Würde

Dignity

(*Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexicon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, Herausgegeben von Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, Reinhart Koselleck, Band 7, Verw – Z, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1984, 2004 (1972-1997), S. 637-677)

(ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗ, »ΠΕΡΙ ΑΞΙΟΠΡΕΠΕΙΑΣ«, ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗ: ΛΕΥΤΕΡΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΥ (Μετάφραση λατινικῶν κειμένων : ΓΙΑΝΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ), ΙΝΔΙΚΤΟΣ, ΑΘΗΝΑΙ, 2002)

PANAJOTIS KONDYLIS

PANAGIOTIS KONDYLIS

»I. ‘Dignity’ in ancient Rome«, pp. 637-645, is by Viktor Pöschl / Victor Poeschl and will only be translated here after the complete translation of the P.K. text, pp. 645-677[, which is never going to happen]

I. ‘Dignity’ in ancient Rome. II. ‘Dignitas / Dignity’ in medieval theology.

I. ‘Dignity’ in ancient Rome

»I. ‘Dignity’ in ancient Rome«, pp. 637-645, is by Viktor Pöschl / Victor Poeschl and will only be translated here after the complete translation of the P.K. text, pp. 645-677[, which is never going to happen, but here are the first lines of the text, which in themselves are compelling and of great interest…]

‘Dignity’ (‘dignitas’) is in Rome first of all a political concept. Belonging to the nobility, official (officious) function(s) / functioning / positions, service to the community, commonwealth, polity, but also dignity of appearance, presence, occurrence, demeanour, air(s), of the manner/way of expression, of leading one’s life / one’s mode, style of life (lifestyle [[but not in today’s Hedonismus-Konsum sense]]) are essential elements of Roman dignitas / dignity. The gloss, shine, lustre, splendour, sheen, glory, glamour, brilliance,

brightness, radiance which they (Romans) have, belongs to the peculiarities, characteristics of the order of life of/in Rome. Leading politicians have a personal entitlement to dignity, to recognition and consideration, which in our world would not only appear presumptuous, pretentious, arrogant, overweening, but absurd. Thus, as he explicitly states several times, CAESAR is waging / waged civil war for the sake of his dignitas / dignity. …

…

…

…

VIKTOR PÖSCHL

II. 'Dignitas / Dignity' in medieval theology

Like early-Christian theology, so too did medieval theology support, prop up, base its concept of dignitas /dignity on the teaching, doctrine, theory of man being made in God's image / the likeness, resemblance of man to God. We cannot / should not wonder / be surprised about this continuity. Because the teaching, doctrine, theory of man being made in God's image / the likeness, resemblance of man to God constituted one limb, member of an antithetical (conceptual) pair (of concepts), which as a whole was indispensable, essential for Church ideology. That / This means : man as the image and likeness of God represented and constituted the inevitable, indispensable (not to be thought away) reverse side of man as the originator, perpetrator, creator, author and at the same time the victim of the Fall of Man / Original Sin. If likeness to God / being made in God's image guaranteed the future salvation (redemption, deliverance) of man, thus reference/pointing to his / man's sinfulness served in relation to that, to found, justify the present-day [[i.e. in the Middle Ages]] necessity of more or less ascetic disciplining. The disciplining was supposed, indeed, in regard to the presumed, assumed sinfulness, in any case, to occur, but it could, in the final analysis, finally, only find in the hope of salvation a plausible, reasonable, lucid or else consoling, comforting, consolatory justification — a salvation (redemption, deliverance), which for its part [occurred, was found] not only thanks to the effect, impact of (divine) Grace, but was also considered secure, certain, safe, because man as the likeness, image of God seemed to carry the beginnings in relation to that salvation ontologically within itself. This scale of thoughts explains why for the Church the likeness of man to God / man being made in God's image and the sinfulness of man were equally indispensable : both complementarily contributed, in relation to that, to underpinning, reinforcing its (the Church's) claim to/on (the) education, bringing up, training (of man) and claim to/on dominance (dominant authority, ruling).

One must take into account this context in order to understand the persistence, perseverance, insistence with which dignitas / dignity is spoken of / about exactly before or after the gloomy, dark, sombre, dim, murky statements, contentions, propositions about the present state (of affairs) / situation of man ; that is why the ontologically given human dignitas / dignity acquires, obtains its whole, entire, total glory, splendour, magnificence precisely from

/ out of (the) contrast to/with the misery, wretchedness, destitution of (fallen) man (after the Fall). Against this bold, (provocatively) cheeky forgetfulness of God, PAULUS DIACONUS asserts, projects the obligations, duties which arise, result from the *dignitas humanae originis* [*dignity of human origins / descent*]. This goes back / is reduced to the fact that God condescended to create man with his own hands, and indeed *plenum atque perfectum, habentum in se et dignitatem qua praecelleret, et potestatem qua cunctis animantibus imperaret, soliserviens [soli serviens] illia [illi,] quo ei cuncta fuerant subjugata, ut imperaret mundo, serviret Deo* [full, complete and also perfect, having in himself the dignity thanks to which he would be superior to other animate beings, and the power with which he would be their master, ruler, governor, commander, controller, being a slave / servant only to Him [i.e. God] who subjugated (subjected, subordinated) to him [i.e. man] everything, in order to rule, govern, control, command the world and serve God][45]. The same dignity which permits, allows the rule, dominance of man over the rest of creation at the same time imposes on him (man) the duty, obligation to serve God, since it (i.e. dignity) originates, stems, springs, comes exactly from God. JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIUGENA differentiates, distinguishes with the same strictness between the state (of affairs) (situation) before and the / that state (of affairs) (situation) after the Fall of Man and believes, thinks, opines that man's true nature cannot be recognised in this latter state (with and after the Fall of Man), which stands / is (found) under the influence, sign, aegis of sensoriality (sensuality (pertaining to the senses in general and not just to sexual arousal etc.)). Rather we should realise, be clear, visualise that that true nature *ad imaginem Dei priusquam peccaret conditia est* [in the image of God is put together, constructed, built, completed before he (man) sinned / sinning] and that it (the said true nature of man) at that time / in those days / back then *omnum sensum corporum, omnemque mortalem cogitationem pro ineffabili naturae dignitate . . . fugit* [flees from (is / was superior to) every sense of the body, and every mortal thought because of the unutterable, unpronounceable dignity of its nature][46]. That / This means, signifies that the essence, nature, character and the dignity of man are free of every sensoriality (have no relation to the senses), i.e. they only take root and exist in the spirit. Because as Johannes formulates it in his (neo)platonic conceptuality, *homo est notio quaedam intellectualis in mente divina aeternaliter facta* [man is an intellectual notion (idea, conception) made (created) in eternity / perpetuity in the mind of God][47] and because of that / accordingly he dominates, rules over the sensorial world *non mole partium, sed rationabilis naturae dignitate* [not on account of the mass, weight, magnitude of his parts, limbs, but on account of the dignity of his rational nature][48].

On / At the threshold of scholasticism ANSELM VON CANTERBURY draws attention to this / underlines with (the) same / equal emphasis, that man after the Fall of Man distanced / estranged / alienated himself greatly *a prima conditionis humanae dignitate* [from the initial (primordial, primeval) dignity of the human condition / situation] and accordingly / through that did not only humiliate (degrade, humble, debase) himself, but also insulted / offended

[45] PAULUS DIACONUS, Homilia 15. MIGNE, Patr. Lat., t. 158 (1853), 1205 f.
[46] JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIUGENA, De divisione naturae 4,5. Ed. Thomas Gale (Oxford 1681), 170.
[47] Ibid., 4, 7 (p. 171).
[48] Ibid., 4, 10 (p. 182).

God; because *secundum dignitatem operis laudatur et praedicatur sapientia artificis* [the wisdom of the artisan is praised / glorified and is proclaimed, declared, asserted in accordance with the dignity of the/his work][49 + i]. Although now fallen man is no longer the *rex* of creation, but is only (a) quasi *regulus* [(a) petty (little, midget) king, (chieftain, prince)][50], nevertheless it is expected that he, *illam dignitatem, quam habiturus erat, si non peccasset* [that dignity, which he would have had, if he had not sinned][51], would fully obtain it anew, again / regain it, and indeed both thanks to Christ's sacrifice, as well as on the basis of the fact that his dignity never completely, entirely dies (out), since it, not least of all, is founded / based on / grounded in Reason and free will and continues (to exist), persists with these. This means: man is a(n) intellectual (spiritual) being (creature), and the expression that he is *imago dei* [God's image], says exactly this. In a meditatio [contemplation / deep (profound) thought], in which Anselm investigates, studies(,) *quid dignitas, quid sublimitatis* [what/which dignity, what/which sublimity, elevation, loftiness] God had provided, awarded, accorded, given to man on the day of his creation, he explicates that expression on the basis of an analogy towards / vis-à-vis / as regards the threefold / triple intellectual, spiritual activity of God, who remembers himself, thinks about himself and loves himself. Only if you too, man, reminds, urges, warns, admonishes Anselm, remember, recollect God, think of / about Him and love Him, *tuae creationis dignitatem, qua ad imaginem Dei creata es, salubriter exprimas* [may you wholesomely, healthfully, salubriously, beneficially express the dignity of your creation, through which you were created in the image of God][52]. Service to / Worship of God and human dignity are, therefore, dependent on each other, since the latter (human dignity) both as regards its origins as well as its composition, constitution, texture, nature goes back / is reduced to God.

In / At the same place / point Anselm explains, explicates, argues that the imago [image] implies a more intimate, heartfelt, profound (deeper) relationship with God than the similtudo [likeness, resemblance, similitude]. RUPERTUS VON DEUTZ attributes to this distinction particular, especial meaning, significance as well, who reduces human rationality (reasonableness) to the imago[image]-relationship, [[and]] human striving after / for good(ness), kindness, benevolence and justice to the similtudo[likeness]-relationship. However, this striving is set in motion and is animated, inspired only by rationality, which also distinguishes the essence, character, nature, being of man when as the result of the effects, consequences, implications, impacts, repercussions of the Fall of Man good(ness) and justice are striven after, pursued a little or not at all[53]. The sentence / proposition, *faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram* [we shall make man in our image and similitude (likeness)], concerns, in any case, the total, overall, whole *creationis dignitatem* [dignity of creation], because it means / signifies two things: that God can *quasi per speculum contemplari* [quasi through a looking-glass, mirror contemplate] himself in man and that

[49] ANSELM VON CANTERBURY, De concordia 3, 7. Opera omnia, ed. Franciscus S. Schmitt, vol. 2 (Edinburgh 1946), 273f..
[50] PAULUS DIACONUS, Homilia 14 (p. 664).
[51] ANSELM VON CANTERBURY, Cur Deus homo 1, 5. Opera omnia, vol. 2, 52.
[52] Ibid., Liber meditationum et orationum 1. MIGNE, Patr. Lat., vol. 158, 710f..
[53] RUPERTUS VON DEUTZ, In genesim 2, 2f. Ibid., vol. 167 (1854), 248f. in connection with his own, De divinis officiis 7, 7. Ibid., vol. 170 (1854), 184.

through / by means of [own-handed / self-made] creation (of his own hand) (*faciamus* [we shall make]) a completely particular honour, glory, credit, kudos was rendered / bestowed upon man[54], whereby, as Anselm underlines, *dignitas pulchre exprimitur conditionis humanae* [the dignity of the human condition is beautifully, fairly, handsomely, excellently expressed][55]. And still something more proves man's particular, especial dignity, worth(iness), value: the fact that God's son assumed / took on / adopted his (i.e. man's) mortal form in order to redeem, save, release, rescue him. At this point, though, Rupertus uses the word 'honor'[56], whose synonymity with 'dignitas' we encounter in multiple, many, several theological texts[57].

It can easily be comprehended why in / amongst theologians with pronounced, marked, distinct(ive) mystical tendencies the dignitas-concept / concept of dignity relates, refers with particular preference to the becoming man / incarnation of God, which, in a certain respect comes / amounts / boils down to / ends up in a deification of man. In view (consideration) of / Considering God's preparedness, readiness, willingness to seek the sinner like a lost sheep everywhere in order to save / rescue him, BERNHARD VON CLAIRVAUX proclaims: *Mira quaerentis Dei dignatio, magna dignitas hominis sic quaesiti!* [Wonderful is the considering / deeming worthy, respect, esteem of (the seeking) God (to seek), great is the dignity of the man (thus) sought, searched (in this way)!][58] God's becoming man / incarnation constitutes precisely the most intens(iv)e form of this seeking, search, whereby / in relation to which even the original, initial relationship between God and man is reversed: now God becomes similar to man, *verbum enim caro factum est* [because the word has been made / become flesh][59]. Bernhard sees, espies a not lesser, slighter sign / indication of obligatory divine favour in the (hand-made) creation of man by God (with His own hands), in order to then deduce, derive from / out of the teaching, doctrine, theory of [man's] (the) likeness to God, the position of ruler of man / man's position as ruler in (regard to) / over nature[60]. Still / Even like (Like) others before him, he (i.e. Bernhard) distinguishes between the imago-relationship and the similitudo-relationship / the relationship of image and the relationship of likeness (similitude); he looks at the former (image relationship) as indestructible, resilient (in contrast to the loss, losing, wastage, forfeiture of the latter (likeness relationship) by means of / through the Fall of Man), and connects it (i.e. the relationship of image) with purely intellectual magnitudes like the freedom of the will / volition / free will, whereas the *similitudo* is supposed to be at work (/ play an active role) in / during the realisation of

[54] Ibid., In genesim 2, 1 (p. 247). Already RHABANUS MAURUS had underlined the *dignitatem operationis* [dignity, worth(iness), merit, value of the labour, work, operation / act] in the creation of man, Commentarii in genesim 1, 7. Ibid., vol. 107 (1864), 459.
[55] RUPERTUS VON DEUTZ, In genesim 2, 22 (p. 267).
[56] Ibid., Commentarii in Matthaeo 1. Ibid., vol. 168 (1854), 1322.
[57] Thus / Hence, ALBERTUS MAGNUS, Summa theologica, 2, 14, 86: *Honor enim hominis est imago et similitudo dei* [For / Truly, Certainly, In fact, the honor of man is the image and likeness of God.]; cf. BERNHARD VON CLAIRVAUX, De diligendo Deo 2. Ibid., vol. 182 (1879), 976: *Homo factus in honore* [Man was / has been made in honour].
[58] BERNHARD VON CLAIRVAUX, In adventu domini sermo 1, 7. Ibid., vol. 183 (1879), 38.
[59] Ibid., Vitis mystica seu tractatus de passione domini 25, 86. Ibid., vol. 184 (1879), 686.
[60] Ibid., In Psalm. Qui habitat sermo 14, 2. Ibid., vol. 183, 239.

various *virtutes* [strengths, capacities, virtues][61]. Human dignity is founded (based) on / grounded in (the) free will (*dignitatem in homine liberum arbitrium dico* [dignity in man I say / declare / contend is in free will (mastery, dominion, judgement, decision)]), but over and above that it belongs together with *scientia* [knowledge, knowing, science] and *virtus* [virtue]. All three, *dignitas*, *scientia* and *virtus*, are supposed to now have a double character. *Dignitatem . . . demonstrat humanam non solum naturae praerogativa, sed et potentia dominatus* [The dignity of man / Human dignity . . . demonstrates not only the prerogative of nature, but also the power of domination]; the *scientia* is supposed to, for its part, be knowledge that we possess value, and, simultaneously, that this value does not stem from us; and finally, *virtus* should mean, signify not merely the tireless, indefatigable, inexhaustible striving after / for the actualisation / to actualise the *similitudo* [likeness] with the Creator, but just as much the keeping / holding to the aim of this striving, if we reach / achieve it. From these determinations it arises that dignity without the double knowledge (in respect) of / about it (i.e. dignity), is useless or even harmful (detrimental). Because should man not know of its (dignity's) existence, presence in himself, he also has nothing from / of its lustre (shine, gloss, splendour); again, should he know of it (dignity), without taking into consideration / note / having knowledge of its divine origins, provenance, thus he has *gloriam, sed non apud Deum* [glory, but not amongst, beside, at God]; he, in other words, falls into / prey to diabolical / devilish hubris. That is why it is obvious, on the other hand, *scientia* without *virtus damnabilis* [knowledge without virtue is damnable, worthy of condemnation]. The edifying, uplifting conclusion from that is: *homo virtutis, cui nec damnosa scientia, nec infructuosa dignitas manet, clamat Deo et ingenue confietur : . . . Nil nobis, o Domine, de scientia, nil nobis de dignitate tribuimus; sed tuo totum, a quo totum est, nomini deputamus* [Virtuous man, to whom neither injurious, destructive, pernicious, harmful knowledge nor unfruitful, useless, fruitless dignity remains, cries out to God and confesses frankly: . . . We attribute nothing to ourselves, O(h) Lord, (in respect) of knowledge, nothing to ourselves (in respect) of dignity; but we ascribe everything to you in your name, from whom everything is][62].

The example given above illustrates in / through which detours / roundabout (indirect) ways the theological dignitas-concept / concept of dignity could ultimately, in the end be interpreted in the interest(s) of God or else of the Church. Dignity was a binding (obligatory, mandatory) gift of / from God and was supposed to at the same time / moment remind man of his dependence on God, whereby he, exactly thanks to this dignity, saw himself placed / posited / set above all other beings, creatures. In accordance with a formulation by HUGO VON ST. VIKTOR : *Et homo factus est ut Deo serviret propter quem factus est ; et mundus factus est ut serviret homini propter quem factus est* [And man was made to serve God for whom he was made ; and the world was made to serve man for whom it was made][63]. Said otherwise / In other words: *sub Deo fuit homo conditione, supra mundum dignitate* [man was

[61] Ibid., In festo annuntiationis beatae virginis sermo 1, 7. Ibid., vol. 183, 386; cf. the same / ibid., Institutio sacerdotis 1 f.. Ibid., vol. 184, 773f.; the same / ibid., Tractatus de gratia et libero arbitrio, ibid., vol. 182, 1005ff. 1016.

[62] Ibid., De diligendo Deo 2 (p. 976).

[63] HUGO VON ST. VIKTOR, De sacramentis 1, 2, 1. Ibid., vol. 176 (1854), 205.

under God in (his) / as to condition, above the world in (his) dignity][64]. If man on the strength / basis / by virtue of his rationality, reasonableness is the image of God, thus he is this because *similis, quod sicut Deus hominibus, ita homo animalibus dominatur* [he is similar, because just as God rules over men, so does man rule / have dominion / is man lord and master of / over animals]. With that / Accordingly, he, nevertheless, remains conscious of the fact that it – through *peccatum dignitatem propriam* [sin destroying one's own dignity] – at least partially has been revealed, disclosed, exposed, divulged that he was deprived of his dominion over the largest and smallest animals, and now he only has control / dominion (at his disposal) / rules over (the) medium-sized animals[65].

[64] Ibid., Excerptiones allegoricae 1, 1, 2. Ibid., vol. 177 (1854), 194.
[65] Ibid., Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon 7. Ibid., vol. 175 (1854), 37f..

THE FOOTNOTES ARE BY P.K. (EXCEPT FOR [[]]), AND THE ENDNOTES ARE KRAZY MAN SHIT

[i] Man confuses the "in the image of God" with "*being there* as God" and so man's unending hubris commences and will only end when he ends.