents; conflagration: gives Latin conflagrātum, flagrātum, but not Greek φλέγω burn, burn up; conflict: gives Latin conflict, not Greek φλέεω chafing, rubbing; confluence: gives late Latin confluēntia, Latin conflātus, not Greek φλέεω and φλαέω boil over, bubble; conform: gives French conformer, Latin conformātum, con+ forma, not Greek μορφή, probable root of Latin forma; congenital: gives Latin congenitus, conwith+genitus born, past part. of γενήτευμα to create, to be born, but not Greek γί νομαι come into being; under genus it gives nevertheless Greek γένος; conjoin: gives Latin conjungère to join together, not Greek κοινοῦμαι yoke, put to; conjugate verb: gives Latin coningāre, French conjuger, Latin ingumn yoke, not Greek κοινουγοῦ yoke; consider: from Old French considerer, 14c in Litté; although we have been unable to consult the Litté, it is unlikely that Old French uses the accent on le g: the Dictionnaire du Moyen Français by A. J. Greimas and T. M. Keane does not use the accent on the “é”, and writes considérer; conspicuous: gives just Latin conspicuus, but ignores Greek σκέπασμα look about carefully; constellation: gives constellātio-nem as Latin, but Glare does not record it at all, not considering it as classical Latin, and Niermeyer records it as late Latin; consternation: gives just Latin consternatio, but Greek στόρμαζω to lay down, to level, its probable cognate, should be added; constrain: gives Latin constringere, but the Greek cognate στρογγυλός, round, spherical, should be mentioned; contemplate: gives a history of the word in English, but not a real etymology: this is from con-intensive + templum, which is defined by Glare as “the area of sky or land defined by the augur, within which he took the auspices”, its immediate antecedent being the Greek τέμπων cut, di vide, and τέμνειν, defined by Liddell-Scott as “a piece of land cut off and assigned as an official domain”; contend: gives Latin contendère but not Greek τείνω to stretch by force; context: gives Latin continere to join by weaving, con+ teûre to weave, but ignores Greek τέκτων, carpenter, joiner, and τέχνη, art, skill; contrite: gives Latin contritus, con+terēre, but not Greek τείνω oppress, distress; convenience: gives Latin convenire, vent re, but not Greek τείνω to come, its probable cognate; cooper according to OED it is “apparently of Low German origin”, and goes back as far as medieval Latin capitalis; but Glare records caput as classical Latin; furthermore, since Modern German is Käfer, why write this word in lower case, which is grammatically incorrect? One of the points unclear to the present author, is why the OED constantly writes the German substantives in lower case, while initial letters should be written in capitals; coracle: writes that it appears in 7c in Adamnan in the Latinized form curna, this notwithstanding it takes for granted that the word derives from Welsh corogl of 16c: its appearing in Latin in 7c should suggest that it is cognate with Latin corium leather and Greek κορίτσι, while only in 16c it appears in the Welsh form corogl; obviously, OED entirely ignores this probable derivation; correct: gives Latin corregre and regère, not Gr ἰσχύω reach, stretch out; cosmology: spells Greek κόσμος + λόγια, while it should be λογία, late spelling of λογία with the accent on i; cave: according to OED this word is “common Teutonic”, but the probable cognates Κουβάρη to lie down, to be in bed or on one’s couch, and Greek γυπώ vulture’s nest, should be mentioned; coverlet: the meaning of coverlet is defined as “the uppermost covering of a bed, a quilt”. But the early form coverlite appears to represent an OF *cover-lit (from coverir to cover + lit bed). Examples of coverlet, coverlet occur in 14th-century Anglo-French, but these may be from English. (Modern French couvre-lit is a neologism, suggested perhaps in part by English coverlet). The variants in let, -light, -led, lid, etc, show that at an early date the composition of the word was unknown. As for the word lit, the OED writes as follows: lit n obs excl dial. [a. ON lit-colour... corr. etymologically to OE and early ME wile]. Meanings: 1) a colour, dye, hue; also a stain; 2) dye-stuff; also, a batch of dyeing. As for the word white, the OED gives the following etymology: "after OE wite, OFris wite, OS witi etc", and the meanings: 1) Beauty, splendour; 2) face, countenance". We are not calling into question the ability of the etymologist of the OED, who could reply that, after all, the meaning does not necessarily imply etymology, i.e. the history of a word. Nevertheless the French word lit is after Latin lectus bed and Greek λέκτος couch, bed, and the English cover, French couvrir, is after Latin cooperir to cover; cress: OÆ crese is cognate with Greek γράστικα grass, green fodder; OED entirely ignores this point, and maintains that even Romanic words like Italian crescione, French cresson, MedL. crosisnas, etc, are generally held to be from German, though popularly associated with Latin crescère to grow". Sorry, but the Italian crescione is given by the most recent Italian dictionaries as deriving from Old French cresson. Question: the Greek and Latin origin of this word is just a popular credence, therefore erroneous? crown: gives Latin corōna not Greek κορώνη; crumb: gives Middle Dutch crarte, Dutch krante, Middle Low German krö ne, etc, and then writes that "the ulterior derivation is obscure". The “ulterior derivation” is in Latin grānum, Greek γρύμη, then in Indo-European;
crust: gives Latin crusta and Old French couert, but not Greek κρυστάλλος; rock-crystal; culvert: according to OED, it is "a word of obscure origin, used c. 1770 in connexion with canal construction", and is defined as "a channel, conduit, or tunnelled drain of masonry or brickwork conveying a stream of water across or beneath a canal, railway embankment, or road". Nevertheless in French, in XIIc, the word couvert occurs in the sense of logement, retraite. In XVc the same word is used in a technological sense, meaning couverture du toit. The ultimate source is no doubt Latin coöpëratus covered, past part. of coopère to cover; cumin: gives the Latin cuminum and Greek κύμιον, and after giving German translations, OHG chumin, cumin, MHG kämel, Swedish kummin, etc, adds that "the word has also come down in the translations, OHG and MHG; Arabic kummân, Arabic kammin and their cognates." This statement is surprising. If the word is first Hebraic, Arabic, Greek, Latin, Romanic, it cannot have "come down in the Romanic languages": from Germanic, obviously, in the intention of the etymologist. It is rather likely that it was introduced into Germanic languages from its Greek and Latin roots. After all, there are no records in Anglo-Saxon, but only in OHG and MHG; czar: OED makes of it a word which is substantially Germanic and Slavonic, writing as follows: "The Slavonic word ultimately represents the Latin Caesar, but came, according to Miloslisch, through the medium of a Germanic language... cf Gothic Kaiser, OHG Keiser, etc". The point is that the Goths flourished after the Romans, and Old High German refers to the period 500-1015 AD. After Augustus, all the Roman Emperors had the title Caesar (see, e.g., Suetonius, AD 69-122, De Vita Caesarum), and the Greek Καίσαρ should be mentioned. According to Ernout-Meillet the word Caesar is of Etruscan origin (the Etruscan ‘cumin’); obs: 1910;Appendix by E. Partridge (Hertfordshire, 1969).

Concluding remarks
To conclude, I shall apologize for my shortcomings, and shall apologize, once more and in particular, to my colleagues amongst the philologists and lexicographers. I have explained, in my opening pages, the reasons for my attempt, reasons that are, at one and the same time, educational, historical and political. No doubt, European civilization needs a new, more complete instrument of communication, an instrument that could be conceived by somebody whose aim is that of influencing European society and civilization. Philologists and skilled lexicographers will certainly find inadequacies, limits and, who knows?, maybe even errors in my work. After all, de minimis non curat praetor, but I don’t believe that one man, even with the generous assistance of distinguished colleagues, could actually do more. To be pessimistic, this first volume could mark the burial of a project, which would then remain as just an attempt towards the creation of a ‘European’ lexicon for the general public. It could on the other hand represent a substantial step forward. And I personally cannot believe that, as a project, it is inevitably doomed to failure.

VINCENZO MEROLLE
University of Rome ‘La Sapienza’
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At the beginning of the 18th century the modern mining industry of Russia was established and substantially developed during the century. The richest natural resources of the Empire were concentrated in the Ural region, which became the centre of Russian metallurgy, but the organizational experience of Russian mining was adopted from the leading European countries. Emperor Peter the Great invited to Russia numerous foreign specialists, mainly the Saxon, Dutch and English, as mining engineers, and a number of factories and plants were built.

By the late 18th–early 19th centuries the Ural became not only a mining centre and a strategically important region of Russia, but also a world leader in ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy. In the middle of the 18th century 4/5 of Russian iron and 100% of copper were produced in the Ural, and the Russian Empire got ahead of England and became the second in the world, after Sweden, in cast iron production. At the turn of the 18th–19th centuries Russia took the first place in the world in production of ferrous metals, because it produced over a third of world smelted cast iron and about a quarter of world copper. It was also a time of intensive geological and scientific studies of mining and active rationalization of this sphere of industry.

Foreign specialists played a leading role in the development of Ural. They were not only mining engineers, but also scholars, teachers, doctors and pharmacists as well. One of the outstanding Europeans, who came to the Ural in the 18th century, was the Austrian scientist Benedict von Herrmann. His scientific studies and practical activities were extremely valuable for the Ural region and Russia in general.

Benedict Franz Johann von Herrmann (in Russian – Ivan Philippovich Guerman) was born in 1755 in Styria, the largest industrial area of Austria, in the family of an officer. Herrmann’s parents died when the son was in infancy, so he was brought up by some relatives, who gave him a good education. He studied at school in Murau for several years, then at the monastery school. Afterwards he entered the service of the Duchy of Schwarzenberg in Graz, attending at the same time university lectures. Probably during this period he decided the main disciplines to which he was to devote his future life. These were metallurgy, mineralogy and chemistry. He also worked hard to learn languages. He spoke fluent German, Russian, French, Italian and Latin.

In 1777 Herrmann moved to Vienna, attending university lectures on mineralogy and mining. Three years later he travelled through Germany, Hungary and Italy, familiarizing himself with the metallurgical industry of those states and gaining the knowledge of leading members in the Mining Academy of Shemnitz. In 1781 he lectured on technology in the university of Vienna, submitting to the Government a project to organize the Chair of technology, but unsuccessfully. Apparently the reason was that he had fallen into disgrace after a critical report on his travels through Austria.

After this unsuccessful attempt Herrmann moved to Poland, where he visited the Polish salt industry. His visit to Krakow salt deposits in 1781 was an essential event in his life. He met there a man called Karosy, who introduced him to the Court of Saint-Petersburg. Thus Russia became Herrmann’s second homeland, where his bright career began.

An outstanding scholar
The study of metallurgy and mining in Graz, Vienna and Shemnitz, provided the basis of Herrmann’s scientific and practical work in Russia, where he became an outstanding scholar, and organized the mining industry. Gradually he became one of the first-rate experts of Ural and Siberian mineral wealth. According to official calculations, he devoted 26 years, 9 months and 10 days to mining, out of the 32 years of his service in Russia.

His practical work began in 1783, when he was sent to the Ural by Empress Catherine II, to familiarize himself with the mining industry and to describe mines and plants. He also had to choose the place for building a new steel factory, in fact the first specialized steel plant in the Ural. It was decided to build it in Pyshmink, where there was a gold-washing plant. Herrmann was responsible for its construction. At first the Austrian scientist could scarcely speak Russian. So he had to have recourse for assistance to one of the mining officers of German descent. At that time almost all the high positions at Pyshmink gold washing plants were held by descendants of Saxon masters who worked there by contract since the beginning of the 18th century. One of them, Peter Sturm, supported Herrmann for half a week, but he had almost forgotten his native language. Nevertheless during this short time he tried to do his best to show the factories to Herrmann. Then he was replaced by another mining officer.

The reconstruction of Pyshmink dam and building of the steel factory began in 1785. Earlier metallurgy plants had been converted into gold washing factories in the Ural (Uktuss plant), but

Life and activity of an Austrian Scientist in Russia in the late 18th century: Benedict Franz Johann von Herrmann.*
never the contrary had taken place. In order to make this experiment Herrmann was granted a rank of court counselor and a post of director of the factory to be build. About 200 workers from Yekaterinburg were engaged in the construction of the steel plant. The Senate also committed to Herrmann the management of Yekaterinburg and Kamensk plants.

According to some historians, Herrmann differed greatly from the Russian and German managers of the old school. He had a highly organized mind; he was sensitive and able to hold back. At first, these qualities of his character couldn’t replace the severity, exactness and roughness of the former directors. The factory administrators sometimes treated him with irony, and the workers left the premises when they wanted. Obviously because of this the Pyshminsk factory started working almost a year later than planned.

The factory was built on the Pyshma River, not far from Yekaterinburg. The quality of the steel produced there was rather good, not worse than that of foreign production. But, unfortunately, the factory was burned down in 1792. The reasons were unknown, but it wasn’t a rare case in the 18th century. Steel production was reorganized on Nizhneiskiy plant.

The Nizhneiskiy Mint

In 1795 Herrmann was engaged in a new task: he was responsible for the building of Nizhneiskiy Mint. A year later, in 1796, he was recalled from the Ural, returning to Saint-Petersburg, where he combined both scientific and the administrative work. In 1798 he was appointed a member of Berg-Collegium (Mining governing body of Russia), in 1799 he became the inspector of Petersburg Mining School, and in August 1800 he was sent to supervise the Olonets gun factories as a head of commission.

In 1801 Herrmann was twice promoted for his scientific work Compositions of Siberian mines and factories... and his contribution to the development of Ural mining industry. A year later, when a radical reorganization of the governing bodies of mining in Russia took place, Herrmann became a new Yekaterinburg mining chief. By this time he knew the region well and had already got the title of academician. As a mining chief Herrmann had to solve a main problem. By Government order, factories had to give up the labour of the peasants, who were attached to the plants for life (“attached peasants”), replacing them by the so-called “indispensable workers”, who enjoyed more freedom and received a status of factory workmen. Executing this order was difficult in the Ural region, where ¾ of the population were “attached peasants”. The procedure of replacing them with “indispensable workers” needed numerous calculations. But, thanks to Herrmann’s orders, this hard work was greatly facilitated.

During the first years of his management, Herrmann paid much attention to the development of the gold-mining industry in the Ural. New factories were built. He took also measures to provide Yekaterinburg mint with advanced equipment.

The first printing house

He introduced a main innovation in Yekaterinburg. In 1803 he established the first printing house in the city. Local documents could be printed. This measure helped to accelerate their circulation, usually rendered slow by the bureaucratic system. Furthermore, the printing office published special literature, including books by Herrmann himself.

During his service in the Ural region he cared particularly for the social welfare of the workers. He published a statute of food-supply of workers (1780s) and established hospitals and nursing homes. He paid attention to the problem of education and public health. For example, he introduced vaccination against smallpox. He opened schools for children of workmen, officials and mining officers in the Ural region, since he realized that they would have influenced the development of mining. The Austrian scientist was an initiator of the establishment of Mining Council under the Yekaterinburg mining authority. The Council consisted of the managers of the largest factories and governing officers. It regarded the reconstruction of plants, rationalization of technology and planning. This was a progressive measure for the development of the mining industry.

Scientific and geological knowledge

Herrmann improved the scientific and geological knowledge about mining. In 1809 he sent a group of 20 young men – mine surveyor students and graduates from Petersburg Mining School – to an expedition around the Yekaterinburg district in order to do the mapping of mines and collect all the known rock samples, for a collection of a “Mineral cabinet” in Yekaterinburg Mining School, that he himself had established. In fact, the state geological service grew up from this “Mineral cabinet”, that later was to become a mining museum. In 1810 Herrmann was recalled once more to Saint-Petersburg. He left Yekaterinburg forever though formally he still was a mining chief. His health began to deteriorate. In 1813 he had to retire because of illness. The 30th of January 1815 he died in Petersburg.

Benedict von Herrmann was a recognized scholar, and became a corresponding member of the imperial and royal academies of sciences and societies of naturalists of Europe: of Saint-Petersburg, Moscow, Berlin, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Göttingen, Munich, Prague, Vienna and Graz. His publications numbered 59, 38 of them were in German, 16 in French and 5 in Russian. He played a significant role in the development of science. Soon after his arrival to Saint-Petersburg, in 1796, he submitted to the Academy of Sciences his works: Compositions of Siberian Mines and Factories collected by Court Counselor and Academician Ivan Herrmann, and Mineralogical travel to Siberia from 1783 to 1796, in German. His Compositions in 2 volumes was published in 7422 copies, and a year later a third part of the book was printed. In this work detailed description of several factories was combined with statistic characteristics of other plants.

In the book Description of Plants being under Yekaterinburg Mining Authority Rule Herrmann gives a description of 9 government and 113 private factories, and of Yekaterinburg gold mining. This work is a valuable source of information about the geographic location of industry, technical equipment of plants, number of workers, productivity, etc. Another relevant work of this talented Austrian scientist was the Historical tracing of mining production in the Russian Empire. Herrmann maintained that the
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The Quadruple Alliance’s Italian Investitures (1718-1727)

“Il est impossible que la passion déréglée, et l’ambition aveugle des Particuliers, puissent s’opposer longtemps aux Forces des plus grandes Puissances de l’Europe, unies pour établir la tranquillité Publique, sur des Fondements stables et solides.”

Harangue held by the Earl of Stair, British extraordinary ambassador to Louis XV, at his entrée publique, 5 February 1719

Early modern diplomacy has a bad reputation in the eyes of both political and legal historians. With rules of private law constantly invoked to cover brutal aggression, as in the case of Frederick the Great’s invasion of Silesia, treaties between monarchs are seen at best as unprotected contracts between mere physical persons, and not abstract entities. Promises were constantly broken, alliances only used as soothing words. Nevertheless, historiography has conserved the image of one exceptional episode of concord and tranquillity. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie called the immediate post-Louis XIV era of “Walpole and Fleury” the “trente heureuses”, stretching from the Peace of Utrecht (1713) to the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740). This era was, in reality, far from peaceful, with the wars of the Quadruple Alliance (1717-1720), the War of the Polish Succession (1733-1738) and the end of the Great Northern War (1700-1721). Moreover, it took until April 1725 for the main contenders from the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) to settle their differences at the so-called “Ripperda” Treaty of Vienna. However, in spite of the abovementioned armed confrontations, none of them equalled the general European wars of the 17th century. In view of the bloody battles it is doubtful whether the lack of a continental war reflected the “guerre en dentelle” or softening of military practices. I argue that the relative stability was a product of the diplomatic system, and, more precisely, of its use of interna-

periodization of mining history in Russia had the same stages as Ural’s history in the whole. The author related its beginning to the 17th century. The history of Ural metallurgy, according to him, began at the time of Peter the Great. Herrmann estimated this period as a turning point for Ural factories development. In 1810 the Historical tracing was presented to the Emperor Alexander I, who rewarded Herrmann with the Order of Anne of the 1st Grade. Speaking about Tatischev and Gennin, founders of Yekaterinburg, Herrmann came to the conclusion that the establishment of Ural metallurgy would have been impossible without the participation of foreigners.

His statistical studies are extremely useful even nowadays. They are the unique statistical sources of Ural mining history. So, for example, the Statistical description of Russia related to population, properties of the land, natural products, agriculture, mining, manufactures and trade. The activity of Herrmann in Russia is a bright example of Russian-European interaction, a process which was activated from Peter’s the Great era. The Austrian scientist was one of the Europeans who brought to Russia modern Western achievements and ideas. He was an outstanding personality: a talented and respectable scholar, a honest and intelligent man. All of Herrmann’s books were based on archival material and on his own research. The scientist always posed new challenges. Even if he wasn’t always right in his conclusions, his works are greatly significant for the development of science and of historical studies. Additionally, he greatly contributed to Russian mining and to the development of Ural region. Some historians of Yekaterinburg call the time when he was the city’s mining chief “the epoch of Herrmann”.
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nitional law. I propose to look briefly at a case which contained all possible elements for conflagration: the application of the Peace of Utrecht to Italy.

I. From Utrecht to London: Balance of Power

“Tout Prince qui ne regarde les Traités que comme de vains fantasmes qu’un instant critique a produits, & qu’un autre instant peut détruire arbitrairement au gré de l’intérêt, est non-seulement un ennemi du genre humain, mais encore un très-mauvais politique; indépendamment des considérations puisées dans l’amour de la Justice, les seuls motifs d’intérêt doivent engager les Princes à observer exactement les Traités; la mauvaise foi ne peut avoir dans les affaires d’État, qu’un succès court & passager, au lieu que la réputation bien affirmée […] Un Prince ne peut violer sa parole, sans perdre sa réputation.”

Réal de Curban, *Science du gouvernement*

Ever since Charles VIII’s 1498 invasion of Italy, the peninsula had been the theatre of confrontation between France and Habsburg, wherein the diverse sovereigns and city-states indiscriminately changed and swapped alliances. At the Peace of Utrecht (11 April 1713), the Bourbon King of Spain, Philip V, was deprived of his Italian kingdoms of Naples and Sardinia, which were acquired by Emperor Charles VI of Habsburg, Philip V’s rival during the War of the Spanish Succession. In addition to the Duchy of Milan, this made Charles VI the preponderant power in Italy. However, on 22 August 1717, a Spanish expeditionsary force landed on Sardinia. Legally Philip V and Charles VI were under an armistice, signed at Utrecht in June 1713, and proclaiming the neutrality of Italy. There had been no formal peace treaty, although the Austrian dominance had been militarily established by 1707, ten years earlier. Formally France and Britain were under the obligation to guarantee the Peace of Utrecht, and, thus, to intervene on Charles VI’s behalf. However the Emperor himself had been busy negotiating an amendment to the Italian settlement. Duke Victor Amadeus II of Savoy, seen by Britain as a stabilising buffer between France and Habsburg, had acquired the kingdom of Sicily. Charles had made abundantly clear he wanted an exchange of the poorer Sardinia for Sicily. With this movement in the background, the Farnese dynasty in Parma-Piacenza called upon Spain to intervene as upholder of the internal Italian balance. This was not per se an unpleasant thought to France and Britain, who preferred not to give the Emperor a too dominant position. Émile Bourgeois has shown in his monumental *Diplomatie secrète au XVIIIe siècle* that negotiations were going on with Spain as well as with Austria. Philip V chose the military option, but did not sideline himself entirely by doing so. Neither of the intermediary powers had an interest in seeing Austria dominate Italy. Moreover, Philip V, as Louis XIV’s grandson and uncle to the minor Louis XV, enjoyed considerable popularity in France.

In September 1717, Philip of Orléans, Regent during Louis XV’s minority, sent out his personal confidant, abbé Dubois, to London, to negotiate a peace plan with the de facto chief of the British cabinet, James Stanhope. A year earlier, both men had constructed a system of joint leadership of Europe, with the Utrecht treaties as a basis. General European peace had been tied to the succession in France and Spain. In November 1711, Britain had accepted Louis XIV’s grandson as King of Spain, but only if he renounced his rights to the French throne. In return France recognized the order of succession in Britain, established by Parliament in the Act of Settlement. These operations were far from neutral. France accepted the precedence of treaty law over the internal *lois fondamentales*, which excluded any re-nunciation to a God-established order of succession, but had to ratify the outcome of the 1688 Glorious Revolution and the definitive end of the exiled Catholic Stuart dynasty, which Louis XIV had openly supported, hosting his fellow monarch at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. Finally internal Spanish legal documents, such as the renunciation of Louis XIV’s spouse, Infanta Maria Teresa, or wills of the last Habsburg king Charles II, and his father Philip IV, had been pushed aside.

The change in French policy justified an alliance with an erstwhile enemy: Or, in the words of James Craggs the Younger, writing at the end of 1718 to Dubois:

“Le monde qui s’est revolte contre des Droits si exorbitans en prevoyant qu’une puissance si enorme ne pouvoit avec le tems manquer d’obtenir la monarchie universelle, a repandu des fleuves de sang et des tresors de richesses [etc] pour eviter cet esclavage. Aprés tant de batailles gagnees et perdues, aprés tant de saccages et des miseres, les puissances de l’Europe lassées et fatiguées de tant de maux font un reglement, où le Roy d’Espagne comme les autres, renonce fortement à toutes ses pretentions sur le Royaume de France, et cependant non-obstant qu’il ne jout de la couronne d’Espagne, de quelque maniere qu’on considère la chose qu’en vertu de ce bien public qui ne permette pas que l’Empereur ni le Roi de France, qui sont incontestablement, l’un ou l’autre, legitimes pretendants à ce royaume, l’aient11.”

Dubois and Stanhope grasped the conceptual consequences of this basic consensus. Philip V and Charles VI both resented the Peace of Utrecht. The former had become King of a diminished Spain, whereas the latter only managed to acquire the Spanish Netherlands and parts of Italy. In their eyes, the struggle was still on. However if either of the antagonists chose to take up the fight again, he would have to face both the strongest army and the strongest fleet in Europe: “Il est de notre interêt et de notre situation de ne vouloir jamais la guerre que pour procurer la paix […] Nous sommes son [France’s] amie la plus puissante, la plus naturelle et dont elle doit avoir la moindre jalousie, lorsqu’elle ne songe qu’à être la mediator des troubles de l’Europe et à borner les veuves des autres Princes.” Consequently Stanhope and Dubois realised they could impose a norm hierarchy. This gave them a discursive advantage for the years ahead. Whereas Spanish and Imperial diplomat quarrelled over titles and in reality unrealistic claims, France and Britain were redistributing the cards. After a long and tiresome process, the Austrian ambassador Pentirriedted signed the Treaty of London on 2 August 1718. This “Treaty of the Quadruple Alliance” foresaw an alliance between France, the Maritime Powers (Britain and the Republic of the United Provinces) and Austria, in order to compel Philip V to abandon Sardinia and Sicily, which he had invaded as well, in July 1718. Sicily would then be swapped for Sardinia, as Vienna had demanded for years. Interestingly this was as far as Charles VI could get. The Quadruple Alliance’s article V brought the Duchy of Parma-Piacenza and the Grand-Duchy of Tuscany, both ruled by dynasties threatened with extinction, into the Spanish sphere of influence. Don Carlos, son born out of
Philip V’s marriage to Elisabeth Farnese, was designated as new ruler, thus installing a new separate branch of the Bourbons. In other words: if Philip V ceased his invasion, which was a violation of the Utrecht settlement, and accorded to the Quadruple Alliance, he would be... rewarded for the whole operation. The only loser was Victor Amadeus of Savoy, who reluctantly acceded to the Treaty in November 1718.

II. Making the system work: mediation

“Le bien de l’Europe en vouloit une [Loi] [...] autorisée par le le consentement reciproque des deux Concurreurs, & maintenue par des Garans tels qu’on ne peut pas l’enfraindre impunément.”

French declaration of War against Spain, 9 January 1719
Militarily the War of the Quadruple Alliance was very short-lived. At the time the Treaty of London was signed, Admiral Byng sunk the Spanish fleet off the coast of Sicily (Battle of Cape Passaro, 11 August 1718). In April 1719, a French army invaded the Basque country, forcing Philip V to accede to the Treaty in February 1720.

The Treaty of London called upon all parties to gather for a conference under the direction of France and Britain as mediators. What seemed a small affair (settling the details between Philip V and Charles VI) finally took more than 14 years. Don Carlos was only installed as Duke of Parma in 1732. The prime mover, or stalling factor, was short-term political interest. However, the legal structure of the affair provided sufficient complexity to prohibit a quick outcome.

Parma-Piacenza and Tuscany were fiefs of the Holy Roman Empire. For Charles VI, the acknowledgement of this status was a precondition to signing the Quadruple Alliance. Consequently, France and Britain agreed to describe theses territories as “Sacri Romani Imperii feudus masculines” (art. V15). This implied that, at the extinction of the male line of the ruling dynasty, the Emperor would be allowed to appoint a new vassal as he pleased. Nevertheless the treaty had made this choice in his stead, designating Don Carlos. Spain and Austria put as many obstacles before the resolution of the problem as they possibly could. Charles waited to issue the expectative letters of eventual investiture (the document confirming Don Carlos would be appointed at the incumbents’ decease) until the end of 1723. In January 1724, after two years of entertaining an impressive assembly of European diplomats, and after both Stanhope and Dubois had disappeared, the Congress of Cambrai could open.

Although Philip V had been the aggressor in 1717-1718, France and Britain had always occupied a position in the middle of the game. Not devoid of any personal interest in the outcome, the mediators had switched alliances between Charles VI and his competitor. Once Philip adhered to the Treaty of London both France and Britain concluded an alliance with him, promising to act as supporters at the conference, turning the negotiation into a verbal war machine against the Emperors. Louis XV was even betrothed to Philip’s daughter. Preferably negotiations should last as long as the accumulation of Franco-British support could continue to grow.

Nevertheless, whereas the mediators had drawn profit from their discursive advantage as far as the precedence of treaties over national norms was concerned, they were pinned down by the Imperial plenipotentiaries concerning their obligations as guarantors. Penterriedter, who had signed the Treaty of London, approved the conservation of its acquis as the maximal outcome of the negotiating process, and, thus, a quick termination of the talks.

Once this proved impossible, the court of Vienna decided to clutter the agenda with two intervening themes. First, it asked for international confirmation of the new East India Company, created in the Austrian Netherlands. Second, if the mediators had “taken care to establish the succession of other princes, why [not] by that of the Emperor, who has no male successor, nor likely to have any?” Charles had settled his succession in the Habsburg lands by his 1713 Pragmatic Sanction. Bringing this text to the external forum and asking for the others’ consent, would equal the confirmation of the British 1688 settlement, the separation of the crowns of France and Spain, and, finally Don Carlos’ transfer to Italy. Success issues had such far-reaching consequences for the European system, that it was impossible to settle them legitimately through mere national norms.

III. From break-up to reconciliation: ambition tamed in a legal web

At the conference lingered on, producing innovative legal distinctions on terminology (“Garants”, “Mediators”, or “Contracting Parties”), the titles both contenders would be allowed to claim, or the extent of the Savoyard and Spanish accessions, Spain abandoned the mediators en une campagne, and concluded the so-called “Ripperda” Treaties with Charles VI in April and May 1725. Although the preamble appealed to the spirit of the Utrecht treaties, recalling the separation of the crowns of France and Spain, the text in itself was an overt violation of the principles of balance of power, and of its Franco-British genesis, expressed in the Cambrai mediation.

Twelve years after Utrecht Charles VI finally concluded peace, definitively abandoning Spain. The Emperor accepted everything he had been fighting at the conference, e.g. allowing Don Carlos into Italy. In return for lavish subsidies and the opening of the Spanish colonies to the East India Company, he even promised the hand of one of his daughters to Philip V’s son. Consequently, there existed a risk that Don Carlos would one day become an 18th century version of Charles V, standard image of the Franco-British system.

The “trente heureuses” could well have ended here. In reaction to the threat of a hybrid Austro-Spanish renaissance, France and Britain assembled the league of Hannover (August 1725). Charles VI lured the Russian Czarina into the Ripperda Treaty. Nevertheless, the union between Madrid and Vienna was mainly based on money, whereas the tranquillity of Europe rested on a common legal structure. Once Philip, whose silver fleet was blocked in the West Indies by the British, was unable to provide the necessary funds, the Emperor became evasive on the concerted marriage. Furthermore, as had been the case in 1717-1718, diplomatic channels remained open all the time. Consequently, the mediation system resurfaced. Cardinal Fleury, Dubois’ successor as chief of French diplomacy, brought the Emperor to the signature of preliminaries in Paris (May 1727), which, again, led to a congress, this time in Soissons.

Conclusion: Balance of Power, Mediation, or the Law’s essential role

Judging this complex episode from a distance, we cannot but assert the unique role of legal argumentation in postponing a major European war for 23 years.
Klassische und moderne Sprachen in der Wahrnehmung des Jesuiten Michael Denis

Abstract
Right through the eighteenth century the Order of the Jesuits produced a number of men variously distinguished in all areas of liberal education, who deeply influenced the intellectual culture of central Europe. Among these, the priest Michael Denis (1720–1800) played an important role as translator, teacher, poet and librarian, publishing his works in both Latin and German. This article deals with the importance of the use of Latin for Denis' self-image as an intellectual, in the context of the Catholic Enlightenment. His unfinished autobiography, Commentarium de vita sua libri quinque, shows how throughout the eighteenth century Latin was the language linking all members of the res publica litterarum, whereas writing in German represented a kind of patriotic protest against the cultural predominance of France and Italy. The conclusion is that Latin remains important and beneficial in modern times, and should not be reduced merely to an instrument of classical studies.

Gottsched und Maria Theresia
Als Johann Christoph und Louise Gottsched 1749 nach Wien reisten, um den Hof für die Gründung einer Akademie der Wissenschaften zu gewinnen, wurde das Ehepaar von Kaiserin Maria Theresia in Privataudienz empfangen. Aus dem Briefwechsel der Louise kennen wir die

Philip's pretensions on Italy had not changed when Spain went to war against Austria in the War of the Austrian Succession. France's reluctance to recognize Charles VI's PragmaticSanction turned its 1727 promise, repeated in 1738, into a paper one. Yet the essence of the Peace of Utrecht, the separation of the major crowns on the continent, organising a multipolar system, which had preceded over internal norms, structured the nature of diplomatic exchange. It took the negotiators (mostly trained on the job, but assisted by skilled jurists and archivists) much more than mere cordial sentiment to channel adverse sentiments into a common accepted vector: the law. Fuelled by centuries of common European legal culture, they constructed and managed a multipolar system of normative hierarchy, reconciling internal sovereignty with the necessity of international fundamental principles.
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7 E.g. Addison (Secretary of State for the Southern Department) to Bubb, Whitehall, 30 July 1717, NA, SP, 94 (Spain), 87, s.f.: “Si vous apprenez [...] que cette Expedition est dessinée contre la Sardaigne ou le Royaume de Naples, ou que vous ayes juste sujet de le conjecturer, vous luy remonterez combien Sa Maîêté est intéressée dans la neutralité et le repos de l'Italie par l'Article de Garantie du Traité d'Utrecht, et luy représenterez en même temps comme la Couronne de France est engagée dans la dite Garantie, et comment les diverses Puissances et Etats qui sont Parties dans le Traité susdit ressentiront la Violation qu'on en fera.”
9 To ensure domestic support, Dubois and Stanhope preferred to blame Philip's prime minister, Cardinal Giulio Alberoni.
11 Craggs to Dubois, Whitehall, 26 November 1718 OS, NA, SP, 78, 162, f. 393v°-394r°.
13 Craggs to Dubois, Whitehall, 26 November 1718 OS, cited, f. 392v°.
15 Treaty between Charles VI, Louis XV and George I, London, 2 August 1718, CUD, VIII/1, nr. CCII, 531-541.
16 Treaty between George I, Philip V and Louis XV, Madrid, 13 June 1721, CUD, VIII/2, nr. XV, 34-36.
17 Polwarth and Whitworth to Carteret, Cambrai, 31 January 1724, NA, SP, 78, 173, f. 53v°.
18 Polwarth and Whitworth to Carteret, Cambrai, 31 January 1724, NA, SP, 78, 173, f. 53v°.

Lateinische Autoren mit einem Blick für die Realität hatten im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert erkannt, in den Kreis einer Minderheit geraten zu sein. Es ist völlig klar, dass das Ringen der Sprachen, besser der Bedrohung nicht zu übersehen, die die Bedrohung nicht zu übersehen, die die Selbstbestimmung der Monarchie stammenden Zöglinge jene Deutschkompetenz vermöllt sollten, deren Fehlen Maria Theresia offenbar als schmerzhafte Empfindung hatte. Nach der für ihn traumatischen Auflösung des Ordens 1773 überschritt er eine weitere Grenzüberschreitung, indem er die Hütten der Grenzüberschreitung, indem er die lateinische Dichtung des Schotten MacPherson überstrach. Hatte der tief im Humanismus verwurzelte Denis die Begeisterung für altkeltische Dichtung in ganz Deutschland angefacht, so hat er seine Stadt, dessen Interessen von der Literatur bis zur Insektenkunde reichen werden. So ist es in sich schlüssig, wenn Denis besonders jene Momente in seinem Leben emotional anreicht, die für die Selbstbestimmung
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