

E-JOURNAL (2020)
9. JAHRGANG / 1

zfl

**FORUM
INTERDISZIPLINÄRE
BEGRIFFSGESCHICHTE
(FIB)**

LEIBNIZ-ZENTRUM
FÜR LITERATUR- UND
KULTURFORSCHUNG

Herausgegeben von Ernst Müller

Leibniz-Zentrum für Literatur- und Kulturforschung
Schützenstraße 18 | 10117 Berlin
T +49 (0)30 20192-155 | F -243 | sekretariat@zfl-berlin.org

IMPRESSUM

Herausgeber dieser Ausgabe

Ernst Müller & Wolfert von Rahden, Leibniz-Zentrum für Literatur- und Kulturforschung (ZfL), www.zfl-berlin.org

Direktorin

Prof. Dr. Eva Geulen

Redaktion

Ernst Müller (Leitung), Herbert Kopp-Oberstebrink, Dirk Naguschewski, Tatjana Petzer, Barbara Picht, Falko Schmieder, Georg Toepfer

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat

Faustino Oncina Coves (Valencia), Christian Geulen (Koblenz), Eva Johach (Konstanz), Helge Jordheim (Oslo), Christian Kassung (Berlin), Clemens Knobloch (Siegen), Sigrid Weigel (Berlin)

Gestaltung KRAUT & KONFETTI GbR, Berlin

Layout/Satz Constantin Sinn

Titelbild D. M. Nagu

ISSN 2195-0598



Sämtliche Texte stehen unter der Lizenz **CC BY-NC-ND 4.0**. Die Bedingungen dieser Lizenz gelten nur für Originalmaterial. Die Wiederverwendung von Material aus anderen Quellen (gekennzeichnet mit Quellenangabe) wie z. B. Schaubilder, Abbildungen, Fotos und Textauszüge erfordert ggf. weitere Nutzungsgenehmigungen durch den*die jeweilige*n Rechteinhaber*in.

© 2020 / Das Copyright liegt bei den Autor*innen.

INHALT

4 EDITORIAL

Ernst Müller, Wolfert von Rahden

I

7 ENTROPY

Christian Hoekema

29 ENERGY

Ernst Müller

39 THE ENERGETIC LEGACY OF ANTHROPOCENE THOUGHT

Anna Simon-Stickley

II

56 MULTIPLE SEMANTIKEN DES SPRACHURSPRUNGSBEGRIFFS

DIE RENAISSANCE DER SPRACHURSPRUNGSFRAGE IM 19. JAHRHUNDERT IM DEUTSCHEN SPRACHRAUM

Wolfert von Rahden

88 ACADEMIES AND THE DEFENCE OF EUROPEAN NATIONAL LANGUAGES

(MIT EINER SELBSTKRITISCHEN VORBEMERKUNG)

Jürgen Trabant

94 HERMANN PAULS SPRACHPSYCHOLOGISCHE WURZELN

(DARWIN UND DIE FUNKTIONAL-PRAGMATISCHE PSYCHOLOGIE)

Clemens Knobloch

REZENSION

106 GÉRARD RAULET/MARCUS LLANQUE (HG.): »GESCHICHTE DER POLITISCHEN IDEENGESCHICHTE«, BADEN-BADEN: NOMOS 2018, 494 S.

Kari Palonen

ACADEMIES AND THE DEFENCE OF EUROPEAN NATIONAL LANGUAGES (MIT EINER SELBSTKRITISCHEN VORBEMERKUNG)

Jürgen Trabant

VORBEMERKUNG

Ich hätte am 8. November 2019 in Turin das Folgende auch auf Italienisch sagen können. Bisher hatte ich an der Turiner Accademia delle Scienze, deren Mitglied ich bin, italienisch vorgetragen. Aber die Akademie hatte diesmal eingeladen zu einem Kongress mit dem englischen Titel »The Role of Academies in Sustaining European Knowledge Societies in Times of Crisis« und mich um einen Beitrag zur Rolle der Sprachen in den europäischen Akademien gebeten. Die Turiner Akademie war die AusrichterIn des Kongresses der Allea, der Gemeinschaft der europäischen Akademien, All European Academies, die längst das Englische zu ihrer gemeinsamen Sprache erkoren hat. Die anglophone Internationalität der Tagung war damit gesetzt. Niemand in Italien nimmt mehr an, dass jemand von außerhalb Italiens seine Sprache beherrscht. Daher haben dann auch alle italienischen Kollegen auf dem Kongress der All European Academies englisch gesprochen. Aber gerade deswegen hätte ich, der Nichtitaliener, auf Italienisch vortragen müssen, denn ich kann es ja, ich unterrichtete und schreibe auch manchmal in dieser Sprache. Das wäre ein Zeichen gewesen an die versammelten europäischen Akademien, die auf die englische Einsprachigkeit setzen. Und es hätte zum Inhalt der Rede gepasst, die ja dafür plädiert, in der Wissenschaft nicht nur englisch zu reden und zu schreiben, sondern auch die europäischen Nationalsprachen zu verwenden und zu verteidigen. Aber ich habe es nicht gewagt.

Meine Sprachwahl ist ein krasses Beispiel für jenen laschen Opportunismus, der zumeist eine solche Entscheidung bedingt: Man möchte natürlich von möglichst vielen verstanden werden, man möchte zeigen, dass man die dominante Sprache beherrscht, dass man dazugehört zur Sprachgemeinschaft der Mächtigen. Bei der Frage der Wahl zwischen zwei

Sprachen in einer Situation, die eigentlich beide Sprachen erlaubt, siegt zumeist die stärkere. Sie gewährt dem Sprecher einen größeren Kommunikationsraum, Prestige, Coolness und was sonst noch alles zum Starksein gehört – im Feld der Wissenschaften die wichtigen Impact-Punkte. Dabei hätte ich die Gelegenheit gehabt, die ultimative Coolness zu zeigen: nämlich wie ein nicht-italophoner Ausländer die italienische Sprache in einem internationalen Kontext benutzt. Und damit, dass das Italienische immer noch eine große, wichtige und auch international sprech- und schreibbare Sprache der Wissenschaft ist. Genau das sage ich ja in meiner Rede »on the defence of European national languages«. Aber ich habe meine wirklich leidenschaftlich gefühlte Botschaft performativ nicht angemessen realisiert.

Die Verwendung des Englischen in dieser Rede ist also ein Zeichen der Niederlage, sozusagen ein Beweis für die Vergeblichkeit jenes Widerstands, zu dem ich die Akademien aufrufe. Eine solche Position der Schwäche zeigt sich immer wieder in Situationen der Konkurrenz von Sprachen. So wurden die Regionalsprachen Frankreichs – Bretonisch, Flämisch, Deutsch, Okzitanisch, Korsisch, Katalanisch, Baskisch –, die in der französischen Republik seit der Revolution dem Untergang geweiht sind und dem Französischen weichen, in den regionalistischen Sprachkämpfen zumeist auf Französisch, also in der glottophagen Sprache selbst, verteidigt. Sonst hätte es ja niemand gehört. Wenn ich auf Okzitanisch zur Bewahrung und Stärkung des Okzitanischen aufrufe, hört das niemand außerhalb Okzitaniens. Dort kann es zwar die Widerstandskräfte stärken. Aber um auch jenseits des bedrohten Territoriums Gehör zu finden, muss man die Sprache in der dominanten Sprache verteidigen. Der performative Widerspruch ist alternativlos – und tragisch. Denn die starke Position der dominanten Sprache, die man ja schwächen möchte, wird damit auch gleich wieder bestätigt. Oder

vielleicht haben doch die lauten französischen Verteidigungen des Okzitanischen dazu beigetragen, dass das Okzitanische noch nicht ganz untergegangen ist? Zu meiner Verteidigung bringe ich also die Hoffnung vor, dass die Verteidigung der unterlegenen Nationalsprachen erfolgreicher in der dominanten Welt-Sprache als in einer der Nationalsprachen stattfindet. Aber es ist eine traurige und nicht ganz glaubwürdige Verteidigung. Ich hätte drauf pfeifen sollen, ob mich jemand außerhalb der italienischen Sprachgemeinschaft versteht. Ein – international eher unverstandenes – symbolisches Zeichen des Widerstandes wäre vielleicht wichtiger gewesen als der opportunistische Wunsch nach kommunikativem Erfolg.

Ich hab's vergeigt!

Der einzige Vorteil meiner Sprachwahl ist daher, dass dieser englische Text nun hier im *Forum Interdisziplinäre Begriffsgeschichte* erscheinen kann, in einem Journal in der deutschsprachigen Welt also, die ja so besonders stolz darauf ist, dass sie so schön Englisch kann. Einen italienischen Text hätten die deutschen Leser dieser Zeitschrift vermutlich eher nicht verstanden. Auch dass der italienische Text für die bevorstehende Publikation des Allea-Kongresses in den *Quaderni* der Turiner Akademie nicht eigens ins Englische übersetzt werden muss, ist ein tröstlicher Gedanke.

Ma per dire la verità: non sono troppo fiero della mia performance globalese.

ACADEMIES AND THE DEFENCE OF EUROPEAN NATIONAL LANGUAGES

Speaking of the defence of national languages evokes automatically the mother of all language defences, i.e. Joachim Du Bellay's *Défense et illustration de la langue française*, 1549.¹ It is a defence of French against Latin, the universal language of the Middle Ages, and its aim is to make French as illustrious as Latin. I will not say more about that book. But I want you to keep its title in mind.

Language academies promote and defend national languages. Scientific academies promote and defend science.

1 Joachim Du Bellay: *La deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse* (1549), ed. Henri Chamard, Paris 1904.

I. LANGUAGE ACADEMIES

Thus, to mention the two most famous language academies, the Crusca and the French Academy, the Académie française explicitly and passionately defends French against all possible aggressors, hence also against the most aggressive aggressor today, the one that takes the place of French in many communication situations: against English or Globalese, as I call it. The Accademia della Crusca bravely defends Italian. In the conflict about the introduction of English as the only teaching language in the Politecnico di Milano (2012–17), the Crusca fought for the maintenance of Italian in the Universities. Claudio Marazzini, its president, protested against the “imposizione totale, autoritaria e forzata, della lingua inglese, con esplicita e autolesionistica abolizione dell'italiano,” the “authoritarian and compulsory total imposition of the English language, with the explicit and self-destructive abolition of Italian”.² The Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung would never do such a thing. I am not aware of any protest of that academy against the decision of the Technical University at Munich to do just the same as the Milanese Politecnico, i.e. to establish an exclusively English teaching, or against the recent announcement of the Bavarian government to impose English in all technical universities. And there are and will be no German professors suing the Munich University or applying to the Constitutional Court as did their Italian colleagues. Nobody dares. Protesters against the “imposizione totale, autoritaria e forzata” of English would be crucified as awful nationalists – and worse. Hence no defence of German in German Academia and the Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung. But normally, language academies defend their languages. This has to be specified historically.

The Crusca and the Académie française were founded to make order in a somewhat chaotic linguistic situation: the Crusca to codify a literary norm for Italy, the French ay to create a linguistic norm for the social elite of the centralized kingdom: “donner des règles certaines à notre langue et à la rendre pure, éloquente et capable de traiter les arts et sciences.”³

2 Claudio Marazzini: “Internazionalizzazione sì, ma non contro l'italiano,” *Accademia della Crusca*, 16.03.2017, <https://accademiadellacrusca.it/it/contenuti/internazionalizzazione-s-ma-non-contro-litaliano/7410> (accessed 10.07.2020).

3 Art. 24 of the *Règlement* of the Académie française (1635), *Académie française*, http://www.academie-francaise.fr/sites/academie-francaise.fr/files/statuts_af_0.pdf (accessed 10.07.2020).

These tasks necessarily imply a 'defence' of the languages they create and protect, not necessarily against foreign languages, but against unwelcome linguistic forms that contradict the finality of their codification. Thus, the Crusca defended its Tuscan Italian against words from other dialects and from lower or spoken language. The French Academy defended its aristocratic Parisian language against low and provincial language.

The adversary against which the languages are defended changes in the course of history. Thus, the French Academy, after the Revolution, fought against aristocratic distinction and old royalistic thinking in the words – hence against itself – and for a republican or democratic language. It did not really succeed, but, nevertheless, the language it defended after the Revolution was considered as the language of the nation that had become the sovereign in the Republic, hence a 'national' language.

Language academies in democracies in the globalized world therefore defend their national languages against the linguistic dangers of that world. The main danger being, of course, the invasive power of English and the disappearance of the national languages in certain important domains of communication. Thus, once more, the Crusca defended Italian against the takeover of English at the Politecnico, against "the authoritarian and compulsory total imposition of the English language with the explicit and self-destructive abolition of Italian," as Claudio Marazzini put it.

The Crusca thereby pointed to the fact that, in fact, one of the most important and prestigious fields of discourse the national languages are losing is the field of science. The language of science was already one of the problems raised by the so-called *questione della lingua* in the '500. The question then was whether science should write and speak the national language or better: the language of the People, *volgo*, i.e. *Volgare* – or stay with Latin, the learned language of medieval Europe, the *Globalese* of the Old World. And the most advanced and modern position, the position of the natural scientists, was then to switch from the Latin *Globalese* to *Volgare*. This is what Galilei did – the scientist of scientists – when he passed from Latin to Italian/Tuscan in his most influential writings: *Saggiatore* (1623), *Dialogo* (1632), *Discorsi* (1638). This is what Francis Bacon did, the Father of the European Enlightenment, and then Descartes, Vico, Kant.

In the wake of the Italian discussion, the French academy took a strong and modern stance in the question of the language of science: Its second task, as we read in the *règlement*, was to make the French language "capable de traiter les arts et les sciences." The French Academy elaborated French for being used in the sciences. Therefore, the Academy did not only write a dictionary for common language, the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*⁴, but the French Academy published also the *Dictionnaire des Arts et des Sciences*, by its member Thomas Corneille⁵. This is an explicit inclusion of science into the French language i.e. into a vulgar language, and the integration of French into science. From that historical book on, the sciences in Europe belonged so to say officially to the vulgar languages.

II. ACADEMIES OF SCIENCE

Now, in the same period, academies of science were founded: Accademia dei Lincei 1603, the Royal Society 1660, Académie des Sciences 1666, Kurfürstlich Brandenburgische (Königlich Preußische) Societät der Wissenschaften 1700, Académie des Inscriptions 1701.

II.1

The academies of science have to foster and defend scientific excellence, and the best conditions for scientific production. Defence and illustration of science. There is, at first sight, no concern with language.

Thus, the Royal Society describes its mission:

"The Society's fundamental purpose, reflected in its founding Charters of the 1660s, is to recognise, promote, and support excellence in science and to encourage the development and use of science for the benefit of humanity."⁶

The Académie des Sciences affirms as its fundamental task:

"Encourager la vie scientifique: La production de connaissances, motivée par la perspective d'applica-

4 Académie française: *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 2 vols., Paris 1694.

5 Thomas Corneille: *Le Dictionnaire des Arts et des Sciences*, 2 vols., Paris 1694/95.

6 "Mission and priorities," *The Royal Society*, <https://royalsociety.org/about-us/mission-priorities/> (accessed 10.07.2020).

tion ou par la seule envie de savoir, est vitale pour le dynamisme économique et culturel d'une nation."⁷

There is no explicit mention of language in those statements on the function of the academies.

But as places for the encouragements of science, the academies are institutions in which, as the philosopher Jürgen Mittelstraß put it, science reflects upon itself – in order to create those good conditions for scientific excellence: “In the academy, Science reflects upon itself, and in the academy, society reflects upon its scientific nature. Science recognises itself and society recognises its future that is not possible without science.”⁸ Now, in that self-reflection, academies will easily come to the point that science is also a linguistic process: Science speaks, science writes, at different points of its production of knowledge, for different people, for different purposes, in different depth. Science is a complicated ensemble of language games. Therefore, science and its institutions, the academies, certainly have to give some thought on the question of language in the scientific process.

II.2

And this is what science did, from its very first academy on, from Plato's grove of Akademos. Plato asked: What is the role of language in the search for true knowledge? Do we find any knowledge in words? This was Plato's question in his dialogue about language, *Cratylus*. And his answer was: Since words are rather bad images of the world, it would be better to do without and thrive for true knowledge without language. Hence, from its very first moment science is opposed to language. Plato did not say whether obtaining true knowledge without language is possible or not. But Aristotle resolved that question for the European scientists for thousands of years: Language, according to *De interpretatione*, has no cognitive impact, it is only a means of communication, words are only

signs, language is only sound, different languages are different sound. Thought, Aristotle says, is universally the same for everybody. Hence, language does not matter for cognition – and for science. What language we use is only a question of practical communication.

This is still the majoritarian position not only in science. It is the trivial common opinion about language. And this is, why the Politecnico or the TU Munich or the Bavarian government just want to switch to English without any further reflection. For them, languages are nothing but indifferent means of communication.

However, Aristotle is not always right. 2000 years after Aristotle, after the encounter with the American nations and their radically different languages, the Europeans had to realise that languages are not only different sound, but that they contain also different thought, that they conceptualise the world in different ways. Language is production of thought – not only communication – and thought is different in different languages.

This insight renders scientists still more furious against language because it jeopardises the existence of universal thought. Hence, they must do something about it, they must re-establish a universal scientific language. The new Aristotle, Francis Bacon, connects the instauration of the modern science with a passionate criticism of natural language with its false and unscientific concepts – *idola fori*, idols of the market – and he imagines a kingdom of science – *regnum scientiarum* – with a new scientific language in a scientific Paradise.⁹ Locke laments about the “mist” words cast before truth.¹⁰

But what happens in real (scientific) life - and Bacon is one of the protagonists of that historical process - is that science, modern science, Baconian science, just goes over to the vulgar languages notwithstanding the terrible semantic dangers connected to them: Modern science speaks in vulgar languages – and not in a new celestial language. Modern scientists do so simply for political reasons: Their domain of action

7 “Encourager la vie scientifique,” *Académie des sciences*, <https://www.academie-sciences.fr/fr/Encourager-la-vie-scientifique/encourager-la-vie-scientifique.html> (accessed 10.07.2020).

8 “In der Akademie schaut sich die Wissenschaft selbst an, und in der Akademie reflektiert die Gesellschaft ihr wissenschaftliches Wesen. Die Wissenschaft erkennt sich selbst und die Gesellschaft ihre Zukunft, die ohne Wissenschaft [...] nicht zu haben ist.” Jürgen Mittelstraß: “Wissenschaftskultur. Zur Vernunft wissenschaftlicher Institutionen,” Lecture at the German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina, 26.02.2010, printed in *Forschung & Lehre* 17 (2010), pp. 406–409.

9 Francis Bacon: *The New Organon* (1620), eds. Lisa Jardine/ Michael Silverthorne, Cambridge 2000.

10 “[T]heir [the words'] *obscurity* and *disorder* does not seldom cast a *mist* before our eyes and impose upon our understandings,” John Locke: *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), ed. Peter H. Nidditch, Oxford 1975, III ix 21.

is the closer political or linguistic community: France, England, Italy, and not the old Latin world, the catholic European world, any more.

Thus, all the academies on my list use their vulgar – or national – languages (and still some Latin), as their names indicate: Accademia dei Lincei, The Royal Society, Académie des Sciences, Kurfürstlich Brandenburgische (Königlich Preußische) Societät der Wissenschaften, Académie des Inscriptions.

The Académie des Sciences just uses French, it does not reflect upon the language of science. Neither does the Académie des Inscriptions, the academy for the humanistic sciences. They are not concerned with language. This task is left to the Académie française, the French language academy. This French separation of the scientific academies from the language academy perpetuates the Aristotelian separation of thought and language-communication. The scientific academies keep away from the language question.

III. THE LEIBNITIAN ACADEMY

III.1

There is however the interesting exception of my own academy, the *Kurfürstlich Brandenburgische Societät (Königlich Preußische) Societät der Wissenschaften*. The Prussian Academy did not follow the French example of separating the natural sciences from the humanities. And – and this is rather exceptional – it did not separate the two scientific academies from a language academy. It connected both provinces of science with the language problem.

As you can see from the frontispiece of the first publication of Leibniz's Academy (see fig. 1), science and the humanities are taken together. On the left side, we have the allegoric representation of the humanistic disciplines, on the right hand side the natural sciences, medicine, physics, mathematics. 'Science' is conceived of – in the Latin and in the German meaning of the word – as applying to both realms of the learned elaboration of the world. And in the middle, we have a book whose title shows four letters: T and W and two S. The letters T W S S are the abbreviation for *Teutscher Wort- und SprachSchatz*, German Word and Language Treasure. The sciences and the humanities shall develop a linguistic treasure for the national language: *Teutsch*. And vice versa: the



Fig. 1: Frontispiece of *Miscellanea Berolinensia ad incrementum scientiarum*, Berlin 1710, digital library collection of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, <https://bibliothek.bbaw.de/digitalisierte-sammlungen/akademieschriften#c17902>.

Language Treasure also feeds the sciences. Thus, on the one side, the sciences are responsible for the enrichment of the national language, for its defence. And, on the other side, the national language is the home of the sciences. The frontispiece symbolizes the connection of the sciences and the national language.¹¹

III.2

And this connection is based on philosophical reasons. Following Bacon's and Locke's insights, Leibniz was deeply convinced of the connection of thought and language. The British philosophers had discovered the cognitive impact of languages, but for them it was a catastrophic insight, they lamented over the cognitive obscurity and diversity of natural languages – "a mist before our eyes" – and wanted to get rid of it. Leibniz just turns this lamentation into a celebration of languages. Yes, languages contain thought, but this thought is precious, it is *connaissance*:

"On enregistrera avec le temps et mettra en dictionnaires et en grammaires toutes les langues de l'univers, et on les comparera entre elles; ce qui aura des usages très grands tant pour la connaissance des choses [...] que pour la connaissance de notre esprit et de la merveilleuse variété de ses opérations."¹²

The different languages contain knowledge of the world, "connaissance des choses," and of the mind, "connaissance de notre esprit." Therefore languages have to be documented as precious depositories of knowledge. They form the basis of our knowledge of the world. And they have to be elaborated and developed through the sciences. The sciences contribute to the cognitive treasure – *Schatz* – of the national language.

For Leibniz, the content of the words in the natural languages is not the highest kind of cognition. Language is only *cognitio distincta inadaequata*.¹³ It is

knowledge, but not yet scientific knowledge, *cognitio distincta adaequata*. Scientific knowledge transcends the knowledge contained in languages. But in order to get there, to reach *cognitio adaequata*, we have to use the treasures of the natural languages. They are the basis of the highest, of scientific knowledge. Leibniz' hierarchy of knowledge makes it possible to understand the language question in science.

Hence: yes, academies, scientific academies have the duty to reflect on their linguistic nature because thought is inextricably immersed in language. This is an element of their self-reflection, an element of the reflection on the conditions of the possibility of scientific production and of scientific excellence.

III.3

And in that reflection of the conditions of scientific excellence they should take into consideration one final observation: In the Prussian Academy, as well as in the Lincei or in the Academy of Torino, humanistic and natural sciences together form one body of knowledge. In Latin as well as in German all disciplines are 'sciences,' *Wissenschaften*. And through this togetherness the academies become aware of the fact that the language question is not the same for the whole scientific family. If I may simplify: The experiential nature of the natural sciences implies material instruments as essential means of the scientific process. Language is here not so much an instrument of research, but rather only a means for the communication of its results. And these results are often symbolised with non-linguistic means, i.e. signs or images. This is different for the humanistic sciences. Their means of exploration, their main research instrument is language. Their research result is not presented in an image, a schema, in numbers – or the next slide. Their result is a text – language. The instrument as well as the result – and often also the object – of that research is linguistic. And just as the natural scientists need the best instruments, also the humanists need the best instruments. And their best instruments are the languages they know and manipulate best. Therefore, they have a much closer relation to the national or vulgar language they use. They therefore tend to cling to the national languages as a condition of the possibility of their excellence. And in the case of academies like the Lincei, like Torino, like Berlin, they have to defend these means for the production of excellent research in the humanistic sciences: *Défense et illustration des langues européennes*.

11 However, the Berlin Academy did not succeed in realising that connection of Science and Language in the past. Only recently, in 2018, through the acquisition of the most important national lexicographical project, the Berlin Academy integrated the TWSS in its body.

12 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain* (1765), ed. Jacques Brunschwig, Paris 1966, p. 293.

13 Cf. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: "Meditationes de cognitione, veritati et ideis," in: idem: *Philosophische Schriften*, vol. I, ed. Hans Heinz Holz, Darmstadt 1985, pp. 25–47.