

Reaktion, Restauration

Reaction, Restoration

(Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexicon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Herausgegeben von Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, Reinhart Koselleck, Band 5, Pro – Soz, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1984, 2004 (1972-1997), S. 179-230)

(ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗ, »ΑΝΤΙΔΡΑΣΗ, ΠΑΛΙΝΟΡΘΩΣΗ«, ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗ: ΛΕΥΤΕΡΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΥ, ΙΝΔΙΚΤΟΣ, ΑΘΗΝΑΙ, 2001)

PANAJOTIS KONDYLLIS

PANAGIOTIS KONDYLLIS

© 2025 to whenever. Translated from the German and Greek by the Krazy Man Barbarian Idiom Barbarian Idiot.

1. Introduction. II. 1. The origins of ‘reaction’ and ‘restoration’ and their encounter in revolutionary times. a) ‘Reaction’. b) ‘Restoration’. 2. The background pertaining to the history of ideas of the endeavours at restoration and of the accusation of reaction.

I. Introduction

If one keeps in mind (an eye on, beholds, follows) the pre-revolutionary [[i.e. before 1789]] history of “reaction” and “restoration”, which no doubt from the point of view of the question / problem formulation of this lexicon must be characterised as their pre-history, thus, a simultaneous handling, treatment of both can hardly be justified. Here we are, namely, dealing with two concepts which appear, pop/crop up, arise at different points in time / periods and in completely, entirely different, various contexts, interrelations, in order to exist next to / alongside / beside each other in the age, epoch of the [[French]] Revolution [[1789 onwards]] and without any contact (without the one traversing / touching the other). The Revolution intensified their politicisation already begun earlier, and effected, caused, brought about, provoked, moreover, a semasiological (meaning-related) widening, broadening,

extension, expansion of both, which first of all lead to their approximation (the lessening of their distance) and finally led to their fusion, merging, amalgamation, i.e. led to their synonymy (becoming synonymous) — at least in so far that today both concepts can mean / signify the striving for / after the restoration, reestablishment, rebuilding, renewal, recovery of outdated, obsolete, antiquated, archaic, outmoded views and arrangements (institutions, establishments, facilities), even though the keeping to / insistence upon / persistence with existing states of affairs vis-à-vis progress [[as an ideological concept]] is characterised / described exclusively by ‘reaction’. Only the revolutionary turn makes possible / enables, in fact demands, requires the pursuit, pursuance, tracking, trailing of the fate, destiny as regards conceptual history of ‘reaction’ and ‘revolution’. The positive and negative mutual, reciprocal influences of both concepts are carried out/executed, take place, in the course of this, both at the political level in the narrower sense, as well as at the world-theoretical level and level pertaining to the philosophy of history.

II.

I. The origin(s), provenance, origination, emanation, descent, pedigree, background of ‘reaction’ and ‘restoration’ and their encounter, meeting in the time(s) of [[the French]] revolution / Revolution (revolutionary times)

a) ‘Reaction’. The word ‘reactio’ is a learned, scholarly, lettered neologism which was formed, constituted in the discussion of aspects of the Aristotelian teaching, doctrine, theory of nature and motion (movement) during the time(s), epoch, era of the Renaissance¹.

Reagere, resistere agenti, describes VOSSIUS the concept and admits its suitability for the ends, goals, purposes of natural philosophy, although / even though he himself preferred

¹ PETRUS POMPONATIUS MANTUANUS, *Tractatus acutissimi, utilissimi et mere peripatetici: De intentione et remissione formarum ac de parvitate et magnitudine. De reactione etc.* (Venice 1525), also for earlier, older discussions of the problem. Following on from / Tying onto / In connection with this, JACOBUS ZABARELIUS PATAVINUS, *De rebus naturalibus libri XXX* (1589; Frankfurt 1654), 425Dff.: *liber de reactione*; for the definition of ‘reactio’ *ibid.*, 426E. 435D. *Reagere* stems from the school(-related) Latin of the 3rd century, *réagir* appears as the alchemistic term in the 14th century, cf. FEW 3. Aufl. / 3rd ed., Bd. 10 / vol. 10 (1962), 132, s. v. (see versus/towards/in the direction of / lexical entry (item)) *reagere*. For the meaning of ‘the mutual effect / reciprocal influence of natural elements / the elements of nature’ in the 15th century : JEAN STAROBINSKI, *La vie et les aventures du mot ‘réaction’* [the life and the adventures of the word ‘reaction’], *Modern Language Rev.* 70 (1975), XXII, footnote 6; cf. *ibid.*, footnote 4 for the gradual reception, intake, inclusion, entry of ‘réaction’ in the/a French dictionaries, lexica of the 17th and 18th century.

*vicissim agere*². In any case, it seems that the new term at the beginning of the 17th century has become common enough because GOCCLENIUS registers, records and explains, explicates it³. The new natural science / science of nature as well as authors who dealt with it philosophically⁴, used it all the more frequently/often(,) until it was solemnly (festively, ceremoniously) established by the formulation of the third Newtonian law: *Actioni contrarium semper et aequalem esse reactionem: sive corporum duorum actiones in se mutuo semper esse aequales et in partes contrarias dirigi*⁵. Now it is (well-)known that an important concomitant (ramification, side effect) of Newton's apotheosis in the age of the Enlightenment was the transfer(ence) / transmission of (reinterpreted) basic / fundamental concepts of his natural science to the fields of biology, of anthropology and of politics. With 'reaction', in the course of this, it similarly occurred – albeit to a lesser / slighter extent – as with '(the force of) gravity / attraction'⁶. First of all, though, there was talk of it (i.e. reaction) only in connection with the – on each and every respective occasion – corresponding action. When Diderot wrote: *je vois tout en action et en réaction*⁷, he meant with that that action and reaction were both unavoidable, essential elements/moments of a dynamic equilibrium, i.e. of the/a world situated/found unceasingly / constantly in motion and yet remaining, pausing in/with / retaining certain basic/fundamental structures. The same conception, notion, idea was the basis of the contemporary introduction of the conceptual pair 'action'-'reaction' in the language of biology⁸ as well as the first transfer(ence) (transmission) of this mode / way / manner of expression pertaining to natural science to politics. MONTESQUIEU, following Machiavelli, saw / espied the inner force of the Roman republic

² GERHARDUS JOH. VOSSIIUS, *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis latino-barbaris* 4,20 (Amsterdam 1645), 733 f.

³ RUDOLPHUS GOCCLENIUS, *Lexicon philosophicum quo tanquam clave philosophiae fores aperiuntur* (Frankfurt 1613; Ndr. Hildesheim 1964), 960, s. v. *reactio*. STEPHANUS CHAUVIN, *Lexicon philosophicum*, 2 ed. (Leeuwarden 1713; Ndr. Düsseldorf 1967), 557, s. v. *reactio*.

⁴ KENELM DIGBY, *Two Treatises in the one of which the Nature of Bodies, in the other the Nature of Man's Soule is Looked into* . . . 16, 4f. (Paris 1644; Ndr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1970), 139 ff.: *Of reaction*, HOBBS, *Elementarum philosophiae sectio prima de corpore* (1655), 3, § 19. *Opera*, t. 1 (1836; Ndr. 1961), 284. RALPH CUDWORTH, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* (London 1678; Ndr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1964), 731.

⁵ ISAAC NEWTON, *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica* (1687), ed. Alexandre Koyré and I. Bernard Cohen, vol. 1 (Cambridge 1972), 55. *Die Encyclopédie*, 3^e éd., t. 28 (1779), 419f., emphasises, stresses, accentuates, highlights the advantages of the Newtonian perception/view of reaction vis-à-vis the peripatetic perception/view. JOHNSON vol. 2 (1755; Ndr. 1967), s. v. (sub voce / in the entry of) *Reaction*, explains the concept of reaction with a passage from Newton's "Opticks" too/as well.

⁶ GEORGES GUSDORF, *Les sciences humaines et la pensée occidentale*, t. 4: *Les principes de la pensée au siècle des lumières* (Paris 1971), 180 ff..

⁷ DENIS DIDEROT, *Principes philosophiques sur la matière et le mouvement* (1770), *Oeuv. res compl.* éd. Jean Assézat, t. 2 (Paris 1875), 68.

⁸ Ders., *Le rêve de d'Alembert* (1769), *ibid.*, 139.

in the mutual, reciprocal supplement(ation), complement(ing) of its constituent elements / parts (components) competing with one another, which he compared to the *parties de cet univers, éternellement liées par l'action des unes et la réaction des autres*⁹. ROUSSEAU, again, did not describe with the help / on the basis of 'action' and 'reaction' the inner / internal circumstances, relations of a state, but the function(ing) of the European state system; since, however, in contrast to the / an uncertain, insecure peace, which this European state system could / was able to guarantee, he dreamt about / imagined a permanent peace,(:) thus for him 'action' and 'reaction' (rather) represented and constituted not so much complementary factors of (a) true harmony as (rather) the causes of a dangerous *agitation continuelle*¹⁰.

The French Revolution brought apart / asunder / separated / divided the conceptual pair 'action'-'reaction'. Whilst at the linguistic, language level 'revolution' takes the place of 'action', with, from now on / henceforth, all the momentum, impetus inherent in this word (i.e. 'revolution'), at the same time the presuppositions for the politicisation of the concept of reaction were created. Because the linguistic, language saying farewell / goodbye to the concept of action and consequently to the imagery / metaphorical expressions of the natural sciences had exactly a real, historical-political reason. If in the concept(ual plan) of the natural sciences, action and reaction constituted, despite all opposition, forces ultimately having an effect inside of a more or less stable equilibrium, thus on historical-political terrain, revolutionary action and counterrevolutionary reaction collided with, crashed into each other with such force, impact, weight that a fruitful, fertile coexistence of both in the framework of a (still to be manufactured / restored / fabricated / produced) equilibrium could no longer be kept in mind / thought about / conceived / grasped. The parallel with the concept of natural science lost its justification when the age of the world civil war began.

However, during the outbreak of the Revolution it was still too early for the consolidation, fixing of the fronts and of the concepts. This indeed resulted in the at least implicit replacement of 'action' by 'revolution', but the with that incipient displacement of the mode / manner / way of expression of natural science by the political mode of expression was left in the middle / remained at the half-way point insofar as no immediate, instant(aneous)

⁹ MONTESQUIEU, *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (1734), *Oeuvres compl.*, t. 2 (1951), 119. Cf. MACHIAVELLI, *Discorsi* 3, 4, 6. *Opere*, ed. Sergio Bertelli, t. 1 (Mailand 1960), 387f. 390ff..

¹⁰ ROUSSEAU, *Extrait du projet de paix perpétuelle de Monsieur l'Abbé de Saint Pierre* (1761), *Oeuvres compl.*, t. 3 (1964), 572.

politicisation of the concept of reaction, in the sense of an unambiguous connection of the same (concept of reaction) with one single party or movement took place. Whilst the concept of reaction remained true for the time being to its origins in natural science and continued to characterise / connote the each and every respective specific counteraction / countereffect / counter-impact on a previous specific action, effect, impact, it could be related / relate / refer to reactive actions, acts, kinds of acting of various groups or parties, but not exclusively to a certain group or party amongst these latter groups or parties. In the early phase of the Revolution, MIRABEAU could / was allowed hence to demand a *réaction* against (the) incorrigible clergy just as the bishop TORNÉ complained about / lamented / bemoaned the *complots combinés de réaction violente*¹¹. The concept of reaction behaves / is here still neutral(ly) as regards political parties (party-neutrally), it points / alludes, namely to any *action politique opposée à une autre*¹², whereby / in relation to which the authors, originators, creators, organisers of this latter any kind of political action opposed to another must be named in every individual case¹³.

The later function of the concept of reaction was, accordingly, first of all fulfilled / suffused by / with the concept ‘counterrevolution’¹⁴, which continued frequently to be used synonymously too / as well. Already etymological associations (counter-, re-) suggested, though, an identification of both, and even the course of the French events (incidents, occurrences, happenings), at the latest after 1792, pushed towards the (said) / that (such an) identification¹⁵. It / The said identification could, however, irrevocably, irreversibly become a reality / be realised (fulfilled) only after 1815 when the defeat of the Revolution let its opponents (temporarily) seize, grasp, grab the initiative,(;) something which gave, bestowed / conferred upon the concept of reaction (a) particular intensity and conciseness, succinctness. It ceased then to relate / refer primarily, mainly to reactive kinds of acting, actions, acts of

¹¹ Quoted in BRUNOT t. 9/2 (1967), 843, (foot)note 8.

¹² Quoted in FEW 3rd ed., vol. 10, 132, s. v. reagere.

¹³ Cf. propositions / sentences like *le caractère royal de la réaction* or *la réaction de ceux qu’on appelait aristocrates*, cited in FREY (1925), 103f.; BRUNOT t. 9/2, 844, (foot)note 1.

¹⁴ Already at the beginning of 1790 ‘contre-révolution’ seems to have been common: PHILIPPE JOSEPH BENJAMIN BUCHEZ/PROSPER CHARLES ROUX, *Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution Française, ou Journal des Assemblées Nationales*, after 1789 until 1815, t. 5 (Paris 1834), 143,145. The initial enforcement / establishment / predominance of the term ‘contre-révolution’ brought with it / about / meant that ‘réactionnaire’ was constituted/formed analogously (in regard) to(wards) ‘(contre)-révolutionnaire’. Before / Prior to that / Previously / Beforehand, ‘réagisseur’ and above all ‘réacteur’ were used, BRUNOT t. 9/2, 837, (foot)note 1.

¹⁵ Around / About 1796 the connection of/between ‘réacteur’ with/and ‘royal’ and ‘royalisme’ became all the (more and) more frequent, BRUNOT t. 9/2, 844, (foot)note 2; cf. FELDMANN (1911/12), 276, s. v. Reaktion.

various parties (factions) and consequently it (itself / even) ceased to be party-neutral (i.e. neutral as regards parties and factions), in order to henceforth / from that/this time on characterise a completely, entirely, totally particular party or else movement, whose actions, acts, kinds of acting did not merely stand up (/ were not merely defensive counteractions) to each and every respective proceeding, procedure (/ the respective actions) of the attacking, invasive, aggressive Revolution, but were supposed to make up / constitute a conscious and cohesive, united, closed in toto directed strategy against the temporarily / for the time being defeated, but by no means eradicated, extirpated, wiped (stamped) out, destroyed, uprooted, killed off Revolution. To the extent that the individual counterrevolutionary act(ion)s, kinds of acting seemed to be condensed in a counterrevolutionary strategy founded in terms of a world view, the reactions thereof were (also) t h e (*the*) reaction. After ‘History’ and ‘Progress’, accordingly, a (wider/broader meaning) collective (an important succinct, concise, comprehensive) singular / name (with a wider meaning) arrived / came on the scene / appeared (in the foreground) of political grammar, which was of course narrowly, tightly interrelated, interconnected with the previous ones/names¹⁶. In CONSTANT’S example, the steps towards the threshold of eventual, finite singularisation (/ the final formation of this important succinct, concise, comprehensive name) can be followed well. In his pamphlet appearing in 1797 “Des réactions politiques”, he (Constant) regrets, deplores, is sorry for / sad about the excesses which necessarily / must entail (bring with them) exaggerated / over-the-top “reactions”. These appear as the opposite of *modération* and can come from all participants, although Constant assumes that reactions would come into being through (the) endeavour(s) to delimit, circumscribe, narrow down again a *hors de ses bornes* [beyond its bounds] runaway Revolution (/ which has gone beyond its bounds, limits)¹⁷. In the course of this, he undoubtedly is thinking of the *réaction thermidorienne*¹⁸, yet the in principle connection with a certain, particular, specific party (faction) still remains absent / fails to materialise¹⁹. It (i.e. the said connection with a certain party) is still not directly made in

¹⁶ See sec. II, 2, below.

¹⁷ BENJAMIN CONSTANT, *Des réactions politiques* (1797), *Écrits et discours politiques*, éd. O. Pozzo di Borgo, t. (vol.) 1 (o. O. (with no place of publication) 1964), 21ff., esp. 28. Also, for other / (some of) his contemporaries, ‘réaction’ just as much means ‘malveillance’ or ‘intolérance’; cf. BRUNOT t. [vol.] 9/2, 844, (foot)note 1.

¹⁸ Cf. ALBERT MATHIEZ, *La réaction thermidorienne* (Paris 1929).

¹⁹ Party-neutral / Neutral in terms of party politics [is] also the definition of the Dic. Ac. franç [Dictionary of the French Academy], 5e éd., t. [vol.] 2 (1798), 426, s. v. réaction : *Il se dit figurément d'un parti opprimé qui se venge et agit à son tour.*

Constant's private notes from the years 1814—1816²⁰, but this time, however, it is obvious (close (by), near, just around the corner). Because if here the talk continues to be of political act(ion)s, kinds of acting and not of political actors, thus the former nevertheless are comprehended as components of an organised activity (wherefore / for that reason Constant also, in contrast to 1797, uses the singular *réaction*), which always aims in the same direction and hence must have not interchangeable / exchangeable, and unmistakable, distinctive bearers. If now the relation between reactive activity and certain, always equal, the same bearers of the same reactive activity is determined to be / stands as (/ given and) necessary²¹, thus the next step can then also (effortlessly, casually) occur/take place/ensue/arise (in a free and easy manner), namely, the politically or even in terms of the philosophy of history meant hypostatisation of reaction, which for its part, as we are still to see / shall see below, was bound / supposed to reach, attain, achieve different degrees, grades of intensity.

b) **'Restauration'**. 'Restaurare' and 'restauratio' were in Latin indeed considerably older than 'reagere' and 'reactio', and also received / came into at a much earlier (point in) time political meaning / significance, yet / nevertheless, it was likewise after 1815 that they were granted, given, imparted that particular, special (content as to) meaning (sense-content), which secured (for) them a firm, fixed, stable place in modern political language and simultaneously made their lasting connection with the concept of reaction unavoidable, inevitable. In classical Latin, 'restauratio / restoration' was used mainly, chiefly, principally in the narrower sense of restoration, of the rebuilding / reconstruction / restoring / rehabilitation / renewal / recovery of destroyed (ruined, demolished, shattered, wrecked) buildings (structures, edifices); the metaphoric(al) use / usage of the word remained / stopped, halted inside of narrow boud(arie)s, limits as well²². Indeed, a late Roman inscription was dedicated to an imperial / Caesarian reaturatori orbis terrarum et restitutori [restorer, renovator of the universe, globe, world and restorer, rebuilder]²³, yet / but this use / usage is (rather, very, extremely) rare / has scarcity value. The strengthening, reinforcement of 'restaurator' [renovator] with 'restitutor' [rebuilder, restorer, rectifier, redresser] did not occur by chance, accidentally, coincidentally, since in Latin the act or else fact(s) (of the case) / state of affairs of

²⁰ B. CONSTANT, Notiz v. 5. 5. 1814, 14. 8. 1815, 16. 1. 1816, Oeuvres, éd. Alfred Roulin (Paris 1957), 731, 791, 807. Also in the English [language], the concept of reaction in the modern political sense first appears in 1816 as the *French use of the word*, cit. OED vol. 8 (1933), 192, s. v. [see the entry] Reaction.

²¹ Already NAPOLEON equated 'réacteurs', 'contre-révolution' and 'vieux féodalistes', Notiz v. 9.—10. 4. 1816, in : *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène* par le Comte de Las Cases, éd. Gérard Walter, t. 1 (Paris 1956), 470.

²² CHARLTON LEWIS / CHARLES SHORT, A Latin Dictionary (Oxford 1969), 1582, s. v. *restauro*.

²³ *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*, ed. GUSTAV WILMANN, t. 8/1 (Berlin 1881), 114, Nr. 896.

(the) reinstatement (resetting) to / re-establishment of the former, previous (sound, healthy, wholesome, fit) state of affairs / situation was primarily, chiefly, principally expressed by ‘restituere’ [to put/set up again, replace into the former position, to restore, to rebuild, to revive, to renew] and ‘restitutio’ [restitution, a restoring, a giving back]²⁴. That is why ‘restitutio’ also could appear / make an appearance next to / beside ‘reformatio’ [reformation, metamorphosis, transformation, rehabilitation, anamorphosis] and ‘regeneratio’ [regeneration, a being born again, rebirth], as the synonym of ‘renovatio’ [renewal, a renewing], when in the 10th century the slogan, motto, watchword, catchphrase of the “renovatio imperii romani [renewal of the Roman Empire]” was coined, moulded, shaped, embossed, imprinted, given²⁵. The word ‘restauratio’ did not fall (with)in / under this context; in medieval texts, it basically retained, maintained the meaning, significance of (the) classical Latin or it specified the same meaning in (such a way) that it means (exactly) the same / just as much as ((is) a synonym of) ‘reparatio’ [restoration, renewal, repair(ing)] or ‘compensatio’ [a weighing, balancing of several things together, compensation]²⁶. Even / Also when the papal nuncio / ambassador Bishop Carol Carafa published in 1639 in Köln his “Commentaria de Germania sacra restaurata” in order to report, tell, relate, cover the progress, advances of the Counter-Reformation under Ferdinand II, the concept of restoration had not yet obtained the figurative meaning / metaphorical significance of the “inner/internal renewal” of ‘restitutio’ or ‘renovatio’²⁷.

²⁴ Regarding the judicial, juristic term ‘restitutio (in integrum)’ cf. RE 2. R., vol. 1 A/1 (1914), 676ff..

²⁵ PERCY ERNST SCHRAMM, Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des Karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit, vol. 1 (Berlin 1929); GEOFFREY BARRACLOUGH, Die mittelalterlichen Grundlagen des modernen Deutschland, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1947), tr. by Friedrich Baethgen (Weimar 1953), 55ff.. Also, the Anabaptists demanded the ‘restitutio’ of the Church by invoking the Acts of the Apostles 3,21; see ROBERT FRIEDMANN, article Restitution, The Mennonite Encyclopedia. A Comprehensive Reference Work on the Anabaptist-Mennonite Movement, ed. HAROLD S. BENDER and C. HENRY SMITH, vol. 4 (Scottsdale/Pa. 1959), 302 ff.; regarding the concept ἀποκατάστασις [restoration, reclamation, restitution, reinstatement], which the Vulgate renders, reproduces as ‘restitutio’, see ALBRECHT OEPKE, article ἀποκαθίστημι, ἀποκατάστασις, KITTEL vol. 1 (1966), 386ff.; against that / in contrast, chiliastic sectarianism of the 19th century uses the term ‘restorationism’ in the place of ‘restitutio’, cf. OED vol. 8, 552f., see entry Restoration, Restorationism, Restorationist.

²⁶ DU CANGE vol. 7 (1886), 154, see entry restaura, restauramentum, restaurare. The *restauratum* [restored (thing)] or *jusculum salubre et delicatum* [healthy and delicious (exquisite, superb, scrumptious) soup, broth, juice] was in the French of the 16th century to become / converted into *restaurant*, and in the 18th century this concept no longer characterised certain dishes, foods, but the place where they were offered. A certain Boulanger, who opened in 1765 in Paris the first modern restaurant, placed / put / posited over the (restaurant’s) door: *Venite ad me, qui stomacho laboratis, et ego restaurabo vos* [Come to me, (those of you) who labour, have difficulties from / have pains in the / your (suffer from) stomach (problems), and I shall restore you], LAROUSSE vol. 13 (1875), 1049, see entry Restaurant.

²⁷ CAROLUS CARAFA, Commentaria de Germania sacra restaurata (Köln 1639).

In regard to the course, evolution, career, track of the concept after 1815 it is important to hold onto / keep hold of / note that it, even in its first great political appearance, namely on the occasion of the *happy Restoration of his Majesty to his People and Kingdoms*²⁸, it had remained limited, restricted to the strictly dynastic aspect [[of the Stuarts]] and did not / was not in the least have to / allowed, obliged to suggest a revival, resurgence, reawakening of previous relations, conditions, circumstances, let alone, then, their world-theoretical justification or justification in terms of the history of ideas: from Charles II one expected in fact in general no less than the continuation of the politics of his father^{29 + i}. Just as important for the understanding of later development(s) appears to be, however, also the ascertainment that the concept of restoration even before its renewed use in the dynastic sense, had experienced an extension, expansion upon the return of the Bourbons, which after 1815 additionally enabled it to undertake new duties, functions, tasks (i.e. encompass meanings) beyond its dynastic meanings, significance. Already the French National Assembly had in the night(-time) session / sitting of 4th August 1789 decided to call Louis XVI *restaurateur de la liberté française* [restorer / restaurateur of French liberty]³⁰. And whilst / whereas still in 1779 in the »Encyclopédie« 'restauration / restoration' meant / signified the re-establishment, rebuilding, restoration, renewal, reinstatement of buildings and works of art as well as the return of the Stuarts³¹, in 1801 with reference to the same concept it is said: *son plus grand usage est au moral* [its greatest use/usage takes place / is in morality, ethics, morals], which again is explained, explicated in more / greater detail by *Restauration de l'Etat, des Belles-Lettres, de la Discipline, des Lois* [restoration of the state, of letters (literature), of discipline, of the law] etc.³².

The meeting / encounter of 'reaction' and 'restoration' after 1815 now presupposed both the hypostatisation of the former as well as the semasiological widening, extension, expansion of

²⁸ Journals of the House of Commons, 30. 5. 1660 cited in OED vol. 8, 552, see entry Restoration. The English Republic had already used / made use of the same word in the state seal / State Seal of 1651, cited in KARL GRIEWANK, *Der neuzeitliche Revolutionsbegriff. Entstehung und Entwicklung*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt 1973), 147. Still earlier there was talk in France of 'restauration' in the sense of the re-establishment, rebuilding, restoration, renewal, reinstatement or else recovery, recuperation, convalescence of the state, thus HEINRICH IV before / in the face (view) of the nobles in Rouen on 4. 11. 1596: *Mon désir me pulse à deux plus glorieux titres* (sic), *qui sont de m' appeller libérateur et restaurateur de cest Estat* [My desire propels, pushes me to two glorious titles (sic), which are to call me liberator and restorer / restaurateur of this state], *Recueil des lettres missives de Henri IV*, edition of M. Berger de Xivrey, vol. 4 (Paris 1848), 657.

²⁹ Cf. MAURICE ASHLEY, *England in the 17th Century*, 3rd ed. (London 1978), 129 ff..

³⁰ BUCHEZ/ROUX, *Histoire parlementaire* (see footnote 14), vol. 2 (1834), 242.

³¹ *Encyclopédie*, 3rd ed., vol. 28 (1779), 973, entry Restauration.

³² CATEL vol. 4 (1801), 94, see entry Restauration.

the latter. Yet / Nevertheless(,) the fact of this encounter, meeting could be interpreted very differently, i.e. one could grant, allow, concede to this or to that / to the former or to the latter the world-theoretical or historical primacy, if one did not want to equate both (of them). In order to be able to apprehend the concrete polemical-political meaning, sense of the (related) controversies (concerning this), we must first outline the broader intellectual / thought-related framework and indeed as regards the history of ideas, inside of which the hypostatisation of 'reaction' and the semasiological widening, extension, expansion of 'restoration' could take place / occur / happen.

2. The background pertaining to the history of ideas of the endeavours, efforts at restoration and of the accusation / reproach of reaction

The need for the semasiological widening, broadening, extension, expansion of the concept of restoration had to be strengthened, reinforced, consolidated to the extent that the [French] Revolution set its opponents before completed, accomplished, finished, executed facts / a fait accompli. The insight / knowledge was unavoidable that in view / the face of the accomplished or ongoing upheaval, radical change of social or else property, ownership relations, circumstances, conditions, there was much more to be restored than only overthrown dynasties. FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL, who already in 1805/06 had considerations, thoughts, reflections, deliberations about the possibility of a restoration, reinstatement, restitution, at least with regard to France, was / proved to be extremely sceptical – even in the case that *the current system would collapse (go to ruin / become ruined); everything good in this country has been (very much) eradicated, destroyed, wiped out, extirpated*³³. Despite that / Nevertheless, he hoped for a *higher, superior restoration (re-establishment, rebuilding) of order*³⁴, which, however, as he expounded, set forth, explained, stated, formulated more thoroughly (comprehensively) / in greater detail two decades later, should / ought (to) not be limited, restricted to *the restoration of the overthrown thrones, to the mere reinstatement / re-establishment of all the (displaced) dynasties (in exile)*, but should take in / capture / catch / include / encompass / apprehend the *basic / fundamental principles and casts of mind / mentalities / ways of thinking / attitudes / convictions / ethos / ethe*, i.e. the whole (of) / entire political and religious life; thinking about / contemplating the size,

³³ SCHLEGEL, Vorlesungen über Universalgeschichte (1805/06), SW vol. 14 (1960), 246.

³⁴ Ibid., 252.

greatness, bulk of the task, he raved, enthused, went into raptures, in the course of this, about the *scale, stages of the great restoration*³⁵. From the point of view of liberalⁱⁱ critics, the same matter was / facts (of the case) were summarized as follows in 1830, that extremist *political restorationists / restaurateurs* under ‘restoration’ wanted to understand not merely, simply *the reinstatement / re-establishment of a dethroned, deposed regent (sovereign, reigning monarch, ruler)*, as it, in fact, was / had been the case in (regard to) / (occurred) during the first use of the concept of restoration *with a political meaning*, but the return to the *old French monarchy with all its embellishments, trappings, facilities, arrangements, fittings, furnishings, appointments, in particular / especially with all the former, erstwhile privileges of the nobility (aristocracy)*³⁶.

The detachment of the concept of restoration from the dynastic aspect enabled / made possible the handling, treatment, processing, examination of / dealing with restoration, and indeed from all sides, as a (pan-European) matter of concern (regarding (the whole of) Europe (overall))³⁷, although the question, matter, issue of (concern of) dynastic restoration was not at all set / posited / put for / did not concern (apply to) the whole of Europe; because the concept of restoration had been widened, expanded, extended in terms of content, it could refer to a great, major geographical space, area.

³⁵ Ibid., Philosophie der Geschichte (1828), SW vol. 9 (1971), 409f. 420.

³⁶ BROCKHAUS 7th ed., vol. 9 (1830), 215. entry Restoration.

³⁷ The end/goal/purpose of the Congress of Vienna was *to restore again the destroyed, ruined European republic*, says GÖRRES, Deutschland und die Revolution (1819), Ges. Schr. vol. 13 (1929), 42. Also, according to MOSES HESS, Die heilige Geschichte der Menschheit (1837), Philos. u. sozialistische Schr. 1837–1850, ed. by Auguste Cornu and Wolfgang Mönke (Berlin 1961), 34,(;) with the Belle-Alliance began *not alone, only, solely in France . . . , but also in the rest of Europe*[[,]] *a so-called restoration*; cf. *restauration européenne* in ETIENNE CABET, Voyage en Icarie (Paris 1845), 450.

ALL ENDNOTES ARE BY KRAZY MAN, FOOTNOTES ARE BY P.K. UNLESS [!!!].

ⁱ The Greek translation, in contrast to P.K.'s German text, reads : "from Charles II, the continuation of his father's politics was not expected generally in any way", which at first glance makes more sense, though I can't be certain P.K.'s text has a typo or is not what P.K. meant, because history relates that Charles I was not in total opposition to Cromwell on everything.

ⁱⁱ When P.K. says "liberal" here in regard to the first half of the 19th century, he means real-deal liberal and not what came to mean GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-MASS-DEMOCRATIC (TOLERATING AND OR PROMOTING SELF-RACISM, SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING, SELF-GENOCIDE, CHILDLESS, STERILE, BARREN WOE-MEN, ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID RULE AND CONTROL (KONTROL), HOMOZ, LEZZOZ, TRANZ-FREAKS, PERVERTS, THE PROMISCUOUS, THE DEVIANT, DRUGS, PORN, OTHER WORSHIP, ZIO-KOST WORSHIP, FREUD, EINSTEIN AS "AUTHORITIES" !!! AND "POINTS OF REFERENCE" !!!, NARCISSISTIC INDIVIDUALISM, I AM WHAT I FEEL, I AM A ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID BRAIN-WASHED ZOMBEE-STOOGUE AND I LIKE IT ETC. ETC. ETC.)