

LiVeS Journal
July 2015 / 9

LiVeS Journal
/Liberty, Verity, and Spirit/

Leto V julij 2015
sštevilka 9 (v pripravi)

Izdajatelj revije



REVIJA SRP

m.sh.1339427, d.sh.71461965
i.a: <http://www.livesjournal.eu>
e.m: urednishtvo@revijasrp.si
e.m: editors@livesjournal.eu

Naslov

Revija SRP, Prazhakova 13, 1000 Ljubljana,
Slovenija

UREDNIŠTVO

Ivo Antich
Damir Globochnik
Rajko Shushtarshich

LIVES JOURNAL je slovenska revija, ki nadaljuje in na novem nivoju povzema projekt Revije SRP: gre za nadaljevanje posebne publikacijske prakse (v tisku in na spletu) kot radikalno naravnane preizkusa možnosti neodvisne umetnishke, esejistichne, znanstvene refleksije v geohistoricnem kontekstu in oblik identitete v njem, ter gre za inovacijo zlasti v smislu vzporednega slovensko-angleshkega zapisa, ki se odpira sledovom slovenstva kjer koli po svetu. Usmeritev publikacije s svojo obliko in s pomenskimi razsezhnostmi nakazuje tudi ime: zacetni chrki obeh besed sta kratica za Ljubljano (LJ), v angleshki besedi LiVeS pa so simetricni soglasniki zacetnice istih treh vodilnih pojmov kot v slovenski besedi SRP (Svoboda – Resnica – Pogum / Liberty – Verity – Spirit).

ISSN 1855–8267

LiVeS Journal
/Liberty, Verity, and Spirit/

Year V July 2014
number 8 (in preparing)

Publisher of review



REVIJA SRP

m.sh.1339427, d.sh.71461965
i.a: <http://www.livesjournal.eu>
e.m: urednistvo@revijasrp.si
e.m: editors@livesjournal.eu

Address

Revija SRP, Prazhakova 13, 1000 Ljubljana,
Slovenia

EDITORS

Ivo Antich
Damir Globochnik
Rajko Shushtarshich

LIVES JOURNAL is a Slovenian review which continues on a new level and summarizes the project of Review SRP: a continuation of the special practice of publication (in print and online) as a radical examination of the possibilities of an independent-oriented art, essayistic, scientific reflection in geohistorical context and its forms of identity, and the innovation especially in the sense of parallel Slovenian-English writing, which is opened to the traces of Slovenian identity anywhere in the world. The orientation of publication is also suggested by the name with its form and dimensions of meaning: the initial letters of both words are an abbreviation for Ljubljana (LJ), and in English word LiVeS symmetrical consonants perform the initials of the same three leading concepts such as in Slovenian word SRP (Svoboda – Resnica – Pogum / Liberty – Verity – Spirit)

ISSN 1855–8267

Vsebina (v pripravi)		
		6
		10
		12
		12
Rajko Shushtarshich		
		6
		26
Damir Globochnik	O likov.	76
	Likovna dela	80
	Likovna satira	
Za zgodovinski spomin		
Branko J. Hribovshek	Najbolj nevarna knjiga II	34
Iz zgodovinskega spomina		

Index

		7
		13
Rajko Shushtarshich		
		7
		27
Damir Globochnik	Painter	50
	Artworks /illustrations/	58
Damir Globochnik	Visual satire	69
For historical memory		
Branko J. Hribovshek	A most dangerous book II	35
From historical memory		

Damir Globochnik

O LIKOVNEM ...

PAINTER ...

Ima Avt

LIKOVNA DELA

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
Naslovnica	
	9

Ime Avt. (roj.

Ime Avt.

ARTWORKS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Naslovnica

9

Ime Avt

Damir Globochnik

LIKOVNA SATIRA ...

VISUAL SATIRE ...

Branko J. Hribovšek

»NAJBOLJ NEVARNA KNJIGA«

(II)

ROSSOVE SPLOSHNE RAZLAGE

Zelo lahko je imeti »Tacitovo« *Germanijo* za izvirno – in ravno tako za ponaredek. Pravzaprav je veliko težje, praktično nemogoče, dokazati njeno izvirnost, kot pa dokazati, da je ponaredek. Morda je to še eden od dodatnih razlogov, da je bilo hote prezrto vsako glede tega kritično delo.

Germanijo naj bi »odkril« Poggio z rokopisoma *Dialogues* in *Agricola* v Fuldi, toda prinesel od tam in »reshil« naj bi jo Enoch iz Ascolija (Enoch d'Ascoli), kot to na splošno trdijo (tudi Krebs).

J.W. Ross¹⁶ je dejansko dokazal, da so Tacitusovi *Anali* ponaredek. Kot je bilo tukaj zhe recheno, je obtožil Poggia kot krivca ponaredbe.

Pravzaprav ne maram oznake »ponaredek«, vendar jo bom obdržal.

V skladu s Hochartom¹⁷ so poleg *Analov* ponarejene tudi *Historiae*, in che je tako, to velja še za ostala Tacitova dela, torej za *Germanijo*, *Dialoge* in *Agricolo*. Za slednjo pripoved zhe trdijo, da ni skladna z arheoloshkimi najdbami.

Naj navedem le del stavka iz predavanja Birgitte Hoffmann *Archaeology versus Tacitus' Agricola*³³:

... kaj je narobe z besedilom? Ali Tacit resnično lažbe?

In neke pozneje:

In mogoče bi se morali spomniti, da je rimski pisatelj Tertullian napisal okoli sto let po zaključku Agricole:

»Cornelius Tacitus, seveda, ki je, po resnici, najbolj zgovoren v lažbi.«

Sam Tertullian, še posebno pa njegovi spisi so tudi zelo sumljivi, toda tu se soočimo z istimi problemi, ki nasploh zadevajo klasiko, ter z dodatkom močno chustvene verske pristranosti ... In zakaj Tertulliana ne navajajo kot dokaz za izvirnost Tacitovih del?

Morda je malce naporno prebirati Rossa ali Hocharta – zelo sta zgovorna, njuni stavki so zelo dolgi, obrazložitve nadvse široke, toda tak je bil način pisanja v njuni dobi. Poskušal bom skrajšati Rossovo besedilo, toda obdržati jedro pripovedi, ne da bi izgubil njegov način izražanja.

Zgoraj sem, kar zadeva Poggia, obširno navedel in uporabil Rossove posebne razlage in opombe, tukaj pa bom predstavil njegove najbolj splošne razloge.

Branko J. Hribovšek

»A MOST DANGEROUS BOOK«

(II)

THE J. W. ROSS' GENERAL ARGUMENTATION

It is very easy to take »Tacitus' s« *Germania* as genuine – or as a forgery. It is much harder, actually practically impossible, to prove its authenticity, than to prove it to be a forgery. This is probably an additional reason to ignore completely any critical work. *Germania* is listed to have been »discovered« with *Dialogues* and *Agricola* in Fulda by Poggio Bracciolini and allegedly recovered by Enoch of Ascoli, as generally reported (Krebs).

J. W. Ross¹⁶ actually proved that Tacitus's *Annales* are forgery. As already said, he accused Poggio Bracciolini as the most possible culprit.

I do not like the word »forgery«... but I will keep it.

If *Annales* and according to Hochart¹⁷, also *Histories* are forged, the same is due for all Tacitus's works, also *Germania*, *Dialogues* and *Agricola*. The later is already declared to be disapproved by the modern archeological findings.

Let me quote just a part of the sentence from Birgitta Hoffmann's lecture on »Archaeology versus Tacitus' *Agricola*«³³:

...what is wrong with the text? Is Tacitus actually lying?

And somewhere later:

*And we should perhaps also recall that the Roman writer Tertullian wrote about 100 years after the completion of the *Agricola*:*

»Cornelius Tacitus, however, – who, to say the truth, is most loquacious in falsehood.«

Tertullian and especially Tertullian's writings are also very questionable... but here we are confronted with the same problems, concerning the authenticity of classics, with an addition of the emotionally strong religious bias ... and why is Tertullian not quoted as a proof of the authenticity of the Tacitus's works?

It is a little bit intricate to read Ross or Hochart – they are very loquacious, their sentences very long, explaining broadly – but it is just the style of the written word in their time. I will try to abridge Ross' text, keeping the essence of the narrative, but not loosing the style ...

Above, concerning Poggio, I already extensively used Ross' arguments and comments, here I cite mostly the general ones.

Navajam le dele, ki so razumljivi po zdravem razumu in za katere bralec ne potrebuje nikakršnega posebnega znanja, da bi jih razumel. Po mojem mnenju zadostujejo kot dokaz, da dela, ki naj bi bila Tacitova, niso izvirno starorimski spisi.

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter I, i:

... Tacita povzdiguje njegova genialnost do take višine, da ga že dviga iz dosega kritike. Sveti na lepopišnem nebu kakor sonce, pred zharom katerega se vsi kot parsi priklanjajo v chashchenju.

*Prejšnji rodovi so ga prebirali s sposhtovanjem in občudovanjem: kot enega največjih učiteljev zgodovine; tako ga moramo prebirati še naprej. Toda kljub temu, da niti hvala niti graja ne moreta povečati ali zmanjšati njegovega slovesa, **resnica in pravica klicheta trezno raziskavo narave in značaja del, ki kazhejo tolikšno razliko v sestavi in taka nesoglasja glede raznih zadev kot Historiae in Annales ...***

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter II, i:

V zacetku raziskave bom izhajal iz domneve, da gre za ponaredek iz petnajstega stoletja; pri tem mi je podlaga za to domnevo dejstvo, da je to bila doba, ko so bili odkriti izvirni rokopisi, ki so vsebovali to delo, a obstoja teh rokopisov ne moremo slediti dlje kot do tega stoletja; to je bila doba prevarantov (in to je neizmerno važna posledica pri raziskavi tega spisa), doba tako velike lahkovernosti glede prevar, da so ljudje brez zadostnih dokazov ali zgolj z rahlimi dokazi ali pa brez vsakih dokazov verjeli vse, kar jim je bilo podtaknjeno; takrat je bil pohlep tako velik, da so se ljudje voljno odrekli ugledu, ki je spremljevalec največjih dosežkov duha. Vzemimo na primer plemenito tiskarsko umetnost: na njeno iznajdbo bi bil vsak pameten chlovek po pravici ponosen ... Toda kdo je resnični iznajditelj tiska? Iz katere dežbe izvira? Je to Holandija s Costerjem iz Haarlema? Je to Nemčija z Mentelom, plemenitashem iz Strasbourga? Je to Gutteneberg, zlatar iz Mainz? ...

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter II, ii:

... Velika je bila skusnjava ponarejati leposlovje, posebno dela glavnih pisateljev antike, na rachun papezhev, ki so se trudili pozhiviti pouk in so zato dajali denarne nagrade in odpustke tistim, ki bi nashli rokopisne kopije katerega koli avtorja od starih Grkov ali Rimljanov. Rokopisi so se pojavljali kot po charovnij, z vseh mogochih strani: iz knjizhnic samostanov, tako neznanih kot slavnih; iz najbolj zakotnih mest – z dna izchrpanih vodnjakov, od polzhev umazani, kot je to Historia Velleja Patercula; ali pa s podstreshij, kjer so bili prekriti s pajchevinami in prahom, kot npr. Catullove pesmi. Vsako delo, che je le bilo videti, kot da je zelo staro, so pri pregledu spoznali za staroklasichno; in ni bilo nobenega dvoma o njegovi izvirnosti, cheprav je bilo poleg starinskega videza tudi she v nepopolni obliki.

Ne poznamo preteklosti zadjnih shestih nepopolnih knjig Analov – najmanj do sedaj; cheprav jo bom podal ob koncu te raziskave; ...

Cited are just the parts, which are clear from the standpoint of the common sense and do not need any especial reader's knowledge to comprehend them, but on my opinion suffice to prove that allegedly Tacitus's works are not genuine Roman texts.

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter I, i:

*... Tacitus is raised by his genius to a height, which lifts him above the reach of the critic. He shines in the firmament of letters like a sun before whose lustre all, Parsee-like, bow down in worship. Preceding generations have read him with reverence and admiration: as one of the greatest masters of history, he must continue to be so read. But though neither praise nor censure can exalt or impair his fame, **truth and justice call for a passionless inquiry into the nature and character of works presenting such difference in structure, and such contradictions in a variety of matters as the History and the Annals...***

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter II, i:

*... In beginning the investigation, I shall proceed on the assumption that it is a modern forgery of the fifteenth century, having as grounds for this assumption that **it was the age when the original MSS. containing the work were discovered; that the existence of those MSS. cannot be traced farther than that century; that (which is of vast consequence in an inquiry of this description) it was an age of imposture; of credulity so immoderate that people were easily imposed upon, believing, as they did, without sufficient evidence, or on slight evidence, or no evidence at all, whatever was foisted upon them;** when, too, the love of lucre was such that for money men willingly forewent the reputation that is the accompaniment of the grandest achievements of the intellect. Take, for example, the noble art of printing: for inventing it any man of genius might reasonably be proud. ... But who, for a certainty, knows the inventor of printing? or the country of its origin? Was it Holland in the person of Coster of Haarlem? Or Germany in the person of Mentel, the nobleman, of Strasburg? Or Guttenberg, the goldsmith, of Mayence? ...*

¹⁶ Ross, Book I, Chapter II, ii:

*... **The temptation was great to palm off literary forgeries, especially of the chief writers of antiquity, on account of the Popes, in their efforts to revive learning, giving money rewards and indulgences to those who should procure MS. copies of any of the ancient Greek or Roman authors. Manuscripts turned up, as if by magic, in every direction; from libraries of monasteries, obscure as well as famous; from the most out-of-the-way places;^a the bottom of exhausted wells, besmeared by snails, as the History of Velleius Paterculus; or from garrets, where they had been contending with cobwebs and dust, as the Poems of Catullus. So long as the work had an appearance of high antiquity, it passed muster as an old classic; and no doubt could be entertained of its genuineness, if, in addition to its ancient look, it was brought in a fragmentary form.***

We have no history of the last six fragmentary books of the Annals;^a at least, up to this time; though I shall give it towards the end of this inquiry; ...

Pravzaprav ni vazhno, ali je Ross res nashel pravega ponarejevalca v Poggiu Braccioliniju. Vazhen je njegov nachin analize, da bi dokazal ponaredek v ustreznem zgodovinskem okviru.

Rokopisi so se pojavljali kot po charovnji ... Nicolò Niccoli, Poggiov prijatelj vse zhivljenje in strasten zbiralec starih rokopisov, jih je sam imel priblizhno 800. Najbogatejshe knjizhnice samostanov so verjetno imele okrog 1000 rokopisov. Tolikshno kolichino je lahko izkushen lovec na rokopise pregledal v nekaj dneh. Tako je dejansko nemogoche, da ne bi bili nekateri rokopisi opazheni zhe pri prvem obisku ... Zato so ti lovci navajali najbolj zakotna mesta kot najdishcha pozabljenih rokopisov, kjer naj bi ti bili chakali na svoje ponovno odkritje.

Corpora lente augescent cito extinguuntur.

Telesa rastejo pochasi in umirajo hitro. (Tacit)

In ne le telesa – tudi rokopisi!

Ta mesta so bila dejansko najmanj verjetna kot najdishcha. Zhe sama izdelava pergamenta iz zhivalske kozhe je bila temu primerno draga, potem pa she chas, porabljen za pisanje ali prepis besedila – naposled pa vse to nekam zavrechi in pozabiti ... **Na kakshno mesto, kjer rokopis ne bi prezhivel niti nekaj let; vlaga, plesen, mishi, prah, toplota, zhuzhelke – in tako naj bi pozabljen pochival najmanj stoletje ali vech.** Pergament, che je bil she vedno za uporabo, so obichajno ochistili in popisali z novim besedilom. Od kod naj bi prishli izvirniki, da bi jih prepisali? V zakotnih samostanih, ki v dobi antichnih piscev sploh niso obstajali, naj bi kasneje nashli rokopise? Jih je kdo prinesel iz Konstantinopla? So bili skriti kje v Rimu? Mogoche so bili iz Toleda? Zakaj so bili skriti, che so jih prepisovali?

Ross nadaljuje o tem (podajam skrajshano):

¹⁶ Ross, Book II, Chapter IV, i:

Sum postaja vse mochnejshi, kajti dejstvo je, da je bilo leposlovje starih Rimljanov popolnoma unicheno v Evropi v prvih stoletjih kerschanstva in da bi bil njihov jezik popolnoma izgubljen, che ga do Justinjanove dobe (527-565) ne bi vodilni pravniki obranili za zagovore in spise ...

... zelo je vprashljivo, ali so samostani sploh kdaj resnichno obranili v kakrshnem koli, celo najmanjsbem obsegu dosezhke chloveshkega znanja ...

... Toda cheprav so dela starih Rimljanov obranili menibi v svojih samostanskih knjizhnicah, je to bilo le do zacetka zadnje chetrine shbestega stoletja. Potem pa je prishla mrachna doba osvajanj ...

... v tem chasu je leposlovje popolnoma ugasnilo za dve polni stoletji (568-774), ko so porushili samostane in unichili knjige kakor tudi zravnali z zemljo trdnjave in opustoshili mesta ...

... do ponovnega ozhivljanja znanosti v Petrarconi dobi kot tudi v dobi ocheta sodobne italijanske proze, Boccaccia, sredi shtirinajstega stoletja. Tako je osemsto let trajal moralni mrk vsega, kar je bilo odlichnega v chloveshkem znanju v Italiji in na celotnem zahodu Evrope ...

It is not important if Ross actually found the real culprit of forgery in Poggio Bracciolini. Essential is his analytical method to prove the forgery in the concept of its historical background.

Manuscripts turned up as if by magic ... Nicolò Niccoli, Poggio's lifelong friend and passionate collector of codices, possessed himself some 800 pieces. The richest libraries of the monasteries could have then an order of magnitude of 1000 codices. This amount of codices was able to check an experienced manuscript hunter in a couple of days. So it is practically impossible that even by the first visit, some manuscripts would not be noticed by the manuscript hunter. Therefore the hunters named the most *out-of-the-way places*, where the forgotten manuscripts awaited their rediscovery.

Corpora lente aucescent cito extinguuntur.

Bodies grow slowly and die quickly. (Tacitus)

And not only the bodies – the manuscripts also!

This places were actually very improbable as the discovery sites. Just to produce a parchment from the skin of an animal was a relatively expensive matter, then to invest the time to scribe or transcribe the text, – and then to dump it somewhere and forget ... **This somewhere was actually the place where a parchment wouldn't survive even a couple of years – humidity, mustiness, mice, dust, temperature, insects ... and it should there rest at least a century or more, forgotten.** The parchment, if still usable, was usually cleaned and overwritten with a new text.

Where from came the originals to be transcribed? In dark ages, in the monasteries in which the manuscripts should be later found, which at the time of authors did not even exist? Were they brought from Constantinople? Perhaps were they hidden somewhere in Rome? Perhaps from Toledo transcribers? If they were transcribed, why then hidden?

Ross, continued, but abridged by me, on this subject:

¹⁶ Ross, Book II, Chapter IV, i:

*The suspicion becomes all the stronger with the fact before us that **the literature of the ancient Romans was totally extinguished in Europe** in the very opening centuries of the Christian era; and*

that their language would have been also lost had it not been preserved till the age of Justinian (527-565) by the pleadings and writings of the leading lawyers; ...

... it being excessively questionable whether monasteries ever really conserved, to any, even the least extent, the interests of human knowledge ...

... But even if the works of the ancient Romans were preserved by the monks in their convent libraries, that was only till the approach of the last quarter of the sixth century. Then came the dark period of the conquest ...

...during that period literature became entirely extinguished, for two whole centuries (568-774) in demolishing monasteries and destroying books as in leveling fortresses and ravaging cities...

... the revival of learning during the age of Petrarch and the Father of modern Italian prose, Boccaccio, in the middle of the fourteenth century. Thus for eight hundred years there was a moral eclipse of all that was excellent in human knowledge in Italy and the whole West of Europe ...

¹⁶ Ross, Book II, Chapter IV, iv:

... *Labko razumemo, da so bile vredne knjige Grkov in Rimljanov ... varno in najdlje obranjene v raznih dezhelah, in da bi jih tam prej nashli kot kjerkoli v Grchiji in Italiji; toda ker so te dezhbele skož in skož pregledali, ni tako lahko razumeti, zakaj so bila njihova dela odkrita prav tako hitro in zlahka she v drugih, tudi v barbarskih dezhelah, vchasih celo hitreje in lazheje ...*

... *Ne bi minila stoletja, preden bi svet zvedel za njihov obstoj, che bi bila ta dela ostala v civiliziranih rokah, uchenjaki jih ne bi mogli izgubiti izpred oči, redki izbranci bi posredovali kopije iz roda v rod, toda v lasti nepismenih ljudi, zhivechih v barbarskih dezhelah, bi bila popolnoma skrita pogledu; taki ljudje bi z njimi ravnali kot svinje z biseri; prezirali bi jih; ne bi jih hranili v knjizhnicah, marvech bi jih zavrgli kot neuporabno ropotijo v kleti, jame, temne luknje, umazane prehode, suhe vodnjake, odvrgli bi jih kot izmechek na smetishche ali na kup gnoja. Skoraj isto pove Bracciolini s temachnimi izrazi »v temi«, »v temnici«, »v umazani jechi«, »v bednih jechah«, »v mnogih brlogih«, kot che bi rekel na primer »da so nashli knjige, ki so jih imeli v svojih samostanih zaprte v temi in v jechah brez oken« ...*

... *Resbil je ugledne avtorje iz bednih jech, v katerih so bili proti svoji volji ujeti, nedostopni za uporabo (ker so bili zaprti v mnogih brlogih in gnusnih jechah)« ...*

Mora nam biti jasno, da so knjige, odvrzhene na taka mesta, nashli chisto nakljuchno, ko so prishli do njih; zato je bilo takoj razumljivo, zakaj so stoletja ostale neznanne svetu. Le kdo bi se spomnil iskati knjige na takih mestih?

Toda to so bila tochno tista mesta, kjer je Bracciolini s svojimi spremljevalci iskal knjige, ki jih je hotel imeti; she bolj nenavadno je, da so na takih chudnih mestih odkrivali tochno tiste knjige, ki so jih iskali. Tako je bilo na primer, ko so nashli knjige v samostanu v St. Gallnu; knjig niso nashli tam, priznava Bracciolini, kjer bi morale biti zaradi svoje odlicnosti, namrech na policah knjizhnice, marvech tam, kjer bolj pogosto isbchemo in najdemo polzbe in krastache kot pa knjige in rokopise, v neki izredno umazani temni jechi na dnu grajskega stolpa, in eno teh knjig, avtorja Quintiliana, cheprav so jo oznachili kot »zdravo in varno«, so opisali tudi kot »nasicheno z vlago in umazano z blatom«, kakor da bi jo bili posebej umazali pri odkritju ...

¹⁶ Ross, Book II, Chapter IV, v:

... *Tak nachin mishljenja, che ga sprejmemo, na shiroko odpira vrata prevari in ponarejanju;*

... *Kako so te knjige prishle na taka mesta? Kdo jih je prenesel iz Italije, Grchije ali iz drugega omikanega predela sveta? Kakshen uchen menih, ki je postal opat ali prior kakega samostana v Nemchiji ali na Madzhbarskem? Ali kaksben enako uchen duhovnik, ki so ga v davnini poslali kot sbkofo, da bi pokristjaniel pogane v nekib she bolj barbarskih dezhelah na severu? Zakaj naj bi uspesni menibi, ljubitelji – dovolite – bolj oranja in zhetja kot pa branja in pisanja, ravnali s knjigami kot s smetmi, s knjigami, ki jih ocenjujejo kot brezvredne, kar zadeva njihove lastne okuse in nagnjenja? Saj so vendar vedeli, da te knjige visoko cenijo shtudirani ljudje v bolj civilizarnih krajih, in da bi bili ti uchenjaki, ki razumejo jezik, v katerem so napisane, in imajo njihovo vsebino za zelo dragoceno, pripravljene dati v zameno zanje vsak chas ne le velike, marvech tudi velikanske vsote denarja.*

¹⁶ Ross, Book II ,Chapter IV, iv:

*... We can easily understand how the valuable works of the Greeks and Romans, ... were safest and longest preserved in their respective countries, and that, therefore, they could have been found, sooner than elsewhere, in Greece and Italy; but after those countries had been thoroughly ransacked, **it is not so clear to comprehend how it should follow that their works were to be just as rapidly and easily found in other, and those barbarous countries, nay, indeed, more rapidly and more easily. ...***

*... **If those works had remained in civilized hands, centuries would not have elapsed without the world being cognizant of their existence; the learned could not have lost sight of them; the select few would have transmitted copies from generation to generation; but when they passed into the possession of unlettered men living in barbarous countries, they would then be altogether hidden from view; such people would treat them as swine treat pearls; spurn them; not keep them in libraries, but throw them away as useless lumber into cellars, pits, dark holes, dirty passages, dry wells; fling them away as refuse into dustbins or upon dung heaps.** Nearly as much says Bracciolini by these shadowy phrases: »in darkness«; »in a blind dungeon«; »in a dirty dungeon«; »in dismal dungeons,« and »in many dens,« as for instance, »for the sake of finding books that were kept by them in their convents shut up in darkness and in a blind dungeon«*

... »He had rescued renowned authors out of the dismal dungeons in which, against their will and without being used, they had been kept concealed (for they were shut up in many a den and foul dungeon«

Books thrown away in such places must be regarded, when recovered, as found by the purest accident; hence it was at once comprehensible how they had remained unknown to the world for hundreds of years; for who would think of looking for books in such places?

*Yet it was precisely in such places that Bracciolini and his companions looked for the books that they wanted; **what is still stranger, they always found in such queer places the exact books they were in search of.** It was so, for example, when they recovered the books in the monastery of St. Gall; the books were not found where, Bracciolini admits, they ought to have been, on account of their excellence, on the shelves of the library, but where slugs and toads are more frequently looked for and found than books and manuscripts, in an exceedingly dirty and dark dungeon at the bottom of a tower and one of these books, Quintilian, though described as »sound and safe,« is also described as being »**saturated with moisture and begrimed with mire,**« as if it had been made dirty expressly for the occasion of the recovery ...*

¹⁶ Ross, Book II, Chapter IV, v:

*... **This kind of reasoning, when admitted, throws the door open to fraud and forgery;***

*... How came these books into such places? Who took them from Italy, Greece, or other enlightened parts of the globe? If some learned monk, made abbot or prior of a convent of Germany or Hungary? or some equally learned priest sent as bishop to Christianize the heathen in still more barbarous lands in the North in a far distant age, why should succeeding monks, **fonder, be it granted, of ploughing and reaping than reading and writing, treat as refuse books which, though not deemed by them of any value, as far as their own tastes and inclinations were concerned, they, nevertheless, knew were held in the very highest esteem by the studious in more civilized parts; and that these studious people, understanding the language in which they were written, and considering their contents most precious, would willingly give in exchange for them at any time not large, but enormous sums of money?***

To so vprašanja, na katera ne moremo zadovoljivo odgovoriti; kajpe, da jih najbolj upraviči predlog za utemeljeno domnevo, **da so te knjige na debelo ponarejali**; skoraj nagibamo k temu, da priznamo očetju Hardoninu, da je imel prav, ko je izrazil svoje prepričanje, **da so stari Rimljani morda resnično napisali ne vech kot dva ali tri stare latinske klasike**.

Ti »klasichni« rokopisi so pravzaprav poglavitno znamenje preporoda in zanimivo je, zakaj je do tega preporoda zares tudi prishlo.

Cerkev je na svojih zacetkih nachrtno unichevala rimsko leposlovje kot poganske pisarije. Sveto pismo naj bi bilo dovolj, che kdo chuti potrebo po branju. Vech kot sheststo let pozneje je pochasi naraslo zanimanje za rimske klasike, to pa so mnogi razlagali kot odgovor na topost in dushevno praznino morechega cerkvenega ravnanja in učenja. Toda obstajali so tudi chlani visoke duhovshchine, ki so podpirali iskanje starega leposlovja. To so bili chasi, ko je Cerkev njej neprijetne ljudi ali pa tiste, ki jih je oznachila kot krivoverce, dajala muchiti in nato sezhgati na grmadah, da bi s tem »reshila« njihove dushe. Tako je bilo zanimanje za klasike uradno poimenovano kot zanimanje za klasichno lepoto, umetnost, morda modrost, ne pa za davna verstva.

Toda mislim, da je bilo vse to le posledica dejstva, da je Cerkev pochasi izgubljala svojo popolno oblast in moch; za tako mnenje ni potreben nikakrshen poseben dokaz. Za ljudi, ki so se imeli za naslednike velikega Rimskega imperija, je bila vrednost klasichne umetnosti in zgodovine potrditev za njihovo zahtevo po vodilni politichni vlogi v svojem chasu. Med na novo nastajajochimi silami v Evropi je papeshtvo poskušalo zadržhati ali pa podpreti svojo premoch nad vsako posvetno oblastjo. Polozhaj je bil podoben tistemu, kot je bil kasneje ob primeru *Germanije*. Shlo je za povzdigovanje »slavne« preteklosti, da bi vzbudili in ponovno utrdili oslABLJENO samosposhtovanje, da bi drugim spet pokazali lastno premoch. Tekma med domachimi voditelji in bogatimi meshchani, kdo bo imel vech boljshih in bolj znanih rokopisov, je bila prav »en vogue« in vsekakor vprašanje ugleda (... **pripravljeni dati v zameno zanje vsak chas ne le velike, marvech velikanske vsote denarja**) ter je ustrezala resnično iskrenim obchudovalcem in iskalcem klasichnih starin.

POGGIO IN AENEA

... *Exit Poggio ... Enter Aenea Silvio Piccolomini ...*

S temi besedami se je Krebs »razbremenil« bremena, da naj bi bil »dobil« *Germanijo* od hersfeldskega meniha Poggia, in je hkrati »obremenil« Piccolominija, poznejshega papezha Pija II., z nadaljnjo usodo *Germanije*.

Piccolomini je nekako dobil *Germanijo*, ki naj bi jo, recheno po Krebsu in drugih, v Fuldi nashel Enoch iz Ascolija. Toda zelo verjetno rokopis *Germanije* ni bil nikoli v Fuldi ...

*These are questions that cannot be answered with satisfaction: they seem to give the highest coloring of truth to what has been suggested, **that there was a wholesale forgery of these books**; and one is almost inclined to give Father Hardouin credit, for being quite right, when he expressed as his belief that, perhaps, **not more than two or three of the ancient Latin classics were really written by the old Romans.***

These »classic« manuscripts are actually the main mark of the renaissance and it is interesting, why actually emerged the renaissance?

The Church in its beginnings destroyed systematically the Roman literature as the heathen writings, The Bible should be enough if somebody felt the need for reading. More than officially six hundred years later – slowly rose the interest on Roman classics, many interpreting it as the answer on the dullness and intellectual emptiness of the oppressive Church's behavior and teachings. But there were also the members of the high clergy, which promoted the search for the old literature. These were the times in which to The Church inconvenient people or those declared as heretics, were conveniently tortured and then burnt on the stake »just« to save their souls. Therefore it was officially declared that the interest in classics was the interest for the classic aesthetics, art, perhaps wisdom, and not in the long past beliefs.

But I think that it was mostly due to the fact that The Church was slowly losing its absolute might and power – there is no need for any especial proofs of the situation. For the people, which considered themselves as the heirs of the great Roman Empire, was the promotion of the classic art and history the confirmation of their claims for the leading political role at that time. Among the new emerging powers in Europe, the papacy tried to keep or to promote its superiority over any worldly power. It was actually the situation similar to that later with *Germania*. It was the reflection on the »glorious« past to evoke and reaffirm the weakened self esteem, to show others again the own supremacy. The competition of the local chieftains and the rich citizens, who will possess more, better and more renowned manuscripts was just »en vogue« and a matter of prestige (*... would willingly give in exchange for them at any time not large, but enormous sums of money?*), well serving the genuinely interested admirers and discoverers of the classic artifacts.

POGGIO and AENEA

... Exit Poggio ... Enter Aenea Silvio Piccolomini ...

With these words Krebs »freed« Poggio of burden to have »obtained« *Germania* from the monk of Hersfeld and »burdened« Piccolomini with the further destiny of *Germania* (p 74,79).

Piccolomini did somehow obtain *Germania*, which was according to Krebs and others, allegedly recovered, as said, from Fulda by Enoch from Ascoli. But very probably was *Germania* MS never in Fulda ...

Krebs pravi, naj bi Poggiov sin Jacopo »podal dokaz«, da njegov oče dejansko ni nashel Germanije. Kakšen dokaz? Je Jacopovo pismo dovolj in kako? Che je sploh vedel za *Germanijo*, gotovo ni bil toliko neumen, da bi ogrožhal svojo dedishchino ...

Dejstvo je, da sta se Poggio in Aenea Silvio Bartholomeo, imenovan Piccolomini, osebno poznala.

Mozhno je, da je bil mladi Piccolomini tedaj, ko je bil učenec Filelfa, enega najbolj znanih firentinskih humanistov, zhe seznanjen s Poggiom. Piccolominijevo pismo Giovanniju Aurispi iz leta 1431 pricha o njegovih poznanstvih s humanisti (34 str. 23).

V nasprotnem primeru je bil mladi Piccolomini, ko je leta 1431 prevzel polozhaj tajnika shkofa Domenica Capranica in ga je spremljal na baselski koncil (1431-1439), komajda znan Poggiu.

Piccolomini je bil do leta 1435 vechinoma v Baslu. Takrat je bil Poggio prav tako v Baslu, namrech kot tajnik papezha Evgenija IV., ki ga je nato tudi spremljal v Firenco. Toda za Poggia kot papezhevega tajnika je zagotovo vedel mladi Piccolomini. Oba sta se zanimala za podobne humanistichne ideje in Poggio napredujočega Piccolominija kasneje zagotovo ni prezrl, she zlasti ne zaradi Piccolominijevih zhalilnih pisem proti papezhu Evgeniju IV. Leta 1435 je kardinal Albergati, poslanec Evgenija IV. na koncilu, poslal Piccolominija s tajno nalogo na Shkotsko. Poggio je bival na Angleshkem med leti 1418-1423, pa so se verjetno tudi z njim posvetovali o Piccolominijevi nalogi.

Po vrnitvi iz Shkotske se je Piccolomini pridruzhil protipapezhu Feliksu V. in je tako postal nasprotnik papezha Evgenija IV. Ko je protipapezh Feliks V. odstopil, se je Piccolomini verjetno potuhnil in je odshel, da bi se izognil morebitnim »posledicam«, v Strasbourg, nato pa na Dunaj na dvor cesarja Friderika III. Habsburzhana, pri katerem je bil nato pisar.

Che Poggio ni zhe prej poznal Piccolominija, je zvedel zanj kot za nasprotnika, ki ga je moral resno uposhtevati.

Sodech po Poggiovem sramotilnem pismu zoper protipapezha Feliksa V., je Piccolomini kot pristash tega protipapezha (28 Shepherd, str. 407) pripadal ljudem, opisanim takole:

... Komu ni znan znachaj te buchne tolpe najbolj razuzdanih mozgh? Kdo ne pozna te vrste ljudi, kako izprijeni, kako razpushcheni, kako pokvarjeni so bili zbrani v zlonamerni greznici? Odpadniki, preshustniki, skrunilci, ubezhniki, ljudje obtozbeni najbolj sramotnih zlochinov, bogokletniki, uporniki proti Bogu in proti svojim predstojnikom ...

Piccolomini je nedvomno prebral to zhaljivko; kot porochajo zgodovinarji, je v odgovor napisal tudi svojo protizhaljivko. Vprashanje pa je, ali je sploh kdaj zares pozabil vsebino zhaljivke.

Poggio in Piccolomini sta se gotovo spet sreчала leta 1445, ko se je slednji vrnil v Rim, zashchiten z »diplomatsko imuniteto«, in se je opravičil papezhu Evgeniju IV.; »priznal« je, da je bil zapeljan na krivo pot, k lazni resnici, mlad, neizkushen, ko je sledil slabim zgledom, in papezh mu je odpustil. Nato je Piccolomini odshel kot papezhev pogajalec v Nemchijo.

Poggio's son Jacopo »provided evidence« (p. 74), so Krebs, that his father in fact not obtained the *Germania* – which evidence, is his letter enough, and how? If he knew at all about *Germania*, he was surely not a fool to endanger his inheritance ...

The fact is that Poggio and Aenea Silvio Bartholomeo named Piccolomini were personal acquaintances.

Perhaps was the young Piccolomini as the student of Filelfo – one of the at the time Florentine humanists – already introduced to Poggio. A letter of Piccolomini to Giovanni Aurispa in 1431 testifies on some introductions to the humanists (³⁴ p. 23

If not, was very probably the young Piccolomini by taking the post of secretary to the bishop Domenico Capranica in 1431, accompanying the bishop to the Council of Basel (1431-39), hardly known to Poggio.

Piccolomini stayed mostly in Basel till 1435. At that time was Poggio also in Basel as the secretary of the Pope Eugenius IV, later following the Pope to Florence. But Poggio as the Pope's secretary was surely well known to young Piccolomini. They both had the similar humanistic interests and prosperous Piccolomini surely didn't pass later unnoticed by Poggio, especially due to Piccolomini's invectives against the Pope Eugenius IV. In the year 1435 was Piccolomini sent by Cardinal Alberghati, Eugenius IV's legate at the council, on a secret mission to Scotland. Poggio dwelt in England from 1418 – 1423 and was probably also consulted in the case of Piccolomini's mission.

Returning from the mission Piccolomini sided with the Antipope Felix V, and was so in the party opposite to Eugenius IV. He went, after the Antipope Felix V stepped down, but, very probably just moved out of sight to avoid the possible »consequences«, to Strassbourg and then to Vienna on the court of the Emperor Frederik III.

If not earlier, Poggio learned him then as an opponent to be kept under the scrutiny.

According to Poggio's invective against Antipope Felix V, belonged Piccolomini as a supporter of the Antipope to (Shepherd p. 407):

... For who is ignorant of the character of that tumultuary band of most debauched men? Who does not know what sort of people, how nefarious, how abandoned, how wicked, were assembled in that sink of iniquity? - apostates, fornicators, ravishers, deserters, men convicted of the most shameful crimes, blasphemers, rebels against God and their superiors. ...

Piccolomini surely read this invective, as said, wrote also his own, but did he ever forgot its contents? ...

They both surely met again in 1445, when Piccolomini returned to Rome, safe due to »diplomatic immunity« and apologized to Pope Eugene IV – »confessing« that he was misled on the wrong way, to false truth, young, inexperienced, following the bad examples – and was pardoned and went as Pope's mediator to Germany.

Papezha ustolichijo kot »Ocheta kraljev in princev, vladarja sveta«, zato se je Piccolominiu splachal »razvoj« iz Savla v Pavla, da je spoznal »Resnico in Pravo pot z Bozhjo pomocho« ter se tudi ponizhno skesal za pretekle grehe.

Njegove naslednje stopnice v cerkveni hierarhiji so bile shkof, kardinal in nazadnje papezh. Vechina njegovih zhivljenjepiscev, posebej nemshkih, je polna hvale zanj, zlasti glede njegove pobozhne spreobrnitve ...

... *Konchno je tishino prekinil Roderigo Borgia: »Glasujem za kardinala iz Siene,« je dejal ...*

... kardinali so mu sledili in Piccolomini je bil leta 1458 izvoljen za papezha kot Pij II. (35 str. 243).

Piccolomini v *Bulla retractationis* leta 1463 – Poggio je bil tedaj zhe mrtev – pravi takole (36 str. 4):

... *v neznanju ... v zmoti ... preklicujem ... zavrzite Aenea, sprejmite Pija (Aeneam rejcite, Pium recipite) ...*

Tako je Piccolomini uradno priznal svoje nekdanje zmote, popolnoma skesan, toda z novim zharom, vse z namenom, da bi se izognil izgubi lastne veljave zaradi svojih prejsnjih dejanj.

Med drugim si je prislužil celo slavilno pesnitev. ^{36a}

Piccolomini je bil zelo chastihlepen in tudi nevaren chlovek – oportunist in konformist. Dovolj razlogov torej, da je bil Poggio z njim zelo previden in spravljiv. Piccolomini je Poggia je oznachil kot »auri cupidissimo« (37 Walser, str.199), tj. »zlato najbolj privrzheni«.

Sicer pa je bila Poggiova usoda nekoliko podobna Piccolominijevi. Poggio je bil v chasu koncila v Konstanci v sluzhbi papezha Janeza XXIII. (po nekaterih virih XXII.). Po papezhevem odstopu je ostal nekako zvest svojemu staremu »shefu«, toda vseno je poskushal dobiti sluzhbo pri novem papezhu. Ni mu uspelo, pa je sprejel sluzhbo pri kardinalu Beaufortu v Angliji; pravzaprav se je tako tudi potuhnil, dalech od Rima, da bi se izognil morebitnim tezhavam. Tako Poggio kot Piccolomini sta si zelo prizadevala, da bi premagala revshchino in da bi si pridobila visoke polozhaje.

Sodech po pismih, ki sta si jih izmenjala, sta bila drug do drugega prijazna; che pa sta bila prijatelja, verjetno nista gojila tesnejshega prijateljstva (37 Walser, str. 297).

Poggio je Piccolominiju ob izvolitvi za papezha Pija II. napisal chestitko, izjemno glede na tedaj obichajno prijaznost: *Sanctissimo ac beatissimo domino nostro pape Pio.*

Poggio se je pach zhe zdavnaj nauchil, komu, kdaj in koliko se mora prikloniti. Gotovo mu je bilo tudi znano Piccolominijevo posebno zanimanje za Tevtonce. Zelo verjetno je Piccolominiju posredoval tekst *Germanije*; kdaj je to bilo, lahko le ugibamo, toda moralo je biti prej, preden je Piccolomini napisal tista pisma, pri Nemcih tako chashchena, shkofu v Meinzu, pravzaprav njegovemu tajniku Martinu Mayerju (1458) ³⁸.

Kaj naj bi bil Poggiov razlog za izrochitev *Germanije*? Je bil kot »auri cupidissimo« bogato poplachan? Mogoche je upal, da bo s tem ohranil svoj dober odnos z vatikansko kurijo: Piccolominijev vpliv je rasel, Poggio pa je bil dovolj izkushen, da je lahko predvideval njegov nadaljnji vzpon. Po smrti papezha Nikolaja V. je Poggio zapustil svoj urad v Vatikanu in prevzel sluzhbo firentinskega kanclerja (1453).

The pope is crowned as the »Father of kings and princes, ruler of the world«, so it was worth to »evolve« from Saulus to Paulus, to recognize »the Truth and the Right Way with God's help« as well to remorse humbly past sins.

His further steps in the Church hierarchy were bishop, cardinal and at last pope. The most of his biographers, especially German, are full of praise for him, his pious turn ...

... *At last the silence was broken by Roderigo Borgia, »I vote for the Cardinal of Siena«, he said ...*³⁵

... the Cardinals followed and Piccolomini was in the year 1458 elected to Pope.

Piccolomini in *Bulla retractationis* 1463 – Poggio was then already dead ³⁶:

... *in ignorance ... in error ... revoking ... Aeneam rejicite, Pium recipite ...*

... reject Aenea, receive Pius ... he confessed officially his past mistakes, full regret, but with the new vigor – to avoid any loss of authority due to his former deeds ...

Med drugim si je prisluzhil celó slavilno pesnitev. ^{36a}

Piccolomini was a very ambitious and actually a very dangerous man – an opportunist and a conformist. Enough for Poggio to be very cautious and conciliate concerning Piccolomini, who named him »auri cupidissimo« ³⁷ (Walser p. 199) – an avaricious man.

Poggios fate was actually something similar to Piccolominis. Poggio was at the time of Council of Constance in the service of the Pope John XXIII (according to some sources XXII). After the Pope's abdiction – Poggio remained somewhat loyal to his old »chief«, but tried to get the job by the new Pope. Not succeeding, he went to England employed by Cardinal Beaufort, as mentioned already – actually also moving out of the direct sight of Rome, perhaps avoiding also possible troubles. Both struggled hardly from the poverty to obtain and to attain their positions ...

According to their mutual correspondence, they were both cordial to each other, but if they were friendly, they were no close friends ³⁷ (Walser p. 297). Poggio has him written an exceptional letter of congratulation on the event of the election to Pope Pius II, outstanding from the till then usual cordiality, titled: *Sanctissimo ac beatissimo domino nostro pape Pio*.

Poggio learned already long ago, when, to whom and how much to bend his back. Poggio surely knew Piccolomini's preoccupation with Teutons. Very probably he passed *Germania* to Piccolomini – when and where can be only speculated, but it should have been before Piccolomini wrote his, by Germans so famous and cherished, letter(s) to bishop in Mainz, actually to his secretary Martin Mayer (1458).³⁸

What would be Poggio's reason to do this? Was he, »auri cupidissimo«, richly paid? Maybe he hoped to keep the good relations with Curia – Piccolomini's influence grew and Poggio was experienced enough to estimate his further rise. After the death of Pope Nicholas V left Poggio his office in Vatican and took the position of the Florentine chancellor (1453).

Kasneje (1456) se je zhelel vrniti v Vatikan; v tem času pa je bil v Vatikanu njegov najbolj gorechi nasprotnik Lorenzo Valla, ki je veljal za »strogega slovnicharja« in ki je grajal Poggiov stil pisanja. Poggio je tudi vedel, da je bil Valla nekoch obtozhen krivoverstva, ker je razkrinkal Kristusovo pismo Abgariju kot ponaredek. Za Poggia je bil Valla nedvomno nevaren chlovek. Piccolomini bi bil za Poggia zelo dobrodoshel kot njegov zaveznik v Vatikanu.

Kot rokopis sumljivega izvora *Germanija* ni bila primerna, da bi jo Poggio na vse strani ponujal kupcem; za domache Italijane verjetno sploh ni bila zanimiva. Nasprotno pa velja za Piccolominija, ki je verjetno poznal njeno poreklo; morda je kaj »popravil« ali »dodal« rokopisu ali pa je celo prosil Poggia, da to naredi – vse v interesu lastnih politichnih namenov. Taka domneva je mozhna, ker naj bi Piccolomini »odkril« Jordanesov (Jordanes, Jordanis, Jornandis) spis *Getica*, v katerem je referenca k *Analom* nekega Cornelija (²⁷ *Europa*, str. 180, knjiga 29, 96).

Ross o tem pishe (¹⁶ Book I, Chapter I, ii):

Na splošno domnevajo, da Jornandes, chigar dela so tako vredna zaradi v njih podane zgodovine petega in shestega stoletja nashe dobe, pravzaprav govori o Tacitu, ko v drugem poglavju svoje zgodovine Gotov govori o nekem »Corneliju kot avtorju Analov« – ti so bili brez naslova vse do leta 1533, ko je Beat Rhenan prvi dal tem knjigam ime Anali. In dalje, le kako bi mogel Jornandes, ki je zhivel v shestem stoletju, kaj vedeti o kakršnih koli Tacitovih spisih z imenom Anali, ko pa jih s tem naslovom niso oznachevali vse do shestnajstega stoletja?

Silvio Aenea Piccolomini je bil tudi humanist z leposlovno izobrazbo. Na dvoru nemshkega cesarja Friderika III. so ga okronali s krono »vechno zelenih lovorjevih listov«, namenjeno pesnikom (³⁴ Ady, str. 73); torej je bil brez dvoma sposoben »popraviti« Jordanesa s kakshnim vstavkom. Zagotovo je bil je oche dveh, domnevno (po govoricah) pa celo dvanajstih otrok; pisal je erotichna (vchasih oznachena kot pornografska) besedila, njegov roman *Pripoved o dveh ljubimcib* je bil do srede 20. stoletja prepovedano branje v katolishkih deklishkih ustanovah, mogoche to velja she danes.

Toda on bo vselej v spominu kot oche pravzaprav celotne nacije – je edinstven, kot porocha Krebs (str. 81):

... Piccolomini used Germania to identify Germanen and contemporaneous Germans as the same people at two different moments in history ...

(... Piccolomini uporablja *Germanijo* za istovetenje Germanov in sodobnih Nemcev kot istega ljudstva v dveh razlichnih trenutkih zgodovine ...)

V svojem delu, pozneje imenovanem *De Europa* ²⁷, Piccolomini redkokdaj graja mogochnike, njihove vojne, umore, ropanja, plenitve in posilstva, marvech jih v glavnem oznachuje kot modre, plemenite, vzgojene in dobre kristjane. Posebno so mu pri srcu nemshki plemenichi, ni maral Francozov in tudi ne slovanskih narodov, ki jih je oznachil kot zelo divje, najbolj pa je obsojal »divje« Shvicarje, ki naj bi jih z njegovega vidika prekashali morda le Turki.

Njegova politichna zvijachnost kakor tudi dvosmiselnost med intimno in uradno privrzenostjo kazheta veliko razliko, pridobljeno na podlagi osebnih izkushenj, saj se je vechinoma moral prikljanjati, in to ne le veljakom, kot je najboljše oznachila Cecilia M. Ady (³⁴ str. 109):

Later (1456) he wished to return to Vatican. In Vatican stayed his at the time worst adversary Lorenzo Valla, who was held as an »acute grammarian« and allegedly criticized Poggios literary style. Poggio also knew that Valla was earlier accused of heresy by debunking a letter of Christ to Abgarus as a forgery. For Poggio he was a dangerous man. Piccolomini would be very welcome as his ally in Vatican.

As a manuscript of a suspicious provenience, was *Germania* somewhat less safe to be generally put on the market and for the locals was also just not interesting at all. Not so for Piccolomini.

It is possible that Piccolomini knew *Germania's* source, maybe he »reformulated« or even »added« something to the manuscript or very probable even asked Poggio to do so – it had just to serve his political goals. This assertion can be made, as Piccolomini allegedly »discovered« Jordanes *Getica* and in *Getica* is the reference to *Annales of a certain Cornelius* ²⁷ (Europa p. 180, Book 29, 96).

Ross on the subject (¹⁶ Book I, Chapter I, ii):

It is generally supposed that Jornandez, whose works are so valuable for their history of the fifth and sixth centuries of our aera, -when speaking, in the second chapter of his History of the Goths, of one »Cornelius as the author of Annals,« is speaking of Tacitus, -it not being till 1533, that Beatus Rhenanus first gave those books the name »Annals« Then how could Jornandez, who lived in the sixth century, have known any writings of Tacitus by the name of »Annals«, when that title was not given to them until the sixteenth century?

Sylvius Aeneus Piccolomini was also humanist, linguistically educated. On the court of Frederik III was he crowned with the »ever verdant laurel leaves« crown of the poets (¹³⁴Ady p. 73) and he was doubtless capable to »correct« Jordanes with an insertion. He fathered two (surely) to twelve (gossip) children – he wrote erotic, sometimes designated as pornographic, texts – his novel »The tale of two lovers« was till the middle of the 20th century a forbidden reading in the catholic female schools – and maybe still nowadays.

But he will be ever rememberd as the father of actually a whole nation – he is the one, as Krebs reports (p. 81):

... Piccolomini used Germania to identify Germanen and contemporaneous Germans as the same people at two different moments in history ...

In his work, later named *De Europa* [64], Piccolomini rarely criticizes the powerful, their wars, their murders, their robberies, their plunders, their rapes ... but they are mostly designed as wise, noble, educated and good Christians. Especially the German nobility was at his heart, he didn't like the French, the Slavonic nations – designed as the very wild ones, but he mostly condemned the wild Swiss, they were surpassed in his view perhaps only by Turks.

His political »wit«, his ambivalence between his personal and his official preferences shows a contrast to his personal experiences and feelings, mostly bending his back not only to powerful, at best illustrated with Cecilia M. Ady's (¹³⁴p. 109) remark:

... *bila je simpatija, s katero se je srečal pri ljudeh, ki niso bili Tevtonci ...*

Tako je označeval svoje izobrazhene *žnance*, vechinoma Slovane in Madzhare (ne velja za Tevtonce), s katerimi je imel zelo slabe izkushnje na Bavarskem; o tem poroča v svojih pismih, kot kazhejo naslednji citati (³⁵ Boulting, str. 117):

... *nich ni hujshega od vrochichnega taborishcha, kot je to princhev dvor. Zavist, ljubosumje, obrekovanje, mrzkost, sovrashstvo, sramotenje, zhalitve in nenebno muchenje so tam doma ... Ne moresh prijetno pljuniti (pri kosilu), marvech morash umažati sosedova oblachila ...*

Dunaj je opisal takole:

... *Shtudentje se predajajo zabavam, so pogoltneshi in pijanci, ponochi postopajo po ulicah in napadajo meschane, njihovi mozhgani so polni labkih zhenesk ...*

... *Neustadt je mesto menihov in Zhidov ... na Shtajerskem, Koroshkem in Kranjskem zhivijo barbari ...* (³⁵ Boulting, str. 119)

V omenjenih dezhelah je imel shkofovski položaj; to so slovenske dezhele, kjer celjskih grofov in knezov ni maral, bili so med redkimi mogochniki, ki jih je v spisih grajal.

O Leipzigu je zapisal:

... *Tam je navada, da družhba Saksoncev daje chastno mesto tistim, ki najvech zhlampajo, in to razvedrilo imenujejo – pijanska tekma.*

Te vrstice zvenijo kot obrekovanje, toda podobno pravi tudi Krebs v svoji knjigi *Negotatio Germanie* (³⁹ str. 20) z naslednjim zapletenim stavkom:

Enea Silvius und seiner oratio fördert signifikante Differenzen zutage; und wieder anders ist das Bild Deutschlands in Enea Silvius Briefen an seine zumeist italienischen Korrespondenten. Aus ibrem jeweiligen Kontext gelöst und zum Deutschlandbild des Autors hypostasiert, widersprechen die Bilder einander derart, daß der Versuch einer verbindlichen Aussage über das Deutschlandbild Enea Silvius schlechterdings scheitern muß; jedoch innerhalb ihres argumentativen Kontextes machen diese Bilder Sinn, weil sie als Argument das jeweilige Beweisziel zu erreichen helfen.

Krebs ugotavlja, da sama sebi nasprotujocha podoba Nemchije Piccolominiju pomeni sredstvo, da dosezhe svoj namen v danih okolishchinah; pravzaprav gre za svojevrsten makiavelizem pred Machiavellijem.

Piccolomini v *De Europa* omenja legendo, da so Franki potomci plemenitih Trojancev, na drugem mestu pravi, da so potomci Skitov (²⁷ str. 226), Saksonci pa potomci pogumnih Makedoncev. To omenjam, da bi opozoril na Piccolominijevo tezo o t. i. »selitvi narodov«, zlasti slovanskih (²⁷ knjige 16-21), ker je to ena od osnovnih zgodovinskih postavk, ki so jo iz te knjige prevzeli nemshki zgodovinarji. Piccolomini sicer tudi navaja, da so »divji« Shvicarji iz trupel svojih sovrazhnikov delali klopi in mize za pojedine, ko so zhrli njihova srca (enako menda danes pochnejo sirski uporniki z Assadovimi vojaki).

Piccolomini ne omenja spisa *Translatio sancti Alexandri*⁹, porochila o pokristjanjevanju Saksoncev, kjer je opisan prenos relikvije (trupla sv. Aleksandra iz Rima v Spodnjo Saksonijo v 9. stol.), ki je bila darilo papezha Leona nemshkemu cesarju Lotharju. Poroča pa o krvavechih hostijah (o Saksoncih, ²⁷ knjiga 32, 113, str.197).

... *it was the sympathy which he met with among the non-Teutonic peoples ...*

naming his educated acquaintances, mostly Slavs and Hungarians, but not Teutons – with whom he made quite a bad experience in Bavaria (reported in letters, ⁽³⁵⁾ Boulting, p. 117):

... *no more hard-beated camp than the court of a prince. There envy, jealousy, calumny, hatred, enmity, infamy, insult and ceaseless torment take up their abode ... One cannot spit [by lurch] comfortably, but one must needs soil the clothes of a neighbor ...*

He wrote on Vienna:

... *The students give themselves over to pleasure they are gluttons and wine-bibbers, they prowl the streets at night and attack citizens, their minds are wholly taken up with light women. ...*

... *Neustadt is a city of monks and Jews ... Styria, Carinthia and Carniola are inhabited by barbarians ...* (⁽³⁵⁾ Boulting, p. 119).

In these lands he lived and held the bishop's seat ... but they are Slovenian lands, and the Counts and Dukes of Celje disliked he especially – the rare powerful he criticized.

On Leipzig:

For there is a custom at the gatherings of the Saxons to give the place of honor to those who can swill the most, and they call the pastime a drinking match.

The rows above read as a gossip, but Krebs in his *Negotatio Germanie* (⁽³⁹⁾ p. 20) states the similar in this complicated sentence:

... *Enea Silvius und seiner oratio fördert signifikante Differenzen zutage; und wieder anders ist das Bild Deutschlands in Enea Silvius Briefen an seine zumeist italienischen Korrespondenten. Aus ihrem jeweiligen Kontext gelöst und zum Deutschlandbild des Autors hypostasiert, widersprechen die Bilder einander derart, daß der Versuch einer verbindlichen Aussage über das Deutschlandbild Enea Silvius schlechterdings scheitern muß; jedoch innerhalb ihres argumentativen Kontextes machen diese Bilder Sinn, weil sie als Argument das jeweilige Beweisziel zu erreichen helfen. ...*

and concludes that the Piccolomini's controversial depiction of Germany just suit to serve as argument of evidence to reach the goal of the given context ... actually an application of Machiavellism before Machiavelli.

In *De Europa* he mentioned the tale that the Franks were fathered by noble Trojans, somewhere else that they are the offspring of Scythes (⁽²⁷⁾ p. 226), the Saxons were fathered by brave Macedonians – I refer this just to remember on allegedly his people's migration ideas, especially the Slavic (⁽²⁷⁾ Books 16-21), as it is one of the basic notions from this book, endorsed by German historians. Further, the wild Swiss made from the corpses of the foes the banks and the tables, where they sat and devoured the hearts of their enemies – just the same as the Syrian insurgents with the Assad soldiers nowadays.

He did not mention the *Translatio sancti Alexandri*, the report on the conversion of Saxons to Christianity, describing the transport of the relic (the body of the St. Alexander ⁹, from Rome in Saxonia, in the 9th century), the gift of the Pope Leo to emperor Lothar. But he reports on bleeding hosties ... (on Saxonia, ⁽²⁷⁾ Book 32, 113, p. 197)

V *De Europi* (27 str. 58, knjiga 1, 4) je ena redkih graj Nemcev, ko Piccolomini skoraj opravičuje Madzhare za pokol nemških trgovcev:

... Za panonske narode ni nich bolj neprijetno kot z trgovati z Nemci, ki izplechejo vse zlato iz dezhle ...

V nobenem odlomku v tej knjigi ni bolje opisal svojega (uradnega) prijateljskega odnosa z Nemci kot tam, kjer obchuduje grofa Albrechta, s katerim sta se osebno poznala. Citiram v nemshchini, ker ne zmorem slovenskega prevoda v stilu tako izvirnega prijateljskega navdushenja, kot ga kazhe nemški prevod, kaj shele latinski izvirnik (27 str. 232, knjiga 39, 138, ff):

... In dieser Provinz hatte Friedrich, Markgraf von Brandenburg ... vier Söhne: Johannes, Friedrich, Albrecht und den anderen Friedrich ...

... Albrecht zog fast alle Fürsten Deutschlands auf seine Seite, als er Nürnberger angriff; die Städte schickten den Nürnbergern Hilfe. Es war ein schwerer und grausamer Krieg, in dem so mächtige Gegner zwei Jahre lang mit erbittertem Hass stritten. Sie sollen neun Schlachten geschlagen haben, acht davon vollendete Albrecht als Sieger, nur in einer unterlag er als Besiegter und war erst mit dem Frieden einverstanden, nachdem er die Äcker beraubt, die Gehöfte zerriütet, das Vieh weggetrieben, die Landbewohner getöet hatte und Proviant und Geld den Streitenden fehlten. Dann wurde auch über den Frieden gesprochen, und zwar nach dem Willen Albrechts. Dieser Albrecht nahm, wie sie sagen, von Kindesbeinen an dazu erzogen, in Waffen an mehr Schlachten teil, als andere Herzogs seines alters von Schlachten gesehen oder gelesen hatten. Er führte Krieg in Polen, er kämpfte in Schlesien, er schlug in Preussen Lager auf, er warf seine Feinde in Böhmen nieder, er machte Feldzüge nach Österreich, er holte sich Beute aus Ungarn, kein Winkel auf dem Boden Deutschlands, den er nicht bewaffnet betreten hatte; er führte unzählige Kriege an, er vernichtete die wildesten Feinde, er eroberte die bestbefestigten Städte. Bei Zusammenstossen fing er als Erster den Kampf an, als Sieger kam er als Letzter aus der Schlacht; beim erobern von Städten erstieg er oft als Erster die Mauer; von zahlreichen Nachbarn zu Duellen aufgefordert, lebnte er niemals ab, und immer warf er den Feind nieder. Bei kriegerischen Spielen, bei denen man sich mit der Lanze misst, wurde er als der Einzige von allen ermittelt, der niemals von Pferd geworfen wurde und der alle, die gegen ihn los rannten, abwarf. Aus Turnieren ging er immer als Sieger hervor. Siebzehn Mal eilte er, allein bedeckt mit Schild und Helm, im Übrigen nackt (wie es bei den Deutschen eine besondere Art des Duells ist), gegen seine auf gleiche Weise bewaffneten Gegner zu, mit scharfer Lanze, wobei er keinen Schaden erlitt, währen er selbst die Gegner immer vom Pferd werfen konnte. Wegen dieser Taten wurde er nicht zu Unrecht der »deutsche Achill« genannt, an dem nicht nur die Kriegskünste und die Tugenden eines Feldherrn mit einziger Anmut strahlten, sondern auch der Adel seiner Herkunft. Der hohe Wuchs und die Schönheit seines Körpers, die Grösse seiner Kräfte und seine beredte Sprache machten ihn bewundernswert und fast göttlich.

...

Skratka, Albrecht je pristal na premirje shele, ko je izropal polja, porushil kmetije, odpeljal zhivino, pobil vse kmete ...

... Vojeval je na Poljskem, boril se je v Shleziji, taboril v Prusiji, premagal svoje nasprotnike na Cheshkem, opravil pohode na Avstrijskem, plenil po Madzharskem, ni ga kota na nemških tleh, kjer ni nastopil z orozhjem, vodil je neshete vojne, unichil je najbolj divje sovražnike, osvojil je najbolj utrjena mesta. Prvi je shel v boj, zadnji se je vrachal iz bitke ...

In De Europa (²⁷ p. 58, Book I , 4) even one of seldom serious reproaches to Germans, almost excusing the Hungarians for the slaughter of the German traders:

... For the Pannonic nations there is nothing more inconvenient than the trading with Germans, who drag all the gold out of the region.

... No passage of his book better illustrates his (official) friendly relation to Germans as his admiration (private?) of count Albrecht, his personal acquaintance. I cite it in German – I am just not capable to translate it in the original amicable pathetic style (²⁷ p. 232, Book 39, 138, ff):

... In dieser Provinz hatte Friedrich, Markgraf von Brandenburg ... vier Söhne: Johannes, Friedrich, Albrecht und den anderen Friedrich ...

... Albrecht zog fast alle Fürsten Deutschlands auf seine Seite, als er Nürnberger angriff; die Städte schickten den Nürnbergern Hilfe. Es war ein schwerer und grausamer Krieg, in dem so mächtige Gegner zwei Jahre lang mit erbittertem Hass stritten. Sie sollen neun Schlachten geschlagen haben, acht davon vollendete Albrecht als Sieger, nur in einer unterlag er als Besiegter und war erst mit dem Frieden einverstanden, nachdem er die Äcker beraubt, die Gehöfte zerrüttet, das Vieh weggetrieben, die Landbewohner getötet hatte und Proviant und Geld den Streitenden fehlten. Dann wurde auch über den Frieden gesprochen, und zwar nach dem Willen Albrechts. Dieser Albrecht nahm, wie sie sagen, von Kindesbeinen an dazu erzogen, in Waffen an mehr Schlachten teil, als andere Herzogs seines Alters von Schlachten gesehen oder gelesen hatten. Er führte Krieg in Polen, er kämpfte in Schlesien, er schlug in Preussen Lager auf, er warf seine Feinde in Böhmen nieder, er machte Feldzüge nach Österreich, er holte sich Beute aus Ungarn, kein Winkel auf dem Boden Deutschlands, den er nicht bewaffnet betreten hatte; er führte unzählige Kriege an, er vernichtete die wildesten Feinde, er eroberte die bestbefestigten Städte. Bei Zusammenstößen fing er als Erster den Kampf an, als Sieger kam er als Letzter aus der Schlacht; beim Erobern von Städten erstieg er oft als Erster die Mauer; von zahlreichen Nachbarn zu Duellen aufgefordert, lehnte er niemals ab, und immer warf er den Feind nieder. Bei kriegerischen Spielen, bei denen man sich mit der Lanze misst, wurde er als der Einzige von allen ermittelt, der niemals von Pferd geworfen wurde und der alle, die gegen ihn los rannten, abwarf. Aus Turnieren ging er immer als Sieger hervor. Siebzehn Mal eilte er, allein bedeckt mit Schild und Helm, im Übrigen nackt (wie es bei den Deutschen eine besondere Art des Duells ist), gegen seine auf gleiche Weise bewaffneten Gegner zu, mit scharfer Lanze, wobei er keinen Schaden erlitt, während er selbst die Gegner immer vom Pferd werfen konnte. Wegen dieser Taten wurde er nicht zu Unrecht der »deutsche Achill« genannt, an dem nicht nur die Kriegskünste und die Tugenden eines Feldherrn mit einziger Anmut strahlten, sondern auch der Adel seiner Herkunft. Der hohe Wuchs und die Schönheit seines Körpers, die Größe seiner Kräfte und seine beredte Sprache machten ihn bewundernswert und fast göttlich.

...

In short, ... Albrecht agreed to peace after he plundered the fields, destroyed the farms, took away the cattle, killed all the peasants ...

... He conducted war in Poland, he fought in Schlesia, he camped in Prussia, he defeated his enemies in Bohemia, he made campaigns in Austria, he looted in Hungary, there is no corner in the German land, where he did not armed stepped in, he conducted countless wars, he destroyed the wildest enemies, he captured the most reinforced towns. He started as the first in the fight, returned as the last from the battle ...

... Sedemnajstkrat se je vrnil iz dvoboja, v katerem se je bojeval gol na konju in le s chelado, sbchitom in kopjem, kot zmagovalec, neranjen ... in so ga zato imenovali »nemshki Ahik« ...

... niso z milino blestele zgolj njegova bojna umetnost in vrline voskovodje, temveč tudi plemenitost njegovega rodu. Njegova visoka rast in lepota njegovega telesa, njegova velika moč in njegova zgovorna beseda so bile obchudovanja vredne in so ga naredile skoraj bozhanskega ...

Ena nemshkih narodnih svetinj je Albrechtov meč, imenovan »Das Kurbrandenburgische Schwert«, ki mu ga je podaril Silvio Piccolomini alias papezh Pij II. z besedami:

Vzemi ta sveti meč kot darilo od Boga, z njegovo pomočjo bosh zmgel pokonchati svoje sovražbnike. Pius Pontifex.

Je Piccolomini zares obchudoval Albrechta? Kot papezh mu je dal oznako »skoraj bozhanski« in lahko bi rekli, da je s tem odkril globoko bolechino svoje dushe, kajti sam je bil »der Giftzwerg« (strupeni pritlikavec), kot v nemshko govorechih dezhelah zmerjajo chastihlepnezhe majhne postave, in cheprav je bil nekoch na dvoru okronan za kralja pesnikov, je bil na istem dvoru cenjen manj kot tisti, ki je kidal gnoj v stajah.

Mogoche pa se je le prilizoval Albrechtu. Kot sposoben in izkushen politik makiavelistichnega kova je poskushal Albrechta pregovoriti za boj proti Turkom. Da bi zdruzhil evropske sile v boju proti Turkom, je bila Piccolominijeva zadnja velika zhelja, s katero je umrl, ne da bi jo uresnichil.

Papezh Pij II. o Albrechtu tudi: » ... Veseli me, da se nashe stoletje ponasha s tako velikim mozhem ...«

O Ericu iz Stettina (ali kar je Piccolomini slishal o njem ⁴⁰):

... Bil je lep mozh z zlatimi lasmi, precej velikimi ochmi, svetlega obraza in dolgega belega vratu. Oblachil se je nevsiljivo in je pokrival svoj dolgi vrat z lanenim shalom, toda pritrjenim z zlato zaponko. Sam in brez vsake pomochi je lahko skochil na konja, ne da bi se dotaknil ostrog. Vsaka zhenska, ki ga je videla, she posebno pa cesarica (Barbara Celjska), je bila razzvmeta od pozhelenja.

Eric je bil kakor Albrecht izjemen zgled plemenitega germanskega bojvnika; morda kje obstaja tudi njegov opis kot svetlolasega, modrookega velikana ...

Toda navedeni stavki so le eden od Piccolominijevih germanofilskih opisov, ki sicer povsem ustrezajo podobi Germanov v spisu *Germanija*. In ta spis je javnosti prvi predstavil javnosti prav Piccolomini. Je tudi on »ochetoval« nekaj vsebine v besedilu *Germanije*?

Na nemshkem govornem podrochju je bil Piccolomini vedno v najvishjih chasteh. Tudi dandanes zavzema tam edinstven polozhaj kot oche »der Europäischen Gedanke«, se pravi t. i. evropske misli ali pojma Evrope, ki jo je hotel zdruzhati v boju proti Otomanom ... ⁴¹

... Seventeen times he returned from the duel, which he fought riding naked on the horse, having just the helmet, shield and lance, victorious ... therefore he was named »the German Achilles« ...

... he was not only charmingly splendid in the arts of war, in the virtues of commander-in-chief, but also in the nobility of his descent. Admirable were his high stature and the beauty of his body, the might of his strengths and his eloquent speech had made him almost god-like ...

The one of the German national icons is his sword »Das Kurbrandenburgische Schwert«, which he got from Aenea, the Pope Pius II, with the words:

Nimm das heilige Schwert als Geschenk von Gott, mit dessen Hilfe du deine Feinde niederschlagen mögest. Pius Pontifex.

or in English: *Take the holy sword as the gift of God, with his help thou may defeat the enemies. Pius Pontifex.*

Did Aenea Sylvius Piccolomini really admired Albrecht? As a Pope he named him »almost god-like«, revealing his soul's deepest pain. He himself was »der Giftzwerg« – »the poisonous dwarf« as in German speaking lands nickname the very ambitious guys of small stature as he was, crowned as the king of poets, at the time valued less than a cleaner of stables.

Perhaps he just flattered Albrecht – as a good and very skilled politician of naturally Machiavellian attitude, he wanted Albrecht to fight the Turks. To organize the forces to fight the Turks was his the very last great wish with which he died.

Pope Pius II : »... *Ich freue mich, dass unser Jahrhundert mit einem so grossen Mann geschmückt wird, ...* « – ... *I am delighted that our century will be decorated with such an eminent man, ...*

On Eric of Stettin [what Piccolomini heard of ⁴⁰]

... He was a handsome man with golden hair, fairly large eyes, a glowing complexion and a long white neck. He dressed unostentatiously and covered his white neck with a linen scarf, albeit fastened with a golden buckle. Alone and without any assistance he could jump onto his horse without touching the stirrups. Every woman who saw him, and especially the Empress (Barbara of Celje), was aroused by desire.

But as Eric was and is Albrecht just the master sample of a noble Germanic warrior – perhaps is also somewhere to be found his description as a blond, blue-eyed giant ...

But, this text is just one of his German-philic descriptions, which corresponds excellently to the notions of Germani in *Germania's* text. And, the very first introduction of *Germania* to the public was made just by Piccolomini. Did he father also some of *Germania's* contents?

Even nowadays has Piccolomini a unique position as the originator of the »Europäische Gedanke«, a notion of Europe, which he wanted to be united in a struggle to resist the Otomans ... ⁴¹.

PREZRTI, DIE TOTGESCHWIEGENEN, REVIZIONISTI ...

Navedel bom le najbolj vidne avtorje, ki so kritično raziskovali zgodovinske dokumente. Vsi imajo vsaj en posreden stik s problemom izvirnosti klasičnih rokopisov. Uradna znanost sicer ne upošteva prispevkov teh avtorjev k zadevni problematiki.

Isaac Newton (1642-1727) je bil eden prvih, che zhe ne sploh prvi, ki bi ga danes lahko oznachili kot revizionista, mogoche celo kot »teoretika zarot«, ker je poskusil kritično pregledati ali revidirati uradno kronologijo svetovne zgodovine, ki je slonela na Scaligerjevem delu *Dissertatio de crucifixione Domini* iz leta 1583 (Joseph Justus Scaliger, niz. zgod., 16. st.). Newton se je zelo dobro izkazal: njegovo delo o kronologiji so namreč oznachili kot okultno shtudijo in jo bolj ali manj dobrohotno zavrgli. To njegovo delo je le posredno povezano s problemom klasičnih rokopisov. Tedaj je bil she prezgodnji chas za resne raziskave ...

Newtonov sodobnik je bil Jean Hardouin (1646 – 1729)⁴², francoski klasicist, omenjen z negativnim prizvokom tudi v Wikipediji kot »tvorec različnih paradoksalnih teorij ... najbolj znachilna je ... da so z izjemo del Homerja, Herodota in Cicera vsi klasiki Grhije in Rima nepristni, ker so jih naredili menibi v 13. stoletju ...« Morda to drzhi, z izjemo navedbe stoletja.

Skoraj hkrati je omenjen Hardouinov »sodobni dedich« – ruski matematik Anatolij Timofejevich Fomenko⁴². Ta je izdelal skrajno spremenjeno zgodovinsko kronologijo »... katere ugotovitve slonijo na njegovih lastnih metodah statistichne analize besedil in rachunske astronomije ter so she bolj radikalne, toda imajo jih za psevdoznanstvene ...« (tako Wikipedija).

Fomenko je matematik mednarodnega slovesa, strokovnjak za statistiko; njegove »metode statistichne analize besedil« naj bi bile psevdoznanstvene (kdo je dal tako oceno, ni navedeno), toda niti metod niti problemov, s katerimi se je ukvarjal, ni nihche resno preveril, le njegova nova razlaga zgodovinskih dogodkov je oznachena kot napachna, seveda z vidika uradne zgodovine.

Pri Fomenku moramo she omeniti, da statistichno analizo besedil redno uporabljajo, ko preverjajo znanstvene chlanke pri sumu plagiata, podobno tudi shtudentska dela (diplome, naloge in seminarji) na univerzah. To je posebna uporaba leksikalno-statistichnih in »data mining« metod, ki pa v teh primerih moti le plagiatorje, vendar ne tudi uradne znanosti. Z druge strani pa »uradno« velja trditev, da Tacit ne more biti ponarejen, ker domnevnemu ponarejevalcu v srednjem veku niso bile na voljo ustrezne rachunalniskhe metode, da bi tako dobro zadel nachin, stil in vsebino starih del (to mnenje je najti v nekaterih razpravah o izvirnosti porochil o zgodnjih kristjanih).

Naslednji znani sodobni »revizionist in toretik zarot« je nemshki zgodovinar in publicist Heribert Illig⁴³. Njegova »bipoteza domneva, da so obdobja zgodovine, zlasti Evrope v zgodnjem srednjem veku (614-911), napachno datirana ali pa se dogodki sploh nikedar niso zgodili, ter so to dejstvo poskusali sistematically prikriti« (tako Wikipedija). Skladno s tem je za Illiga npr. Karel Veliki zgolj mit. Seveda pri tem ni omenjeno, da je Illig uporabil uradno nesporno dejstvo (iz dokumentov *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*), da je vech kot dvajset tisoeh letopisov, ki naj bi bili napisani v vprashljivi dobi, ponarejenih (napisani so stoletja kasneje), ter da arheologija ne kazhe vmesnih slojev med rimsko dobo in srednjim vekom.

THE IGNORED, *DIE TOTGESCHWIEGENEN*, THE REVISIONISTS ...

Let me list the most prominent. They all have at least indirect relation to the authenticity problem of the classic manuscripts. They are not referenced by the official scientific community.

Isaac Newton (1642-1727) was one of the first if not the first, who should be today called a revisionist, maybe even a conspiracy theorist – as he tried to revise the official chronology, based on Scaliger's work *Dissertatio de crucifixione Domini* iz leta 1583 (Joseph Justus Scaliger, Dutch hist. 16th century). But he passed astonishingly well; his work on chronology was classified as his occult studies and more or less benevolently put aside. His work is only indirectly related to the problem of the classic manuscripts.

His contemporary Jean Hardouin (1646 – 1729)⁴², French classical scholar, is already mentioned with the negative touch in Wikipedia as the » *the originator of a variety of paradoxical theories*«: *The most remarkable, contained in his Chronologiae ex nummis antiquis restitutae (1696) and Prolegomena ad censuram veterum scriptorum, was to the effect that, with the exception of the works of Homer, Herodotus and Cicero, the Natural History of Pliny, the Georgics of Virgil, and the Satires and Epistles of Horace, all the ancient classics of Greece and Rome were spurious, having been manufactured by monks of the 13th century ... and he was perhaps right, save the named century!*

Almost in the same breath is named also as Hardouin's »modern heir« the Russian mathematician Anatoly Timofeevich Fomenko⁴². He is a supporter of drastically revising historical chronology: ... *whose conclusions being based on proprietary methods of statistical textual analysis and computational astronomy are even more radical, but considered to be pseudo scientific ... (so Wikipedia)*

Fomenko, an international renown mathematician, specialist in statistics – his »methods of statistical textual analysis« are declared as »pseudo scientific« – by whom (?) – but the methods and the problems which he tackled are not seriously discussed, just his reinterpretation of historical events disapproved, naturally with the official interpretation.

To Fomenko, it has to be mentioned that the statistical analysis of texts is regularly used to test the scientific articles on the suspicion of plagiarism, as well as the students' works (diplomas, exercises and seminars) on high schools. This is the single use of the lexico-statistical and data mining methods, which in this case bothers only plagiarists and not the official science. The opposite is valid with the »official« statement that Tacitus can not be falsified, in the middle ages the assumed plagiarist did not have the corresponding computer methods on disposal to fit so perfectly the art, stile and content of the classic works (this opinion is to be found in some discussions on the authenticity of texts on the early Christians).

As the next modern »revisionist and conspiracy theorist« is declared the German historian and publisher Heribert Illig⁴³. His *hypothesis proposes that periods of history, specifically that of Europe during the Early Middle Ages (AD 614–911), are wrongly dated, or did not occur at all, and that there has been a systematic effort to cover up that fact (so Wikipedia)*.

Accordingly is for Illig i.e. *Charlemagne – Karl der Grosse* just a myth. Naturally it is not mentioned that Illig based his findings on the official fact (from *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*) that more than twenty thousand chronicles allegedly written in the questionable period are falsified – written hundreds of years later and that the archeology shows no strata between Roman period and the Middle Ages ... etc.

Seveda je Illigovo gledanje zavrženo, največkrat brez razlage prikazanih problemov. Nekoliko mileje je obsojen Mario Alinei⁴⁴, sodobni italijanski avtor teorije kontinuitete od paleolitika. Wikipedia v zvezi z njim pravi: ... *ta cblanek daje nezasluzheno pomembnost določenim idejam ... je jasno pogled manjšine, ker uzhiva zelo malo akademske podpore, resna razprava je omejena na majhen krog znanstvenikov ...*

Seveda gre za majhen krog znanstvenikov, ker vechina Alineija ne uposhteva, saj njegova hipoteza nasprotuje zelo cenjeni – zlasti v nemshkih krogih – t. i. kurganski hipotezi o izvoru Indoevropcejev, katere avtorica je Maria Gimbutas in ki jo je razveljavil zhe Renfrew⁴⁵. Kurgansko hipotezo naj bi po svoje podpirala tudi knjiga *Germanija*. Alinei je razveljavil tudi v uradni znanosti »priljubljeno« teorijo o selitvi Slovanov, to pa je popolnoma dovolj za biti »totgeschwiegen«.

Popolnoma neuposhtevana pa je – zlasti na Zahodu – knjiga *Veneti – nashi davni predniki* slovenskih avtorjev Tomazhicha, Shavlija in Bora⁴⁶, v kateri so podani arheoloshki, toponomastichni in jezikovni dokazi za tezo, da so Slovenci kakor tudi nasploh Slovani prastari avtohtoni prebivalci Evrope. Ti dokazi podpirajo Alinejevo teorijo kontinuitete in razveljavljajo teorijo o slovanski priselitvi v 6. stoletju, s tem pa so seveda v ostrem nasprotju z »zgodbo« uradno veljavne zgodovine. Poleg tega pa gre, kot zhe recheno, za dejstva, ki ne ustrezajo niti nekdanji in sedanji evropski, pravzaprav zahodni politiki. Knjiga *Veneti* je v krogih vladajoche javnosti prav tako »totgeschwiegen«, kajti v njej ne morejo najti dejstev in razlogov, da bi jo lahko argumentirano razveljavili, zato so bili odzivi nanjo predvsem chustveni. V Wikipediji vsebino knjige oznachujejo kot napachno »venetsko teorijo« in pri tem povsem zgresheno obveshchajo, da ta teorija nasprotuje slovanskemu poreklu Slovencev.

Wikipedia: ... *razlage so znanstveniki popolnoma zavrgli ... kejer so pokazali nevarnost amaterskega jezikoslovja ...* Pri tem so navedene zgolj reference iz krogov uradnih (institucionalnih) slovenskih zgodovinarjev.

Nashteti primeri »revizije« nasprotujejo razlagam uradne zgodovine, ki v veliki meri sloni na »klasichnih« rokopisih, med katerimi *Germanija* zavzema najvishje mesto in kot taka je tudi uporabna za interese nekdanje in danashnje politike. Ne zhelim posebej omenjati mochne chustvene pristranskosti v oceni raznih klasichnih del ...

Mimogrede naj she omenim znachilno stilsko-terminoloshko razlikovanje v ocenah, ki jih dajejo Zahodnjaki glede zahodnoevropskih, srednjeevropskih in vzhodnoevropskih kritichnih avtorjev.

O zahodnoevropskih:

- prezgodnja doba znanstvenega razvoja,
- nobenega od avtorjev niso na splošno sprejeli,
- so bili utishani.

O srednjeevropskih:

- zelo sporno,
- manjshinski pogled uzhiva malo akademske podpore.

O vzhodnoevropskih:

- psevdo znanstveno,
- amaterski jezikoslovci.

Naturally all disapproved, but with no explanation of the problems shown.

A little bit softer is condemned Mario Alinei⁴⁴, the author of Paleolithic Continuity Theory.

Wikipedia: ... *this article lends undue weight to certain ideas ...*

... is distinctly a minority view as it enjoys very little academic support, serious discussion being limited to a small circle of scholars ...

Clear a small circle of scholars. It is ignored by majority because the hypothesis contradicts to so cherished Gimbutas's Kurgan hypothesis of the origin of the Indo-European people – refuted already by Renfrew⁴⁵. The Kurgan hypothesis is considered to be in a way »supported« by *Germania*. Alinei refutes also the officially »beloved« Slavic migration theory, and this is just enough to be »totgeschwiegen«.

Completely, especially in the west, is ignored the book »Veneti First builders of European Community« by I. Tomazhich, J. Shavli, M. Bor⁴⁶, actually is the title of the original »Veneti – nashi davni predniki« (Veneti – our ancient Ancestors), in which are introduced the archaeological, toponomastic and lingual proofs that Slovenians and Slavs are the ancient autochthon dwellers of the Europe. These facts support Alinei's theory, refute Slavic migration theory in 6th century and are so in total opposition to the official history »narratives«. As mentioned above, these facts do not suit the past and the contemporary European, actually western politics. The book is in official circles »totgeschwiegen« as there are also no counterarguments to be found, all reactions were completely emotional. In Wikipedia are the book contents misnamed as »Venetic theory«, informing incorrectly that the theory contradicts to the Slavic origin of Slovenes.

Wikipedia ... *interpretations have also been completely rejected by scholars ... showing the danger of the amateur linguistics ... given only the references of official (institutional) Slovenian history circles.*

I mentioned these as the most prominent »revisionist« examples – they all contradict to the official interpretation of history, to a great extent based on »classic« manuscripts, among them is *Germania* on one of the most prominent positions, serving now as before the contemporaneous politics.

I do not want to mention especially the emotionally strong religious bias concerning the evaluation of the other classic works ...

And – did you notice an especial west-east cline in the general western validation of the authors:

In the West:

- to early stage of the scientific development,
- none of these writers have won general acceptance,
- were hushed,

In the Central (Western) Europe:

- highly controversial,
- minority view enjoys very little academic support,

In the East:

- pseudo-scientific,
- amateur linguists ...

Posvetimo se zdaj znova vprašanju rokopisov. John Wilson Ross¹⁷ je bil obtožen, da je objavil svojo knjigo anonimno, čeprav je v posvetilu knjige omenjen njegov brat s polnim imenom in priimkom. Nasprotniki tudi niso navedli nobenih razlogov, ki bi ovrgli njegove trditve.

Polydora Hocharta¹⁸ pa je Walser prav na kratko odpravil z besedami: *Da bi ovrgli fantazije P. Hocharta: L'authenticite des annales usw. 1891 u. Nouvelles considerations au sujet des Annales usw., Paris, Thorin 1894, kot vse kaže, ni potrebno.*

Praktično nihče ne omenja Lea Wienerja¹⁹. Podobno kot zhe Ross in Hochart, je tudi Wiener, seveda še bolj natančno, s svojim jezikoslovnim znanjem primerjal in razchlenil nekatere pripovedi iz klasičnih zgodovinopisnih virov, kot so Jordanes, Pavel Diakon, Tacit itd. Tukaj lahko navedem le nekaj primerov njegovih sklepanj in vrednotenj, zato je ta izbor nekoliko nepovezan in ne povsem dorečen, a zadostuje za splošen vtis o celotni analizi.

O Jordanesu pravi:

(str. 67)

... *V Getici je referenca o Jordanesovem poreklu, toda če upoštevamo, da je zhe uvod k delu držen ponaredek ... V skladu z njegovo izjavo, da je bil kljub temu, da ni bil pismen (agrammatič), vseeno pisar Gunthiga ... je tudi dejal, da je napisal svojo knjigo v letu 511 ...*

... *Tako dobimo pozitiven in neovrgljiv dokaz, da je Jordanes napisal Getico po letu 711 ...*

(str. 141)

... *Zmешnjavo ponarejevalca, Jordanesa ali pa njegovega predhodnika, ko je sestavljal zgodovino Gotov, smo pravkar pojasnili ...*

Naj omenim Wienerjevo etimološko izpeljavo besed ali imen arabskega izvora. Med njimi je »Haliurunnae« – ime charovnice (str. 90):

... *OHGermansko (staro visokogermansko) »alruna« je obranilo le pomen »mandragora«. V ohgermanskem imamo »belliruna«, tj. »necromantia«, kakor da bi bila sestavljenka iz »bella«, tj. »pekkel«, in »runa«, tj. »skrivnost«, in podobno v starosaksonsčini »helirun, bellrun«, tj. »charovnik« ...*

... *Kasneje bomo srečali te charovnice ali charovnishke zheenske v drugih ponaredkih, npr. v Tacitovi Germaniji.*

O imenu »Finnic« (str. 96)

... *je tudi pomenilo »mochvirje«, celotna sestava natanko ustreza opisu skrajnega severa. Tam se je pojavilo pleme neznanе preteklosti. To so verjetno »Finnic«, in spet ni naključno, da je možno finsko ime za Finsko – »Suomi« izpeljati iz finske besede »suo«, tj. »mochvirje« ... Toda arabska beseda je izvor za gotsko »fani«, OHG »fenna«, tj. »blato«, staronorveshko »fen«, tj. »mochvirje«. V svoji obliki »vanga, fanga« je beseda dala italjansko »fango«, francosko »fange« itd.*

O Tuisconu: (str. 208)

... *ponarejevalec, ki je bil Got in je prebival v Franciji ali celo bolj verjetno v Shvici, je poznal sodobno ime za »Nemshko«, ki je bilo obranjeno v najstarejših francoskih virih kot »tiesche, tiesque, thyos, ties« itd., in ki je prishlo v literarno latinsčino med drugim kot »tutiscus«, v stari italjansčini seveda »tudesco«, sedaj pa »tedesco«. Očitno ga je izgovarjal »Tuisco« in je tako ustvaril svojega slavnega junaka Tuiscona. Iz tega Tuiscona je izvedel slavne junake za plemena, ki jih je poznal iz zgodovine – Sueve, Vandale in Tevtonce. Iz Tacitovih Analov 1.56 in 11.25 je vedel za pleme Marsi, in iz istega izvora je vedel za Arminiusa – silni je kralj ...*

But back to the manuscripts. John Wilson Ross¹⁷ is only impeached that he published his book anonymously, but there is full name reference of the book's dedication to author's brother, no counter arguments to his considerations were given. Polydore Hochart¹⁸ was condemned by Walser: *Die Phantasien von P. Hochart: L'autenticite des annales usw. 1891 u. Nouvelles considerations au sujet des Annales usw., Paris, Thorin 1894, zu widerlegen erscheint überflüssig – The phantasies of P. Hochart ... to debunk is superfluous.*

Leo Wiener¹⁹ is completely hushed. Similarly to Ross and Hochart, Wiener compares and analyzes extensively various narratives from various classic sources as Jordanes, Paulus Diaconus, Tacitus etc. Here can I give just his valuations of some of these sources – therefore the selection seems here somehow the unrelated mix and half told, but gives the general impression on the detailed analysis.

on Jordanes (19, p. 67):

... In the Getica there is a reference to Jordanes' origin, but when we consider that the very introduction to the work is a bold forgery ... According to his statement, he, although »agrammatus«, that is, with out knowledge of letters, had been a notary of Gunthiges ... although, according to his own statement, he himself was a Goth. He also says that he wrote his book in the year 551 ...

... Thus we get the positive and incontrovertible proof that Jordanes wrote his Getica after 711 ... p67

... The hodge-podge method of the forger, Jordanes or his predecessor, in concocting a Gothic history, has already been made clear ...

p141

Let me mention also Wiener's deduction of the Arabic origin of certain words and names. Among them is »Haliurunnae« – name of the witches (p. 90):

... OHGerman alruna has preserved only the meaning »mandrake«, In OHGerman we have helliruna »necromantia«, as though it were composed of bella »hell« and runa »mystery«, and similarly, in ASaxon, helirun, hellrun »sorcerer.« ...

... We shall later meet these witches, or magic women, in other forgeries, such as Tacitus' Germania.

Wiener on the name Finni (p. 96):

... also meant »swamp«, the whole combination exactly fitting the description of the extreme north. Thus there arose a tribe of unknown before. It is, again, probably Finni, utterly no accident that the Finnish name of Finland, Suomi, should be derived from a Finnish word, suo »swamp«. ... But the Arabic word gave rise to Goth, »fani«, OHG. fenna »mud«, ONorse fen »quagmire.« In its form vanga, fanga it gave Ital. fango, Fr. fange, etc.

on Tuiscon (p. 208):

... The forger, who was a Goth resident in France, or, far more likely, in Switzerland, knew the current name for »German«, preserved in the oldest French sources as tiesche, tiesque, thyos, ties, etc., and which given in Latin, among others, as tutiscus, hence, in Italian, tedesco, now tedesco. Obviously he pronounced it tuisco, and so created his eponymous hero, Tuiscon. From this Tuiscon he derived the eponymous heroes for the tribes that he knew from history, the Suevi, Vandals, and Teutons. From the Annales of Tacitus, 1.56, and 11.25, he knew of the Marsi, and from the same source he knew of Arminius, the fierce is king. Thus Herminon and Marsus became descendants of Tuiscon.

O Ammianu Marcellinu (str. 148):

... *Kot je Phrygia lahko nastal samo iz sirijske »pushchice odreshenja«, je jasno, da imamo tu najmanj interpolacijo, če ne gre za čisti ponaredek. Nashli bomo še hujski ponaredek v Ammianu kasneje. Zagotovo je čudno, da ni bilo nikdar napisane niti besedice o Ammianu pred 16. stoletjem, razen kratke reference k stavku v štirinajsti knjigi v Priscianu XI.51, in da bi se Marcellinovo delo, o katerem je Poggio poročal, da ga je bil nashel v Hersfeldu ali Fuldi, moralo zacetati prav s tem stavkom, ker je trdil, da je nashel Marcellina sbele na zacetku XIV. knjige. Kazbe, da je Poggio uporabil ta stavek iz Prisciana kot osnovo za svoj izdelek ...*

O Translatio (str. 151):

... *Iz zmesnjave besed »pyramid« in »mogochnega vladarja« je nastal mit Irminsula pri Saksoncih. Pripoved se nahaja v Translatio s. Alexandri, ki sta ga napisala Ruodolf in Meginhard leta 851 ...*

O Velleju Paterculu (str. 163):

... *Kolikor mi je znano, nihče ni dvomil o njegovi izvirnosti, toda vsi vemo, da Vellej sloni na izgubljeni kopiji, ki jo je uporabljal Beatus Rhenanus v svoji Editio princeps, izdani na zacetku 16. stoletja. Nihče pred njim ni nikdar nič slisbal o njem ali pa ga omenil, razen enkrat Priscian ... ne dvomimo o njegovem obstoju pred desetim stoletjem ... toda nimamo nikakršnih sredstev, da bi ugotovili, če so bile napravljene kakršne koli interpolacije ...*

O Germaniji (str. 159):

... *kasneje bom pokazal, da je bil ponaredek, znan kot Tacitova Germanija, napisan v osmem stoletju in da sloni na delih Pseudo-Berosa, ki je tudi sam ponaredek, kot ga je bil ohranil in oznachil Annij iz Viterba. Tukaj bom le navedel toliko, kolikor je potrebno, da bi dokazali, da je Arminijeva zgodba pri Tacitu, Strabonu in drugih pisateljih drzen ponaredek, ki ni starejsi od osmega stoletja ...*

(str. 212): ... *zamenjava Aretije z Veliko Materjo, Cybelo, je zmesnjava, ki, kakor bomo to videli kasneje, zavede ponarejevalca Germanije, da je ustvaril posebno bozhanstvo za Germane ...*

... *Ta poglavja (Germanije) kot tudi nekaj naslednjih slonijo predvsem na Cezarjevem opisu Galije. Opis vojvod sloni na enakosti med Galci, ki so se v glavnem ukvarjali z vojno in so zbirali okrog sebe svoje stranke in pristash v razmerju, kolikor je segala njihova vojashka moč ...*

... *Zgodba o Veledi, Albruni in Ganni iz gozdov, ki so imenovane kot germanske vedezhvalke, pripada arabski dobi, to pomeni, da je nastala le v osmem stoletju ...*

Veleda je ime arabskega izvora, ki pomeni »mlado zhenско«. Tako ne more biti dvoma, da imamo tu neko pripoved iz arabskih ali shpanskih virov, kjer je Veleda oznachena kot keltska, namesto kot zhidovska. Veledo najdemo tudi v Siluai Statiusa ...

1

... *toda vse izdaje sledijo iz enega vira, ki naj bi ga bil nashel Poggio v St. Gallnu, in so vse interpolirane ...*

2

... *popolnoma nesmiselno je navajati ta primer imena Veleda, da bi potrdili njegovo izvirnost. To nas pushcha popolnoma same s Tacitom ...*

On Ammianus Marcellinus (p148):

... As Phrygia could have arisen only from the Syriac »arrow of salvation,« it is clear that we have here at least an interpolation, if not a downright forgery. We shall find a still worse forgery in Ammianus later on. It is certainly curious that not a word was ever written about Ammianus before the sixteenth century, except a short reference to a sentence from the fourteenth book in Priscianus, XI. 51, and that the work of Marcellinus, which Poggio claimed to have found at Hersfeld or Fulda, should almost begin with that sentence, for he claimed to have found Marcellinus only beginning with book XIV. It looks as though Poggio used the sentence in Priscianus as a basis for his fabrication ...

On Translatio (p151):

... From the confusion of »pyramid« and »mighty ruler« has arisen the myth of the Irminsul of the Saxons. The account is contained in the Translatio S. Alexandri, written by Ruodolf and Meginhard in 851 ...

On Velleius Paterculus (p163):

... No one, so far as, I know, has doubted his authenticity, but all we know of Velleius is based on a lost copy, which was used by Beatus Rhenanus in his editio princeps, published in the beginning of the sixteenth century. No one before him ever heard of Velleius or mentioned him, except once more Priscianus, VI. 11, and the scholiast of Lucan, IX. 178. There can be no doubt of the existence of the works of Velleius Paterculus before the tenth century, but we have no means of ascertaining whether there were not any interpolations made after the story of Arminius had found vogue ...

On Germania (p159):

... Later on I shall show how the forgery known as Tacitus' Germania was written in the eighth century and was based on a work of Pseudo-Berosus, itself a forgery, as preserved and annotated by Annius of Viterbo. Here I shall only adduce as much as is necessary to prove that the Arminius story in Tacitus, Strabo, and other writers is a bold forgery of not earlier than the eighth century ...

(p212): ... the confusion of Aretia with the Magna Mater, Cybele a confusion which, as we shall see later, led the forger of the Germania to create a special deity for the Germans ...

... These chapters (of Germania), as well as the next few, are based chiefly on Caesar's description of Gaul. The description of the duces is based on that of the equites among the Gauls, whose main occupation is war and who gather around them their clients and followers, in proportion as they exert military power ...

... The story about Veleda, Albruna, and Ganna, of the woods, who are given as German women who told fortunes, belongs to the Arabic period, that is, it arose only in the eighth century. ...

... for Veleda is the Arab. o-Uj valldah xap&evoc, »young woman.« There can be no doubt, therefore, that we have here an account from an Arabic or Spanish source, where Veleda is made to be Celtic, instead of Jewish. We also find Veleda in the Siluae of Statius, ...

1

... but as all the editions go back to one copy, supposedly found by Poggio at St. Gall, and are all interpolated, ...

2

... it is quite useless to quote this occurrence of Veleda in support of its genuineness. This leaves us all alone with Tacitus ...

... *Ako se sedaj obrnemo h Germaniji, vidimo, da je bil samorog iz Cezarjeve pripovedi spremenjen v narod – v Nabarvale. Takoj je razvidno, da ni Narharvalus nič drugega kot »Narvabl«, morski samorog v germanskih jezikih. Beseda mabl-arez ali mabr-arig, ki je v Fredegarju uporabljena za razlago etimologije Meroeus, se tu pojavi v obliki nabarvalus.*

Da je ta zgodba iz Germanije izposojena od Cezarja, je tako razvidno, da ni potreben niti ponarejevalcev spodrseljaj z Nabarvali ali »samorogi«, da bi to dokazali. Toda ponarejevalec je bil tak bedak ali pa podležh, da se je izdal she na drug nachin. Vzel je Cezarjev rek »sunt item, quae appellantur alces« za nadaljevanje zgodbe o narvablu ali samorogu, in je rekel, da je ime božhanstva aids »ea vis numini, nomen aids.« Neumnost, kot kazhe, ne more iti she naprej, toda ponarejevalec je zagreshil she drugo neizrekljivo neokusnost.

Losa kot tudi samoroga je spremenil v germansko pleme. »Semnoni zhelijo, da jih imajo za najstarejshe in najbolj sposhtovanja vredno pleme suevskega naroda. Oznanjajo, da to potrjujejo skrivnosti vere ...

(str. 273ff)

... *To je bilo lahko v Germaniji dodano ponarejevalčevemu nadaljevanju o Germanih, ki pojejo svoje pesmi, imenovane barritus ...*

... *Ta celotni opis je prepisan iz Vegetija, De Re Militari, kjer pove, da je bojni krik, ki se imenuje barritus ...*

... *tudi Ammian je vzljubil to besedo. Pripoveduje zgodbo o Cornutih in Braccatih v rimski vojski, ki so povzdignili barritus, da bi prestrahbili Alamane. Ta barritus se zachenja s shepetom ...*

... *Ta Ammianusova pripoved je ponaredek, skupaj s pripovedjo v Tacitu, kar kazhe, da sta oba zamenjala barritus z barditus ...*

... *Ta ponarejevalčeva zmeshnjava pri izposojanju se kazhe skozi vso Germanijo. Nekaj primerov bo dovolj. V poglavjih VII in VIII ponarejevalec pripoveduje, da so kralje izbirali zaradi njihove plemenitosti in vodje zaradi njihovega poguma, toda nihče jih ni mogel kaznovati, razen duhovnikov.*

Wiener sklene takole:

Skrajna brezvrednost Germanije je očitna, brez vsake možnosti zagovora. Le dushevno slep jo bo zagovarjal, tako kot ponaredke iz devetnajstega stoletja, kakrshen je razvpiti Koeninghofski rokopis, ki she vedno najde zagovornike. Zhalostno je videti, da germanska zgodovina in z njo povezane zadeve slonijo na Germaniji in Getici, dveh spomenikih zavestne prevare in nezavedne neumnosti, ter na posledicah prvega razcveta arabske romantike, ki je vodila k Tisoeh in eni nochi.

Kdor bi zhelel slediti Rossovim, Hochartovim in predvsem Wienerjevim ugotovitvam, bi moral biti resnični poznavalec klasikov kakor tudi klasičnih jezikov, zato sem zgoraj navedel na kratko le nekaj primerov, ki jih lahko razume vsak povprečen izobrazhenec, vključno z menoj.

Profesor Leo Wiener je bil »utishan«. Toda prav njegovo delo – kot v posmeh »uradnemu« mnenju – daje malo vech zaupanja v določeno izvirnost.

Walser, ki je verjel, da so Poggiove najdbe izvirne, poroča o Poggiovem obisku v Clunyju (29 Walser, str. 50):

... *zanichevanje, ki so jim ga vlili sedanji lastniki sposhtovanja vrednih rokopisov. Ti so bili pustili propadati to chudovito dedishchino kot tudi lastni menishki red ...*

... If we now turn to the *Germania*, we find the unicorn of Caesar's account turned into a nation, the *Nabarvali*. We see at a glance that *Nabarvalus* is nothing but the *Narwhale*, the sea-unicorn of the Germanic languages. The *mahl-arex* or *mahl-arig*, which in *Fredegar* was used to explain the etymology of *Meroeus*, here turns up in the form of *nabarvalus*.

The borrowing of the story in the *Germania* from Caesar is so obvious, as not to need even the forger's slip, *Nabarvali* »the unicorns«, in order to prove it. But the forger was such a fool or such a scoundrel that he gave himself away in still another way. He took Caesar's »*sunt item, quae appellantur alces*« to be a continuation of the story about the narwhale or unicorn, and went on to say that the name of the divinity was *aids*, »*ea vis numini, nomen aids.*« Stupidity, it would seem, could go no further, but the forger man aged to perpetrate still another unspeakable insipidity.

The jointless elk, like the unicorn, is transformed into a Germanic tribe. »The *Semnones* are ambitious to be thought the most ancient and respectable of the *Suevian* nation. Their claim they think confirmed by the mysteries of religion.« ...

p. 273ff

... This may have added to the forger's continuation in the *Germania* about the Germans, who sing their songs, called *barritus*, ...

... This whole description is cribbed out of *Vegetius*, *De re militari*, where it says that the battlecry, which is called *barritus*, ...

... *Ammianus*, too, took a liking to the word. He tells the story of the *Cornuti* and *Braccati* of the Roman army, who raised the *barritus*, in order to frighten the *Alamanni*. This *barritus* begins with a whisper ...

..That this account of *Ammianus* is a forgery, together with the account in *Tacitus*, is shown by the fact that both confuse *barritus* with *barditus*, ...

..The hodge-podge borrowing by the forger is illustrated throughout the *Germania*. A few examples

will suffice. In chapters VII and VIII the forger says that the kings were chosen on account of their nobility and the leaders on account of their bravery, but that no one could punish, except the priests, ...

Wiener concludes:

The utter worthlessness of the Germania is patent, beyond any possibility of defence. Only the mentally blind will defend it, even as the nineteenth century forgeries, such as the notorious Koeniginhof Manuscript, still find advocates. It is sad to contemplate that Germanic history and allied subjects are based on the Germania and the Getica, two monuments of conscious fraud and unconscious stupidity, the result of the first flower of Arabic romance, which led to The Thousand and One Nights.

To follow *Ross*'s, *Hochart*'s and especially *Wiener*'s deductions, one has to be a real authority on classics as well of the classic languages, so here just short citing of the understandable examples for the average citizen, myself included.

The professor *Leo Wiener* was hushed. But just his work – as an irony on the »official« meaning – gives a little more credibility of a certain authenticity – yes!

Walser, who believed that *Poggio*'s findings are genuine, on *Poggio*'s visit to *Cluny* (29 *Walser*, p.50):

... back for contempt, with which treated them the contemporary owner of the venerable codices. Because they let the marvelous inheritance go to waste as well as their own monastic rule ...

... Kot je Boccaccio iz razpadle knjižhnice Montecasina ugrabil Tacita, tako so Poggio in njegovi tovarishi iz samostanskega stolpa v St. Gallnu ali pa iz ostankov francoskih opatij izvlekli marsikaterega plemenitega ujetnika ...

*... **Neposredna porochila o najdbah so na zhalost zelo skopo ohranjena:** zgolj po eno pismo Poggia, Cincia in Bartolomeja iz Montepulciana. Ostala pojasnila dajejo naključne pripombe v epistolarjih Bracciolinija in njegovih prijateljev ...*

*... **Doslej so se omejili na to, da so to iz Poggiovega porochila edino bolj znano odpravo v St. Gallen bolj na široko obravnavali in da so ostala potovanja omenjali le na kratko, dokler tega porochila zelo ostroumno ni pregledal Remigio Sabbadini in z gotovostjo zavrgel shtiri Bracciolinijeve odprave ...***

... Prvo Poggiovo odkritje sta bila dva neznana Ciceronova govora, ki ju je nashel v burgundski opatiji Cluny.

Knjižhnica samostana je skrivala vseh dragocenih Ciceronovih rokopisov, med njimi spodbovanja vredni zvezek s petimi govori, izvirajoch vsaj iz 8. stoleja ...

*... **Zakaj je Poggio shel v daljno Burgundijo, ko je bilo toliko drugih samostanov v blizhini? Najbolj verjetno lahko povezhemo to potovanje s tesnimi vezmi, ki jih je gojil Janez XXIII. z burgundskim, bolonjskim in konstanskim vojvodom ...***

Mogoche to drzhi, toda samostan v Clunyju je tesno sodeloval s sholo prevajalcev v Toledu; kot kazhe, so v vseh referencah o Poggiju to sholo popolnoma prezrli kot mozhni vir srednjeveshkih rokopisov, kopij klasikov. Toda Poggio je za to sholo gotovo vedel.

V Toledu so bili prevajalci Arabci, Zhidje in kristjani; tako je profesor Wiener s svojo raziskavo dejansko točno prikazal to obdobje zgodovine, v katerem je vsaj nekaj referenc, seveda po vsebini nezanesljivih in prepisanih, k vprashljivim delom obstajalo zhe prej in zato morda ta dela niso bila napisana shele v 15. stoletju.

»Faustovskim dusham« pa rad ponudim reshilno bilko; ta se imenuje »nostratika« – teorija o skupnem poreklu indoevropskih, ugrofinskih in semitskih jezikov. Z njo bi se nekako izognili arabskemu izvoru imen, saj v Wienerjevem chasu nostraticzna teorija she ni bila znana.

In she nekaj ... Tudi Fomenko in Illig pravzaprav bolj potrjujeta, kot pa zavrachata izvirnost starih rokopisov.

Fomenko je pokazal, da so letopisi v bistvu ponavljajochi se prepisi malega shtevila izvirnih spisov, vprashanje je le, katerih; zato mogoche vsak letopis vsebuje nekaj skrite resnice – potrebno je le najti primernega ...

In Illig je s tem, da je »odpravil« del mrachnega srednjega veka, priblizhal starorimski svet dokumentiranemu srednjemu veku in tako podal razloge za vechjo verjetnost izvirnosti starih rokopisov, saj je gradnja srednjeveshkih samostanov sledila takoj za rimsko dobo. Potemtakem so rokopisi in njihovi prepisi lahko prezhiveli veliko krajshi chas, brez neznane mrachne srednjeveshke dobe, zashchiteni v zhe zgrajenih samostani.

... As already Boccaccio from the decayed Books of Montecassino abducted Tacitus, so Poggio and his companions pulled from the tower of the St.Gall monastery or under the trash of the French abbey many noble prisoners out ...

*... **The immediate discovery reports are unfortunately sparse:** they consist from just one letter from Poggio, Cincio and Bartolomeo da Montepulciano. Further information provide the occasional remarks in the Bracciolini's and his friend's epistolary ...*

*... **Till now was all broad discussion limited to Poggio's discovery report of the solely known expedition to St. Gall and all other travels were just shortly mentioned, until Remigio Sabbadini sharp-witted the messages examined and with the certainty four Bracciolini's expeditions ruled out.***

*The first Poggio's discovery were two unknown Cicero's speeches, which he found in the **Burgundy Abbey Cluny**. The library of monastery owned several precious Cicero's manuscripts, under them one venerable volume from at least 8th century containing five speeches. They were *Orationen pro Milone*, ...*

*... **Why came Poggio in the distant Burgundy, as there were many other monasteries in the vicinity? Very probably this travel can be connected with the close ties, which John XXIII maintained to the Duke of Burgundy, of Bologna and of Constance ...***

May be, but the monastery of Cluny collaborated closely with the Toledo school of translators; the later seemed to be completely ignored as the possible source of the medieval manuscripts, copies of the classics, in all references to Poggio. But Poggio surely knew for it.

As the translators were Arabs, Jews and Christians, professor Wiener actually pinpointed with his analysis the moments in history in which at least some, albeit by contents unreliable and plagiarized, references to the questionable works possibly existed earlier and were so not just written in 15th century.

With pleasure I offer to »Faustian souls« a lifeline – named »nostratics« – the theory of the common origin of Indoeuropean, Ugro-finnic and Semitic languages. This theory enables to avoid the Arabic source of the names, pretty meaningless in Wiener times.

And something more – Fomenko and Illig actually more confirm than oppose the authenticity of the old manuscripts.

Fomenko showed that the manuscripts are in fact the repetition of the small number of the authentic scripts, problem is to pinpoint the originals and what in them corresponds to the real history ...

And Illig had, with the »elimination« of the Dark Middle Ages, brought the old Roman world closer to documented middle ages and so provided the arguments for stronger beliefs in the authenticity of the old scripts. The manuscripts and their copies were possibly able to survive much shorter time, without the unknowns of the Dark Ages, already preserved in the just constructed monasteries following directly on the Roman period.

O SLAVI, POGGIU IN EINSTEINU

... *quando etiam sapientibus cupido gloriae novissima excutitur.*

... *celo najbolj modri, zbelech slavo, zavržejo vse ostalo.* (Tacit)

Kot je bilo tukaj zhe omenjeno, je Leonardo Aretino hvalil Poggia:

... *Spomin na tvoje zasluge ne bo nikdar izbrisan. Zabeležbeno bo do poznih dob, da si ta dela, izgubo katerih so bili tako dolgo obžalovali prijatelji leposlovja, reshil s svojo marljivostjo.*

J. W. Ross pa o Tacitu:

... *Tacita povzdiguje njegova genialnost do take visbine, da ga zbe dviga iz dosega kritike. Sveti na lep opisnem nebu kakor sonce, pred zharom katerega se vsi kot Parsi (Perzijci) priklanjajo v chashchenju.*

To ne drzhi popolnoma. Poggio namrech nikoli ni dobil ustreznega priznanja – ne pozitivnega ne negativnega, o tem lahko vsakdo presoja po svojem občutku ...

V bistvu sploh ni pomembno, kakshen je bil Poggio po svojem značaju: dober, slab, bolesten, pogolten, pobozhen ali she kaj drugega – pomembna so le njegova dejanja. Danes je precej vseeno, ali je res nashel izvirne starorimske spise ali pa jih je sam napisal ali ponaredil, se pravi prepisal iz drugih vprashljivih virov.

Napravil je nedvomno izredno delo, ki je postalo izjemno pomembno za vso zahodno omiko, za njeno zgodovino in znanost, posebej za jezikoslovje in raziskave o Indoevropcih (zhal v napadni smeri), ter tudi za zahodno politiko pri opravicovanju njenih usmeritev v vseh stoletjih novega veka.

Pravzaprav je Poggio dal Zahodu natanko tako sharo, po kakrshni je ta hrepenel in jo je potreboval. Kot v posmeh pa za svoje delo ni dobil nikakrshnega pravega priznanja; slavljeni so morda zgolj izmishljeni Rimljani, njega pa najvech opisujejo v slabi luchi. Zaradi vpliva, ki so ga imela njegova dela, bi moral biti znan vsakemu bolj izobrazhenemu Evropejcu, toda komajda ga poznajo celo strokovnjaki humanistichnih ved.

Le njegovi kritiki mu dajejo polno priznanje, na primer Ross (»kdo je ta chudoviti mozh?«) ali pa Hochart, ki je preporod oznachil kot Poggiovo dobo, pa tudi njegova zhivljenjepisca, posebno Shepherd.

Poggio je namrech pokazal svoj izjemni civilni pogum, nenavaden zlasti za dobo, v kateri je zhivel, saj je pravzaprav tvegat, da bi bil sezghan na grmadi.

Mogoche je bilo njegovo edino zadovoljstvo denar, ki ga je dobil za svoja »odkritja«, ker je vsa »slava« v glavnem preostala osebam, ki si jih je morda bolj ali manj sam izmislil na podlagi kakshnih stvarnih omemb v rokopisih. To je bila za mojstra njegove velichine zelo bolecha izkushnja, cheprav so ga sicer humanisti, njegovi sodobniki, resnichno sposhtovali.

Za svojo družhino, za svoje zakonske in tudi nezakonske otroke, ki jih je menda vse priznal, naj bi prav tako popolnoma poskrbel.

Ob pomenu in vplivu njegovega dela, njegove skoraj popolne anonimnosti in negativno oznachene osebnosti, lahko Poggia primerjamo s tako rekoch »tochno« nasprotnim primerom – s slavnim fizikom Albertom Einsteinom, chigar dela naj bi imela in gotovo tudi imajo epohalen vpliv na sedanjo globalno civilizacijo.

ON POGGIO AND THE FAME

*... quando etiam sapientibus cupido gloriae novissima exuitur.
... when even the wisest desiring the fame, cast off all. Tacitus*

As quoted already above, Leonardo Aretino praised Poggio:

... The memory of your services will never be obliterated. It will be recorded to distant ages, that these works, the loss of which had been for so long a period a subject of lamentation to the friends of literature, have been recovered by your industry ...

and J. W. Ross on Tacitus

... Tacitus is raised by his genius to a height, which lifts him above the reach of the critic. He shines in the firmament of letters like a sun before whose lustre all, Parsee-like, bow down in worship ...

Not at all so ... Poggio got never a proper credit ... positive or negative, let it be on your taste ...

The fact is that it is not at all important what a character was Poggio – a good, a bad, a crank, ... an avaricious, a pious or something else – important are just his deeds. It is actually nowadays pretty irrelevant if he found genuine Roman texts, if he wrote them himself or if he forged them from other questionable sources.

He has done an extraordinary work, becoming exceptionally important as well for the western culture, history, even the science – considering the Indo-European research and linguistics, albeit in a wrong way – and also for the legitimation of the western oriented politics through all the last centuries.

Actually he gave the West precisely the stuff the West longed for and needed it. As the deepest irony, he has not get the proper credit for his work – the praised are probably fictitious Romans, he himself was and is described in a mostly negative manner.

Due to impact of his works, he should be known to every moderately educated European, but he is barely known even to the humanistic educated people.

There were only his critics, which gave him full credit – like Ross – who is that wonderful man – or Hochart, who named the Renaissance the Age of Poggio, and his biographers, especially Shepherd.

Poggio showed an exceptional civil courage, unusual specially for the age in which he lived, actually risking to be burnt on the stake.

Perhaps was his sole satisfaction the money he got for his »discoveries«, as the whole »divination« went to the more or less from him probably invented characters ...

For a master of his caliber actually a very frustrating experience, in spite of the real respect which showed him his fellow contemporary humanists.

For his family, as well for his legitimate and illegitimate children, which he allegedly all accepted, allegedly he fully took care of.

Considering the importance and impact of his work, his near to be anonymity, his negatively depicted personality, he can be compared to his almost »exact« opposite case, the famous physicist Albert Einstein, as allegedly his work had and still have the epochal influence and impact on the contemporary global civilization.

Njunih resničnih osebnosti verjetno ni mogoče zanesljivo primerjati, saj značaji niso merljivi, možna pa je primerjava njunega javnega položaja, njune javne podobe ter vpliva njunih del in dejanj. V naslednjem opisu so razvidne stichne točke med delovanjem obeh, hkrati pa tudi neverjetni antiparalelizem glede njunega ugleda v javnosti.

Pravzaprav ta primerjava omogoča skoraj sarkastichen uzhitik spricho »absurdistana« chloveshke civilizacije in kulture na tako imenovanem najvishjem intelektualnem nivoju.

Einsteina pozna skoraj vsakdo, vsaj na Zahodu. Ima ugled nedvomnega genija, velikega humanista, najplemenitejshega znachaja, skromne osebnosti. Spodbijati tehtnost njegovih del je skorajda nevarno, saj kritik tvega, da ga oznachijo za neznanstvenega, kajti vse, kar je Einstein naredil, je nedotakljivo. Njegovi univerzalni genialnosti so namenjeni le slavospevi.

Toda »njegova« najslavnejsha dela niso tako zelo njegova, kot to velja na splošno, in celo vechina fizikov ne ve chisto natanko, kaj je pravzaprav sploh naredil. Obrazlozil je fotoefekt in za ta dosezhak je dobil polno priznanje z Nobelovo nagrado. Kar zadeva t. i. relativnostno teorijo, je njegov prispevek v glavnem zbirka tez ostalih matematikov in fizikov, katerih imen pa v svojih objavah ni omenjal. Na glavi, ki nosi najvech »odgovornosti« za splošno relativnostno teorijo, je zlomil kuhinjski stol – njegova zhen, Srbkinja Mileva Marich, je bila sposobna matematcharka in je pomagala Albertu, dobremu fiziku, toda slabemu matematiku. Njegovi zagovorniki poudarjajo, da je dobil iste rezultate kot drugi fiziki, toda po drugi poti in na drugachen nachin, nekateri kritichni poznavalci pa ga imajo za najvechjega plagiatorja vseh chasov ...

Lochil se je od zhene, verjetno iz rasistichnih razlogov; njegova judovska družhina menda ni marala pravoslavne kristjanke Mileve, nagovarjali so ga, naj se porochi s svojo sestrichno. Ob lochitvi je dal Milevi denar od Nobelove nagrade, pozneje pa se ni vech zanimal ne za njuno nezakonsko hchi, ki jo je dal anonimno posvojiti, ne za sinova, ki ju je prav tako imel iz zakona z Milevo.

Z lochitvijo tega zakona je praktichno prenehala Einsteinovo znanstveno delovanje; poslej je pretezhno deloval v javnosti, se pustil slaviti ter je tudi sam slavil bolj ali manj le sebe kot osebo danashnjega slovesa.

Pokazal je pomanjkanje civilnega poguma, ko se je izgovarjal, da ni prav vedel, kaj podpisuje, ko je podpisal tisto slavno pismo, ki je privedlo do izdelave atomske bombe. Vechinoma je le she »produciral znanstveni odpad« (moja oznaka), kot porochi fizik John Dyson, ki je odpovedal srechanje z njim v Princetonu, da bi se izognil nesmiselni razpravi o njegovem najnovishem delu.

Prav zabavno je, kako Poggiu kot tudi Einsteinu »uradno« nikjer ne priznavajo njunega ponarejanja in plagiatorstva; prvi je svoja dela predstavljil kot tuja, drugi se je tako rekoeh kitil s tujim perjem; prvi je skoraj neznan, drugi je neznanstvo slaven, prvemu je prisojen najslabshi znachaj, drugemu najplemenitejsi itd. (vse to je pravzaprav zelo chloveshko). Slavna Einsteinova dela so manj resnichno Einsteinova, kakor pa bi bila Poggiova dela Poggiova, che bi bilo po nakljuchju dokazano, da so ti spisi resnichno starorimskega porekla.

Toda vsaj eno Poggiovo delo, namrech slavna *Germanija*, in Einstein – oba imata nekaj neverjetno skupnega – oboje je povzdignjeno v mit; njuni chastilci ju mochno in vrochichno, ljubosumno in s predanostjo branijo, ne dovoljujejo nikakrshnega kompromisa in nimajo nobenega usmiljenja za svoje nasprotnike.

Yes, they real selves, the personalities, very probably can not be compared as the characters are immeasurable, but their public status and the impact of their work and deeds can be compared.

It is a malevolent pleasure to show in this comparison the »Absurdistan« of the human civilization and culture on the so called highest intellectual level.

Einstein is known almost to everybody, at least in the West. He enjoys the reputation of an unmistakable genius, great humanist, noblest character, the modest personality. To refute some of his work is almost dangerous, the risk is to be declared unscientific, all that he has allegedly done was till now almost untouchable. His universal geniality is praised repeatedly ...

But »his« famous works are not so his as it is generally reported ... and even most of the physicists do not know what exactly he has actually done. He explained the foto-effect and he got therefore the full credit with the Nobel prize. As far as are concerned the relativity theories is his work mostly a recollection of the works of other mathematicians and physicists, whom he did not even referenced. Over the head, which is mostly »responsible« for the general relativity theory, he broke a kitchen chair – his wife, Mileva Marić from Serbia, was a competent mathematician helping Albert, a good physicist, but an incompetent mathematician. His defenders say, he got the same result as the others, but on a different way, some critic pundits do keep him as the greatest plagiarist of all times ...

He divorced his wife very probably due to the racist causes – allegedly his Jewish family disliked the Christian-ortodox Mileva and pushed him to marry his cousin. But he gave Mileva the Nobel price money for the divorce, never asking more for his illicit daughter, given anonymously to adoption, and his sons from marriage, all by Mileva.

His scientific engagement practically expired with the divorce – he was active actually in public relations, letting to be promoted and promoting more or less himself as the person of the current fame.

He showed a deficit in the civil courage distancing himself from the famous letter of atomic bomb promotion and spent his time producing the »scientific garbage« – this designation is by me – as reported physicist John Dyson, who canceled a meeting with him in Princeton to avoid the silliness of discussion on his newest work.

It is amusing, how to Poggio as well to Einstein »officially« was nowhere assigned the designation to be forger or plagiarist; the first one presented his works as someone else's, the second one has decorated himself with the someone else's deeds, the first one is actually almost unknown, the second one immensely glorified, to the first one was assigned the worst, to the second one the noblest character.

The famous Einstein's works are less real Einstein's works as the Poggio's works would be Poggio's, even if proved as the real genuine works of the Roman origin.

But at least one work of Poggio, the famous *Germania*, and Einstein himself, they both have a something strikingly common – they are handled and cherished almost religiously, they are rised to myths – their promoters defend them jealously, they allow no compromise and they are merciless to the adversaries.

ZAKLJUCHEK

La vérité historique est souvent une fable convenue. (Napoleon Bonaparte)

Ta izrek je očitno resnichen v Tacitovem primeru, še posebno glede spisa *Germanija*. Zhe povrshen, toda nepristranski pregled dejstev pokazhe, da je vechina klasičnih spisov, ki naj bi nashli v prashnih, vlazhnih, pozabljenih kotih srednjeveshkih samostanov, ponarejenih; za tako spoznanje ni potrebno nikakršno posebno znanje, dovolj je zdrav razum. To je tudi glavni razlog, da shirsha »znanstvena skupnost« ni napravila nikakršne resne analize zadevnih spisov, kot so jo napravili Ross, Hochart ali Wiener, njih pa niso niti poskusili ovrechi z nasprotnimi razlagami.

Tako Leo Wiener z obzhalovajem ugotavlja: ... *Zhalostno je videti, da germanska zgodovina in z njo povezane zadeve slonijo na Germaniji in Getici, na dveh spomenikih zvestne prevare in nezavedne neumnosti ...*

To lahko dopolnimo: che Nemci nimajo chisto vsega od A do Zh, da bi bili na to ponosni, pa imajo vech kot dovolj vsaj od B kot Bach, Beethoven ... pa Gauss in Goethe ... Hahn, Hilbert, Heine, Herder ... Schiller ... Wegener ... do Z kot Zweig. Tisti »vcherajshnji«, faustovske dushe, seveda tega ne vedo, ker vseh teh velikanov sploh ne poznajo, je pa veliko in vedno vech »danashnjih«, ki so jim predhodniki vzor.

Imamo tudi naslednjo zabavno in bedasto politichno grotesko: cesar Karl Veliki velja za prvega Evropejca, saj naj bi z ognjem in mechem zgradil Evropo kot »Das Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation«. Zato bi morali *Karlspreis* dopolniti s *Prix Napoleon* ali s *Hitler's Award* (angleški naziv naj bi kazal evropsko miselnost, ker prva dva nista angleška); omenjeni so gradili Evropo na podoben nachin, s podobnimi posledicami. Mogoche bi kazalo ustanoviti tudi Piccolominijevo nagrado v spomin na njegovo (italijansko) evropejstvo, npr. *Benedictione Pii* ...

Ironija zgodovine je, da so najbolj chashchena »dejstva« germanske zgodovine, t. i. *faustovske dushe* – Tacitovi Germani, cesar Karl Veliki in slovanska priselitev – zgolj miti, pravljice, ki si jih je izmislila zanichevana *felahovska dusha*; ime Germani, ki je zanicljlivo rimljansko ime za sovrazhne Retijce, protoslovansko pleme – vse to je *faustovska dusha* prav ljubeche sprejela za svoje.

Tacita in posebej njegovo *Germanijo*, cesarja Karla Velikega in slovansko selitev bodo *Germani* zagovarjali do poslednjega *Germanusa*, faustovske dushe.

Toda skrb je odvech. Tako dolgo, dokler bodo pripovedke uradne zgodovine v sluzhbi interesov zahodne politike, bo vse to le »Velika lazh«, ki jo bodo še naprej shirili kot resnico kljub vsem najbolj jasnim nasprotnim dejstvom.

CONCLUSION

La vérité historique est souvent une fable convenue. – Napoleon Bonaparte.

This is especially true in the case of Tacitus, especially in the case of the manuscript *Germania*.

Even the most superficial but unbiased check of the facts shows that the majority of the classic texts, which are claimed to be found in some dust, humid, forgotten corners of the medieval monasteries, are actually forgeries – there is no need of any especial knowledge, just the common sense. This is also the main reason for the »scientific community« that any serious analysis as that of Ross, Hochart or Wiener is just ignored and not met with the counterarguments.

As Wiener sadly states: ... *It is sad to contemplate that Germanic history and allied subjects are based on the Germania and the Getica, two monuments of conscious fraud and unconscious stupidity, ...*

and can be actually completed: If Germans do not have all from A to Z to be proud upon, they have at least from B as Bach, Beethoven, Bethe ... and Gauss, and Goethe ... over Hahn, Hilbert, Heine, Herder, ... and Schieller, ... to Wagner, Wegener ... to Z as Zweig more than enough ...

Those from »yesterday«, the Faustian souls, they naturally this do not know, but there is even more and more of these from »today«, to which are this predecessors an example to cherish.

There is also an amusing and silly grotesque political problem – the emperor Charlemagne – *Karl der Grosse* – is declared to be the first European, building Europe with the fire and sword as the »*Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation*«. Therefore the *Karlspreis* should be also supplemented by the *Pris Napoleon* and the *Hitler's Award* – English title should be used to be European as both previous are not English – they tried to build Europe in the same way, with the similar consequences! Maybe, also Piccolomini's Award is to be instituted for his European orientation, in Italian as *Benedictione Pii* ...

It is an irony of the history – the *Faustian souls'* most cherished »facts« of the German history – Tacitus's *Germani*, the emperor *Karl der Grosse* and the *Slavic migration* are just myths, fairy tales, invented by the despised *Felachian soul* itself. The nickname of the another despised *Felachian soul* – *Germani*, a derogatory Roman name for hostile Rhetians, the Proto-Slavic tribes, all this was lovingly endorsed by *Faustian souls* as their own.

Tacitus and especially his *Germania*, the emperor *Karl der Grosse* and the *Slavic migration* will be defended by *Germani* till the last *Germanus*, the *Faustian soul*.

But they needn't to bother. As long as the official history narratives will serve western politics they will be promoted as a Big Lie against the most sound counterarguments ...

Viri / Sources

³³ Birgitta Hoffmann: Archaeology versus 'Tacitus' Agricola, a 1st century worst case scenario; A lecture given to the Theoretical Archaeology Group conference, held in Dublin, 15th December, 2001.

³⁴ Pius II, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, The Humanist Pope, by Cecilia M. Ady, Methuen & Co. LTD., 1913.

³⁵ Aeneas Silvius, Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman, and Pope; by William Boultong; Archibald Constable and Co., LTD.; London 1908, str. 243.

³⁶ Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini als Papst Pius II.; Prof. Dr. Anton Weiss, Graz, Ulr. Moser's Buchhandlung (J. Meyerhoff) 1897.

^{36a} Pfizer Gustav: Der Welsche und der Deutsche Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pabst Pius II.) und Georg von Heimburg: historisch-poetische Bilder aus dem fünfzenteen Jahrhundert; Stuttgart 1844.

³⁷ E. Walser: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, herausgegeben von Walter Goetz, Heft 14: Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke, von Dr. Ernst Walser, Privatdozent an der Universität Zürich, Druck und Verlag von B.G.Teubner - Leipzig Berlin 1914.

³⁸ Germania Eneae Silvii in qua candide lector continentur: gravamina germanice nationis; confutatio eorumdem cum replicis; de concilio Constantinensi & Basiliensi; describuntur hic urbes, civitates, ecclesie, episcopatus, abbacie, principatus & principatus & nobilissime familie; Strassburg 1515.

³⁹ Christopher B. Krebs: Negotiatio Germaniae – 'Tacitus' Germania und Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Giannantonio Campano, Conrad Celtis und Heinrich Bebel. Hypomnemata 158. Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben. Herausgegeben von Albrecht Dihle, Siegmund Döpp, Dorothea Frede, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Günther Patzig, Christoph Riedweg, Gisela Striker. Göttingen 2005 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

⁴⁰ De Viris Illustribus; Two texts by Eneas Silvius Piccolomini on Denmark by Michael von Cotta-Schönberg¹, str. 5, English trans. Of reviewed anthology: Michael v. Cotta-Schönberg, To tekster af Æneas Silvius Piccolomini om Danmark. In: Umisteligt – Festskrift til Erland Kolding Nielsen. Edited by John T. Lauridsen and Olaf Olsen. Copenhagen, the Royal Library, 2007, pp. 55-74.

⁴¹ Fabian Fischer: Das Europabild des Humanisten und Papstes Enea Silvio Piccolomini/Pius II. LMU-Publikationen / Geschichts- und Kunstwissenschaften Nr. 25 (2007).

<http://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/>

⁴² A. T. Fomenko: Empirico-Statistical Analysis of Narrative Material and its Applications to Historical Dating; Volume II: The Analysis of Ancient and Medieval Records by A. T. Fomenko. Moscow University, Moscow, Russia – Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht Boston London 1994.

⁴³ Heribert Illig: Wer hat an der Uhr gedreht; Ullstein Verlag, München 2009.

Heribert Illig: Das erfundene Mittelalter; Econ Verlag, München 2000.

⁴⁴ Mario Alinei: Origini delle lingue d'Europa; Il Mulino, Bologna, 1996, 2000; The Paleolithic Continuity Theory on Indo-European Origins. <<http://www.continuitas.com/>>

⁴⁵ Colin Renfrew: Anatolian hypothesis. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatolian_hypothesis

⁴⁶ Shavli J., Bor M., Tomazhich I.: Veneti; Editiones Veneti, Wien, Boswell 1996 (prevod slovenske izdaje *Veneti – nashi davni predniki*, Maribor 1989).

Viri / Sources (I)

⁹ Rudolfus von Fulda: *Translatio sancti Alexandri*; Nicolaus Ellenbog: *PASSIO SEPTEM FRATRVM filior... sanctae foelicitatis. Translatio sancti Alexandri. Passio Sancti Theodori martyris*; Ottobeuren 1511.

¹⁶ John Wilson Ross (1818-1887): *Tacitus and Bracciolini. The Annals forged in the XVth century. Originally published anonymously (?) in 1878. (Anonimously with dedication: I dedicate to my esteemed and estimable brother Robert Dalrymple Ross – op. B.J.H.)*

¹⁷ Polydore Hochart: *De l'authenticité des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite*; Paris, Ernest Thorin Editeur 1890.

¹⁸ Leo Wiener: *A History of Arabico-Gothic Culture; Volume III, Tacitus's Germania & other Forgeries*; Innes & Sons, 129435 N. Twelfth St., Philadelphia, Pa., MCMXX.

¹⁹ FAZ – *Frankfurter allgemeine Zeitung*, 18. Oktober, 2008, No. 244 / Str. Z3.

²⁷ Enea Silvio Piccolomini: *Europa*; Herausgegeben von Günther Frank und Paul Metzger; Melanchton-Akademie Bretten, Uebersetzung von Albrecht Hartmann; Verlag Regionalkultur, 2005.

(Melanchton, pravo ime Philipp Schwarzerdt, nemshki reformator najblizhji Luthru – op. B.J.H.)

²⁸ *The Life of Poggio Bracciolini*. By The Rev. W. M. Shepherd, LL. D., Liverpool. Printed by Harris Brothers, For Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green & Longman. London. 1837.

²⁹ *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*; herausgegeben von Walter Goetz, Heft 14: *Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke*, von Dr. Ernst Walser, Privatdozent an der Universität Zürich; Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner; Leipzig Berlin 1914.

Svojskost *LiVeS Journala – Revije SRP*

Vodilo *LiVeS Journala – Revije SRP* so tri vrednotne orientacije individua, tega ne nepomembnega drobca v sistemu institucij.

Te vrednote so: Svoboda, Resnica, Pogum. Pomembne so, vsaka od njih posebej, pomembno je prezhemanje teh vrednot.

Tak namen ima tudi uredništvo Revije SRP, ki izhaja v posodobljenem prvotnem slovenskem chrkopisu bohorichici, katere utemeljitev predstavlja *Zbornik 2001 Bohorichica*.

Individuality of the *LiVeS Journal*

Guidelines of the *LiVeS Journal* are the three values of the orientation of the individual, that irrelevant shred in the system of institutions.

These values are: Liberty (freedom), Verity (truth), and Spirit (courage) Each of them is important in its separate way, the infusion of these values is important.

This is also the intention of the LiVeS Journal editorial board, which is published in an updated version of Bohorichica – the primary Slovenian alphabet, the argumentation behind which is presented in *Zbornik 2001 Bohorichica*.

Sama ustvarjalnost in avtonomija,
njuna utemeljenost v raziskovanju,
nachelno in splošno nista vprashljivi,
nihče, skoraj nihče ne bo nasprotoval
takim usmeritvam. Problem se pojavlja
shele na konkretnem nivoju, kot tak je
nerazviden in skrit ali zhe prikrit
in s tem tezhko reshljiv.

Problem ukinjanja ustvarjalnosti
(in avtonomije) se kazhe v shtevilnih,
a na videz nepomembnih malenkostih.
Lahko jih ne vidimo ali pa se moramo
spustiti na nivo konkretnosti, to je
na nivo ukvarjanja z malenkostmi
in postati malenkostni.

Institucija brez spomina je
kakor podjetje brez knjigovodstva,
mochni in mogochni v njej
pochno, kar jih je volja,
ker vse, kar pochno, utone
v pozabljivi zavesti chasa.

...

a ne gre za chas, ampak za dejstva zavesti,
kjer chasa ni, je samo trajanje,
obche vrednote so neposredna dejstva zavesti,
vsakomur dojemljive, preverljive,
nihče jih chloveku ne more ne dati ne vzeti,
ne sistem ne institucija ne propaganda, tudi kulturna ne,
samo che to sam hoche, jih bo nashel
le v sebi, sebstvu svojem.

Creativity and autonomy themselves,
their justification in research,
are in principle and generally not questionable,
no one, or next to no one will oppose
such an orientation. It is not until concrete action is undertaken
that the problem will occur, and it is therefore
unevident and hidden or even already concealed
and thus difficult to solve.

The problem of abolishing creativity
(and autonomy) presents itself in numerous,
but seemingly irrelevant details.

We can either leave them undetected or
drop down to the tangible level, in other words –
become preoccupied with trifles –
and grow petty.

An institution with no memory
is like a company without accounting,
its strong and its mighty
do what they please,
because all they do is doomed to drown
in the forgetful awareness of time.

...

but it is not a matter of time, but a matter of the facts of awareness,
where time does not exist, there is only length,
general values are direct facts of awareness,
understandable to all, verifiable,
no one can bestow them or take them away,
neither system, nor institutions nor propaganda – not even a cultural one,
only if one so desires, will one find them
only within oneself, in one's own self.

»Torej vsako bitje, ki občuti svojo eksistenco,
občuti zločin pokorjenosti in težhi k svobodi;
che se she zhivali, ki so udomachene za sluzhenje chloveku,
lahko podrede shele potem, ko jim zatro nasprotno zheljo,
kakshna nesrecha je to lahko za chloveka,
ki je edini resnichno rojen zato,
da zhivi svobodno.

Napravila ga je nenaravnega do te mere,
da je izgubil praspomin na svoje prvobitno stanje,
in na zheljo, da ga ponovno ozhivi ...
Vedno pa se najdejo eni, srechnejshi od drugih,
ti, ki so rojeni pod srechno zvezdo,
ki občutijo težho jarma in ne morejo vzdrzhati,
da bi ga ne stresli, ti, ki se nikoli ne navadijo na jarem ...

*Ko bi bila svoboda povsem izgubljena,
zunaj tega sveta,
bi jo ti ljudje ozhivili v svoji predstavi,
občutili bi jo v **svojem duhu** in jo she vedno uzhivali.*

Suzhenjstvo nikakor ni po njihovem okusu,
celo ko je to okrasheno, ne! ...«

Étienne de La Boétie

»So every being that feels its existence,
feels the crime of submission and strives for freedom;
if even animals that are tamed to serve man,
do not submit until their opposing desires are crushed,
what misfortune can this be for man,
who alone is truly born,
to live freely.

It made him so unnatural,
that he forgot the memory of his primeval state,
and the desire to again revive it ...
But you always find some who are happier than others,
the ones who are born under a lucky star,
who feel the weight of the yoke and cannot stop themselves,
from shaking it off, the ones who never grow accustomed to the yoke ...

*If liberty were to be completely lost,
out of this world,
then these people would revive it in their imaginations,
they would feel it in **their spirit** and continue to enjoy it.*

Servitude is by no means to their taste,
not even if it is adorned! ...«

Étienne de La Boétie

OPOMBA UREDNISHTVA

LiVeS Journal (in *Revija SRP*): <http://www.livesjournal.eu> (<http://www.revijasrp.si>)

Internetna uporaba *Revije SRP* je brez omejitev; enako velja za *LiVeS Journal*, ki mu je z vzporedno dvojezičnostjo namenjena širša dostopnost, tudi za izseljenske korenine. Predvideno je, da bodo med novimi sodelavci tudi prevajalci, ki bodo postopoma dodajali prevode iz *Revije SRP* v »globalnem jeziku« (za globalni zgodovinski spomin), danes v angleškem (britanskem ali ameriškem). Izvirnik vsakega teksta je avtorski unikat, prevodov pa je lahko vech, zato bo v internetni izdaji *LJ* kak prevod lahko tudi dodan k predhodnemu ali pa ga bo nadomestil.

EDITORIAL NOTE

LiVeS Journal (and *Revija SRP*): <http://www.livesjournal.eu> (<http://www.revijasrp.si>)

Internet use of *Revija SRP* is without limits; the same is valid for *LiVeS Journal*, for which the wider accessibility is intended by the means of two parallel languages, even to the roots of diasporas. It is expected that the new translators among the contributors gradually will add new translations of the texts from *Revija SRP* in the »global language« (for the global historical memory), today in English (British or American). Every original text is unique as a fact of authorship, but translations may be several, so in the Internet edition of *LJ* new translations also could be added to the preliminary ones, or those could be replaced.