Introduction

'Asymmetrical Counter-Concepts'
Chances and Challenges

Kirill Postoutenko

'Asymmetrical Counter-Concepts': Reinhart Koselleck's View

The notion of 'asymmetrical counter-concepts' (*asymmetrische Gegenbegriffe*, hereafter AC) is one of the finest inventions of Reinhart Koselleck's creative genius.[1] In a nutshell, it traces many important cases of social, political and cultural domination to the string of recurrent asymmetries between standard self-ascriptions and pejorative other-ascriptions: thus, ancient Greeks ('*Hellenes*') rhetorically asserted their sociocultural supremacy by summarily branding their diverse opponents as retarded speechless mutterers ('*Barbarians*'). Conceived on the crossroads of mainstream historical research and semiotic structuralism, the composite term offers an eminently attractive alternative to the one-sidedness of both approaches. Indeed, Koselleck's persistent focus on the 'written and spoken word' in his articulation of sociocultural disparities effectively kills two birds with one stone.[2] Whereas historians studying non-consensual differentiations between social, ethnic and linguistic groups are offered reliable indicators of the divisions' strength, cultural theorists addressing the same phenomena are relieved of the suffocating stringency of logically perfect but practically questionable binary oppositions.[3]

Koselleck's determination to include the article on AC in the Spanish translation of his *Futures Past* attests to his awareness of its actual and potential significance for wider scholarship.[4] In fact, the popularity of his model quickly transcended the boundaries of conceptual history,[5] becoming particularly noticeable in postcolonial studies,[6] global

Beyond 'Hellenes' and 'Barbarians'
Asymmetrical Concepts in European Discourse
Edited by Kirill Postoutenko
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/PostoutenkoBeyond

and comparative history[7] and anthropology,[8] but also being applied in literary and linguistic scholarship,[9] discourse analysis,[10] communication studies,[11] sociology,[12] political and legal history,[13] theology,[14] the history of music[15] and gender studies.[16] Despite this torrent of publications, systematic inquiries into the development and deployment of AC have not yet been undertaken. In an attempt to fill this gap – and departing from the conceptual pairs suggested by Koselleck ('Hellenes' vs 'Barbarians', 'Christians' vs 'Pagans', 'Super-Humans' vs 'Under-Humans') – this volume explores the use of these and other significant conceptual asymmetries ('civilization' vs 'barbarity', 'liberalism' vs 'servility', 'plebs' vs 'people', 'order' vs 'chaos', etc.) in the political, scientific and fictional discourse of European societies from Antiquity to our time.

Before embarking on a large-scale field study, though, it is worth checking the equipment at hand. Among the handful of scholars who chose to take a close and attentive look at AC, some took issue with Koselleck's cryptic and occasionally hurried style, stressing the fuzziness of his major terminological invention.[17] However, his argumentation has hardly ever been the object of thorough examination. The direct consequence of this uncritical approach has been the mechanical application of his brief theoretical sketch to all kinds of contexts. It seems like Koselleck's discovery deserves better. To give AC their due, it makes sense to assess their methodological foundations, performing a bit of fine-tuning whenever necessary, and then test some of Koselleck's original hypotheses on further historical evidence.

A possible starting point could be the somewhat enigmatic double qualification of the key term – (1) *asymmetrical* (2) *counter*-concepts. When two prepositive qualifiers are consecutively placed in the sentence and subordinated to the same noun, they could either have a single combined meaning within an idiomatic construction ('*brand-new* start') or limit one another's scope ('*white fireside* chair').[18] This leaves us with four possible options:

1. If *counter-concepts* is just another name for *asymmetrical concepts*, the only meaningful distinction would be between *asymmetrical counter-concepts* and *symmetrical non-counter-concepts*: whereas all unilaterally imposed other-references would go hand in hand with universally accepted self-references, all conceptual oppositions would be asymmetrical. In other words, *Hellenes* vs *Barbarians* would be as asymmetrical as *Germans* vs *non-Germans* or *Germans* vs *French* or any other pair of labels with somehow contrastive semantics.

2. However, if one interprets *counter-concepts* as a sub-category of *asymmetrical concepts*, then the number of logically permissible options rises to three – *symmetrical concepts* vs *asymmetrical counter-concepts* vs *asymmetrical non-counter concepts*. In this interpretation, some conceptual asymmetries would be bundled into stable pairs of counter-concepts and others would not, but non-asymmetrical concepts would not be able to form any kind of oppositions with each other. Specifically, *Heathens* could be an asymmetrical concept with or without *Christians*, but a dyad such as *Russians and Ukrainians* would not become a conceptual opposition no matter what.
3. Inversely, if *asymmetrical concepts* is a variant of *counter-concepts*, then the corresponding triad would include *asymmetrical counter-concepts*, *symmetrical counter-concepts* and *symmetrical non-counter-concepts*. This reading, too, would rule out the formation of conceptual asymmetries outside of verbal pairs with contrastive meanings, but it would allow the symmetrical coupling of words with opposed semantics. In practical terms, while *Christians* could form a pair of asymmetrical counter-concepts (with *Heathens*) or be a part of a symmetrical conceptual pair (with *Muslims*), the term *Heathens* by itself would never become an asymmetrical concept.
4. Last but not least, if *asymmetrical concepts* and *counter-concepts* are both equal to and fully independent from each other as categories, there are no less than four conceivable interrelations between them – *symmetrical counter-concepts* vs *symmetrical non-counter-concepts* vs *asymmetrical counter-concepts* vs *asymmetrical non-counter concepts*. According to this most liberal interpretation, *Under-Humans* would be an asymmetrical concept both coupled with *Humans* and on its own, and *Northerners* could equally have a fully developed meaning in opposition to *Southerners* or as a standalone term.

For the reader trying to evaluate the comparative likelihood of these interpretations, Koselleck's arresting narrative is of limited help: freely roaming between all four standpoints, he drops hints and suggests preferences but refuses to be pinned down on any of them. Given the complexity of the material and the woolliness of conceptual semantics in the case discussed, this reluctance is quite reasonable. Its downside, however, is the variance between the relatively stiff theoretical imperatives and the sundry empirical data enlisted to support them (see tables 0.1–0.3).

Table 0.1. Koselleck's general references to and specific examples of symmetry and asymmetry in conceptual pairs.

Koselleck's *general references* to *symmetry/asymmetry* within conceptual pairs		**Koselleck's *specific examples* of *symmetry/asymmetry* within conceptual pairs**		
symmetry *'symmetrisch' (symmetrical)*	asymmetry *'Asymmetrie' (asymmetry)*	symmetry *'Man'/'Frau' (man/woman)*	asymmetry *'Christen'/'Heiden' (Christians/Pagans)*	
1 (5.6%)	17 (94.4%)	19 (30.6%)	43 (69.4%)	Type
		31 (18.9%)	133 (81.1%)	token

Koselleck's terminological packaging of AC conveys the impression that *symmetrical* concepts barely exist, or, even if they do, hardly matter: only once, at the very end of his article, does he mention them, compared to the seventeen references to conceptual *asymmetries*. However, the nearly complete absence of symmetrical counter-concepts from Koselleck's theoretical framework is challenged by his own empirical data: among the sixty-two conceptual pairs discussed in his text, almost a third (19, or 30.6 per cent) – exemplify conceptual symmetry (for example, *man* vs *woman*; see also table 0.1). The fact that asymmetrical concepts discussed in the article are much more frequently repeated than their symmetrical counterparts – see the type–token ratio in table 0.1 – renders this discord between speculation and illustration less conspicuous. But the overall feeling is that the difference between conceptual opposition and conceptual asymmetry has been given short shrift. To be sure, Koselleck had every reason to focus on his finding at the expense of all adjacent notions: in a short article specifically devoted to introducing the novel theoretical concept, there is little room for discussing its counterpart. However, Koselleck's understandable reluctance to give AC a clear-cut definition from the start and to support it with the appropriate range of unambiguously interpretable examples comes at a cost. Indeed, attempts to define the notion, whose semantic core remains rather opaque, keep driving abstract assumptions and first-hand observations further apart, with the resulting void being filled with sweeping shortcuts and problematic generalizations.

Indeed, the unsettled relation between asymmetry and contrast in AC surfaces again in the search for the appropriate generic reference to AC as a set. To illustrate the kaleidoscopic flickering of references to AC in Koselleck's texts, a list of such mentions within a single paragraph would suffice: ˊconceptual pairs . . . rigorous dualisms . . . contrary

groups . . . global dualisms . . . counter-concepts . . . in dual (*im Dual*) . . . antitheses . . . counter-concepts . . . negation . . . antithetically managed concepts . . . antithetic concepts'.[19] However, as tables 0.2 and 0.3 purport to show, this apparent chaos is not without its order.

Whereas the equation *asymmetrical concepts = counter-concepts* is never explicitly asserted (or rejected), it is tacitly upheld in Koselleck's choice of terminology: throughout the article, he unmistakably favours *binary* references to asymmetrical concepts (such as 'dualisms'), which constitute 70 per cent of all mentions, compared to 18.5 per cent for *singular* terms ('generic name') and 11.5 per cent for *multiple* terms ('the row of negations'). As seen previously, Koselleck's own examples paint a much more varied picture than his terms: among the AC actually cited in the article, just over half (54.2 per cent) are pairs (*Hellenes/Barbarians*), whereas almost a third (30 per cent) are standalone terms (*Barbarians*) and the rest (15.8 per cent) are triads (*Christians/Hellenes/Barbarians*). And, as with the data presented in table 0.1, the disparity between theory and data is concealed by the over-exposure of favourable empirical material: whereas the examples of conceptual pairs are repeated over and over, amounting to 61.0 per cent of all illustrations, single and ternary terms are quoted more sparingly (31.1 per cent and 7.9 per cent of the total respectively).

Still, the most glaring contrast between descriptive vocabulary and supporting data is evident in the specific relations within the conceptual pairs constituting AC (table 0.3). Again, abstaining from any overt categorizations, Koselleck nevertheless makes his classificatory preferences plain by readily addressing AC as 'negations', 'antitheses' and similar

Table 0.2. Koselleck's general references to and specific examples of the grouping of asymmetrical counter-concepts (AC).

Koselleck's *general references* to the grouping of AC			
single *'Sammelname' (generic name)*	dual *'Dualismen' (dualisms)*	multiple/unspecified *'Negationsreihen' (rows of negations)*	
74 (18.5%)	278 (70%)	47 (11.5%)	
Koselleck's *specific examples* of the grouping of AC			
single *'Hellenen' (Helenes)*	dual *'Hellenen/Barbaren' (Helenes/Barbarians)*	multiple *'Hellenen/Barbaren/Sklaven' (Hellenes/Barbarians/Slaves)*	
32 (30%)	58 (54.2%)	17 (15.8%)	type
68 (31.1%)	133 (61.0%)	17 (7.9%)	token

Table 0.3. Koselleck's general references to and specific examples of relations within the conceptual pairs of AC.

Koselleck's *general references* to relations within conceptual pairs of AC				
open set *'Sprachfigur'* *(figure of speech)*	pair *'Wortpaar'* *(verbal pair)*	opposition A vs B *'Gegensatz'* *(antagonism)*	opposition A vs non-A *'konträr'* *(contrary)*	
18 (6.6%)	74 (27.0%)	90 (32.8%)	92 (33.6%)	
Koselleck's *specific examples* of relations within conceptual pairs of AC				
open set *'Hellenen-Barbaren'* *(Hellenes-Barbarians)*	pair *'Freund-Feind'* *(friend-foe)*	opposition A vs B *'Ihnen-Außen'* *(inside-outside)*	opposition A vs non-A *'Mensch-Unmensch'* *(human-unhuman)*	
36 (62.1%)	5 (8.6%)	10 (17.2%)	7 (12.1%)	type
98 (73.7%)	8 (6.0%)	17 (12.8%)	10 (7.5%)	token

'contrary' verbal oppositions of the kind *A* vs *non-A*. At any rate, this and other allusions to logically perfect privative oppositions are the most common kind of references to AC in the article, making up more than a third (33.6 per cent) of the total. The less stringent but almost as popular way of mentioning AC in the text is the equipollent binary *A* vs *B* ('contradistinction', 'antagonism', etc.), which amounts for 32.8 per cent of the whole. This category is closely trailed by a loosely defined coupling of individual terms ('verbal pair'), constituting 27 per cent of all references to AC. The last, and decidedly less common, designation is an open set consisting of the unspecified number of elements with uncertain relations ('categories', 'figure of speech', etc.), which account for just 6.6 per cent of all references to AC. The summary impression conveyed by these statistics is that AC are nearly always verbal pairs held together by binding semantic or even logical ties.

This neat picture gets shattered as soon as we glance at Koselleck's examples, which suggest the exact opposite order of preference within AC. Indeed, the bulk of illustrations of his theses involve open sets of terms that, in a linguistic sense, owe little to each other and can be extended or reduced at will, as in the case of *Hellenes/Barbarians/?*. Such pairs (or, rather, groups) constitute 62.1 per cent of all AC discussed as type in the article and 73.7 per cent as token, although the latter figure is partly the result of the use of just a handful of pairs as ubiquitous poster examples. The cumulative frequency of the other AC with closer ties and stricter internal rules hovers around a third of all examples – 37.9 per cent

Table 0.4. Koselleck's specific examples of preferred modes of reference, parts of speech and modalities in AC.

Koselleck's *specific examples* of preferred modes of reference in AC		**Koselleck's *specific examples* of preferred parts of speech in AC**		**Koselleck's *specific examples* of preferred modalities of AC**		
identity tags *'Barbaren' (barbarians)*	all other modes of reference *'Barbarei' (barbarity)*	nouns *'Barbar' (barbarian)*	all other parts of speech *'barbarisch' (barbaric)*	negative *'Heiden' (pagans)*	positive *'Über-menschen' (supermen)*	
81 (75.7%)	26 (24.3%)	88 (82.2%)	19 (17.8%)	88 (82.2%)	19 (17.8%)	type
181 (83.0%)	37 (17.0%)	196 (89.9%)	22 (11.1%)	176 (80.7%)	42 (19.3%)	Token

as type and 26.3 per cent as token; the immaculate privative oppositions such as *humans*/*under-humans*, prioritized by Koselleck in theory, make up just 12.1 per cent as type and 7.5 per cent as token respectively. The historian's intuitive identification of ostensible codependency within AC with the minimal pairs in logic (*A* vs ¬ *A*) and grammar (*'Human'–'Unhuman'*) thus fails to be corroborated even by his own data.

Besides those basic considerations concerning the form and substance of AC, confirmed (or, in many cases, challenged) by examples, Koselleck grounds his argument on some unspoken assumptions (deducible from his choices of empirical data) and also proposes a couple of basic theoretical suggestions without attempting to prove them empirically. The first concerns the referential, grammatical and model properties of AC: the overwhelming majority of corresponding examples provided by Koselleck are identity tags (*pagans* rather than *paganism*), nouns (*Barbarians* rather than *barbaric*) and pejorative terms ('*Under-*' rather than '*Super-*' – '*Humans*'; see table 0.4.). The second has to do with the roots of AC in the surrounding social reality: whereas Koselleck sees the genesis of AC in pre-existing 'conflicts',[20] the affinity between conceptual asymmetry and deictic unilaterality, particularly noticeable in identifications (*us* vs *them*) and spatial delimitations (*inside* vs *outside*), is supposed to shed the light on the communicative functioning of conceptual asymmetries.[21]

To sum up, Koselleck's views of AC could be presented as a list of theses, supplemented by empirical conjectures (listed in square brackets):

1. Asymmetrical concepts are rooted in human conflicts and related to deictic distinctions.

2. Asymmetrical concepts are *[predominantly]/almost exclusively* conceptual pairs.
3. Asymmetrical concepts are *typically/[sometimes]* privative oppositions.
4. [Asymmetrical concepts are usually identity tags].
5. [Asymmetrical concepts are normally nouns].
6. [Asymmetrical concepts most commonly have pejorative meanings].

The fact that Koselleck did not try to streamline or finalize this rather disjointed and sketchy picture attests to his modesty, open-mindedness, respect for facts and trust in future generations of scholars. Hence, it would be natural to check these hypotheses one by one against the available theoretical knowledge and textual evidence, relying on both the chapters collected in this volume and external materials. Among other things, this composite summary would help the reader to view this book in the context of what has – or has not – been done so far in the studies of asymmetrical counter-concepts in European discourse.

'Asymmetrical Counter-Concepts': Violent Origins or Deictic Features?

Koselleck's anchoring of conceptual asymmetries in the human propensity for squabbling has many antecedents, sources, motivations and parallels. He himself acknowledged his debt to Carl Schmitt's fundamental dichotomy *friend* vs *enemy* and most of the scholars revisiting his legacy have followed his lead.[22] However, the tradition of associating semantic oppositions with violent conflicts has a much longer history and a wider context: having begun at least with Heraclitus (who considered strife – πόλεμος – the ultimate source of difference between things),[23] it was logically refined by Baruch Spinoza (who saw the destructive potential of different things as the proof of their contrariety)[24] and later flourished in transcendental idealism, modern anthropology and postmodernist philosophy.[25]

Whatever the historical merits of this approach, its explanatory power remains, by and large, on the metaphorical and metonymical level:[26] in this sense, Schmitt's contradistinction is more an example of AC than a tool for their investigation.[27] It is hard to deny that military conflicts such as the Persian Wars in the fifth century BC or the world wars served as potent catalysts for the development and spread of AC.[28] However, this mere fact does not say much about the functioning of conceptual

asymmetries in communication and social life in general. In my opinion, the second, fully original parallel drawn by Koselleck between AC and the deictic terms '*us*' and '*them*', '*inside*' and '*outside*', is much more fruitful in both a theoretical and historical sense. Indeed, both oppositions are not only closely interconnected but also share their essential properties with conceptual asymmetries without losing their referential exceptionality. It is this special kind of semantics and pragmatics that the tangled meanings of AC are arguably modelled upon.

The difference between the intimately familiar, physically close, interconnected and orderly '*self*' (or '*us*') and the alien, irrelevant, distant, disparate and dishevelled '*other*' (or '*them*') derives from the way most human and other systems operate. Indeed, one of the major functions of an open system is the production of order, or, in other words, the retention of distinct identity in a potentially hostile environment:[29] the activities encompassed by this description range from the seemingly primitive (keeping warm in the cold) to the exceedingly complex (staying sane in a lunatic asylum).[30] Under such circumstances, it is only natural that the Self – or whatever the centre of such a unity could be called – defines and (re)produces its ostensible goodness, intactness and territorial integrity on its own terms, branding as the inferior and potentially harmful Other everything that does not match its auto-description. One typical example of this asymmetrical binary logic is the immune system, whose major reason for demonizing and keeping out pathogens is their perceived strangeness.[31] Another is the workings of a secret society defending itself from potential intruders before actually meeting them.[32] Both in living beings and social organisms, preservation of the reflexively construed order and protection of the space enabling its safety go hand in hand: while the tightly knit, eminently valuable, meaningful, central '*inside*' is reserved for '*us*', what is left for '*them*' is the porous, peripheral, senseless and dangerous '*outside*'.[33]

To be sure, neither the personal pronoun '*us*' nor the adverb '*inside*' (which, depending on the context, can also be an adjective, a preposition or a noun) are as inextricably tied to their utterers as the immune system to its body. In reality, all deictic terms are constructed by means of a commonly recognized digital code (a verbal language) and their meanings routinely alternate thanks to the interactional equilibration: every socially competent adult knows that his/her '*I*' has the same signified as the '*you*' of his/her conversation partner, and vice versa.[34] Nevertheless, the rotation of deictic meanings is subject to restrictions imposed by the limited expressive powers of language: neither subjective certainty ('*I believe that x*') nor physical sensation ('*I feel y*') could be translated into (*'*You believe that x*' or *'*You feel y*') without substantial semantic losses.[35] Most likely,

it is this genuine inexpressibility of some fundamental states and beliefs in symbolic terms that breeds the associations between incontestable personal self-reference ('*us*'), its exclusive monitored location ('*inside*'), epistemic predominance ('*true*') and deontic pre-eminence ('*right*').[36] Jean-Jacques Rousseau was arguably one of the first thinkers to derive civil society – the well-scrubbed version of the good old-fashioned *bellum omnium contra omnes* – from the ruthless use of this linguistic, spatial and cognitive symmetry: for him, grabbing a piece of land and telling gullible bystanders '*This is mine!*' ('*Ceci est à moi*') is all it takes to become its sole legal proprietor.[37] The modern version of this grabbing is the information asymmetry strategically deployed in sales, politics and other public and private settings: the meaning of the last word in the sentence '*Our country is doing well*' may have very different meanings for the politicians imposing their judgement on potential electorates and their audiences, who are unable to access, interpret or effectively challenge the sensitive security data.[38]

Even a brief look at AC would allow one to detect the same interweaving of self–other distinctions that was registered above in deictic terms and other reflexive elements of natural and social systems. Similar to the differences between **system* and **environment*, '*us*' and '*them*', '*inside*' and '*outside*', oppositions such as '*Hellenes*' vs '*Barbarians*' appear to amalgamate and blur systemic, territorial and communicative contradistinctions, continually rotating the hidden and the explicit facets of their meanings without losing their overall semantic multidimensionality. To begin with, the identification of the system in question with '*here*' – the unilaterally defined domain of systemic identity encircling its symbolic and functional centre – pushed Barbarians into '*there*' – the unspecified, possibly disjoint and partially hypothetical periphery, which, under some circumstances, could begin as close as at the city limits of Athens.[39] Furthermore, the non-belonging of Barbarians to the 'territory of self' stripped them of any positive value, justifying, in Plato's words (readily quoted by Schmitt), the wars of annihilation against them.[40] In a similar vein, the systemic self-ascription of justice, order and other less specific pre-eminence made Barbarians the bearers of lawlessness and chaos: if we are to believe Plutarch, the Greek king Pyrrhus could not believe his eyes when he saw the Roman – 'Barbarian' – army encamping with perfect discipline (τάξις).[41] Last but not least, the extension of the 'first-person authority' (see endnote 36) resulted in the Hellenic monopolization of communicative ability: accordingly, Barbarians in Aristophane's comedies were twittering like birds and the verb immediately derived from their designation – βαρβαρίζειν – onomatopoetically referred to the substandard use of the default idiom – the (Greek) language.[42]

How do the authors of this volume interpret the blurred traits of AC, their social roots and their communicative origins? While Paul Paradies and Heli Rantala explicitly admit the need to clarify the meaning of conceptual asymmetry, other authors support and further develop Koselleck's genealogical observations, refining and illustrating his distinctions. The catalytic influence of the Spanish Revolution of 1854 upon the development and dissemination of the conceptual opposition 'people' vs 'plebs' highlights the role of political upheaval in the formation of AC (Pablo Sánchez León). The territorial imperative reveals its strength in the Neo-Hellenic demands of relocating the tyrannical Ottoman 'barbarians' to Africa (Alexandra Sfoini). At the same time, following Koselleck's apt distinction between 'non-Christians' and 'not-yet-Christians', many chapters feature *time* – as opposed to *space* – as an equally potent differentiator between '*us*' and '*them*'.[43] Thus, the alleged 'barbarity' of both Algerian natives (Nere Basabe and María Luisa Sánchez-Mejía) and Spanish *serviles* (Luis Fernández Torres) stems from their belonging to earlier stages of human civilization than their self-appointed critics (respectively French colonizers and Spanish *liberales*). To be sure, the tendency to incorporate sociopolitical distinctions initially projected outwards is not necessarily limited to modern societies:[44] Thucydides equated the otherness of Barbarians with their backwardness.[45] Nevertheless, notwithstanding the Nazi obsession with freeing their invented '*Lebensraum*' from '*Under-Humans*',[46] the unilateral spatial delimitation as the basic feature of AC may be less powerful in modern societies than it was in Antiquity.

In contrast to territoriality, the somewhat more abstract opposition between the self-assumed order and the other-ascribed chaos remains a staple of AC. As in the times of Plutarch and Pyrrhus, the contradistinction takes different shapes, giving rise to familiar images once in a while. Whereas Carl Linnaeus distinguishes the strict adherence of eighteenth-century Europeans to the rule of law from the reliance on opinion, caprice and customs typical of their scattered counterparts (Monica Libell), Polish socialists of the early twentieth century decried the 'anarchy' bred by their unspecified 'capitalist' adversaries (Wiktor Marzec).

Expectedly, the unilaterally proclaimed communicative incompetence of adversaries retains its principal role in the formation of their 'disorderly' image. While the inability to master Latin summarily singled out non-Europeans as beings of questionable humanness (Monica Libell), the overwhelming majority of Finns were, until the early nineteenth century, treated as speechless outsiders in their own land, because all administrative and scholarly activity in Finland was conducted in Swedish (Heli Rantala). The most peculiar example of this kind – the privative opposition '*euskaldun*' vs '*erdaldun*' – bore a close superficial resemblance

to its antique prototype '*Hellenes*' vs '*Barbarians*': whereas the first term referred to the Self as the speakers of Basque, the Other was *en masse* defined as a foreign language-speaking crowd (Iñaki Iriarte López). However, the linguistic heterogeneity of the Basque territories made the consistent application of the asymmetry impossible and the synecdoche '*Basque language ~ Basque people*' has largely remained the stuff of nationalist utopias.

'Asymmetrical Counter-Concepts': Privative Oppositions Arranged into Conceptual Pairs?

The Other devoid of space, reason and linguistic abilities looks like a perfect negative of the Self, with the most significant features of the original appearing dim and murky. This mirroring lends some credibility to Koselleck's description of AC as privative oppositions *A* vs *non-A*, even if their contrary semantics has not really been proven by his own material (see above). Both linguistic theory and historical semantics offer some cautious support for this claim. The negative affixation, in practice, may harden from grammatically implied contradictoriness ('*A isn't B*') to semantic contrariety ('*A is not-B*'): *unhuman* does not just mean something different from *human* (as the prefix *un-* may suggest), but rather refers to a phenomenon that is vastly inferior and even potentially harmful to the latter.[47] This could be even more true for certain prefixes with a heightened propensity for contrariety (such as *anti-*), which could then serve as anchors for familiar bundles of similarly construed privative oppositions based on negative affixation: thus, in the fifth-century *Apocalypse of St. Andrews*, Antichrist is presented as a man of lawlessness (ἀνομία) and disorder (ἀπολεία).[48] To be sure, none of Koselleck's examples of AC, except for '*Inhumans*' (*Unmensch*) vs '*Humans*' (*Mensch*), are based on negative affixation, but the strict coordination between morphological and lexical semantics in human language is optional at best and there is some evidence, or at least an opinion, that privative oppositions are the main means of making sense in human language at all levels, from phonology (*nasal [ã]* vs *non-nasal [a]* in French '*sans*' vs '*sa*') and graphemics ('*son*'/'*sun*') to semantics ('*life*'/'*death*').[49] So if *life* vs *death* can be regarded as a privative semantic opposition, could the same be true, say, of '*Christians*' vs '*Pagans*' or at least '*Inhumans*' vs '*Humans*'?

The simplest answer to this question would probably sound like this: yes, AC may get bundled into privative oppositions from time to time, but that bundling would not say much about their semantics, let

alone provide an explanation of their asymmetry. In their own ways, both the verbal pairs with negative affixation ('*kind*' vs '*unkind*') and the common antonyms ('*good*' vs '*bad*') offer good complementary analogies to AC.

In the first case, there is a clear asymmetry between the 'positive' concept ('*kind*') and its unspecific negation ('*unkind*'), which could neither be easily reversed nor constructed the other way around. Indeed, unlike in classical logic or mathematics, where double negation is synonymous with affirmation ($A \equiv \sim(\sim A)$), in natural language there is only a vague affinity between the mildly positive '*not unkind*' and the unquestionably positive '*kind*'.[50] Besides, the inverse distribution of negative affixation is fairly uncommon: whereas the addition of the negative prefix '*un-*' to positive adjectives recalls a smoothly working assembly line ('*happy*' → '*unhappy*', '*kind*' → '*unkind*', '*wise*' → '*unwise*', '*clean*' → '*unclean*', etc.), the negation of pejorative concepts in the same way is noticeably less common ('*sad*' → *~~*unsad~~*, '*cruel*' → *~~*uncruel~~*, '*foolish*' → *~~*unfoolish~~*, '*dirty*' → *~~*undirty~~*, etc.).[51] All this appears to make perfect sense for AC, whose core semantics, according to Koselleck, is largely built around opposing the presence of certain positive – and positively stated – features (lawfulness, morality, biological fitness, religious correctness, linguistic ability) in the Self to their absence in the Other. The semantic asymmetry resulting from the semantic under-specification of the negative term also seems to obtain in AC: the meanings of the notions '*Barbarians*', '*Pagans*' and '*Inhumans*' are generally confined to the lack of the aforementioned positive features of their reflexively construed counterparts, as manifested in the popular proverb *'whoever is not Hellene is Barbarian*'.[52] To my knowledge, the opposite statement – **whoever is not Barbarian is Hellene* – is nowhere to be found, despite the fact that attempts at a balanced interpretation of both opposites persisted from early Antiquity to late medieval scholasticism.[53] In this interpretation, AC are contradictory privative oppositions consisting of definite self-ascriptions of truth and rightness and the vague other-ascriptions of their absence.

In the second case, AC are not fastened to each other by means of negative prefixes but rather jumbled together according to 'the rule of minimal contrast':[54] because of the human propensity for the bipolar mapping of the world, the most common associations for '*good*', '*boy*' and '*life*' for an average language user would be '*bad*', '*girl*' and '*death*'.[55] Admittedly, such oppositions offer greater equality to their counterparts than the pairs created by negative affixation and also reveal greater divergence, as well as the more rigorous semantic structure close to logical contrariety. In what may sound like a paradox, '*good*' and '*bad*' are generally perceived as being further apart from each other than '*good*' and '*not good*'. At the same

time, they generate less uncertainty in-between: the single distinctive feature (which could equally be called '*goodness*' or '*badness*') apparently exhausts the semantic difference between the two poles, without the dark intermediate space produced by a fuzzy negative semantics (as in the previous example).[56] In this reading, AC are contrary equipollent oppositions dividing the semantic realm into two complementary parts with *tertium non datur*: Herodotus' neat fantasy about the inversion of Hellenic gender roles among Barbarians sharpens the distinction between the two poles of the AC, but also relativizes their inequality by tying it to the symmetrical binary '*men*' vs '*women*'.[57]

Taken together, these reconstructions of semantic interrelations within AC seem to favour Koselleck's theory over his examples (Table 0.3.): conceptual asymmetries look like tightly knit minimal pairs, evenly split between contrary and contradictory privative oppositions, with less rigorous contradistinctions somewhat less frequent and individual unbounded terms nearly extinct. This interpretation, however, hinges on the presumption that the grip of Koselleck's 'semantic oppositional structures' over AC is at least as firm as the rule of minimal contrast in language, which the scholar himself calls into question at least once and which also happens to be quite a stretch for a number of linguistic and historical reasons.[58] The treatment of polar opposites as inseparable pairs has been popular in speculative scholarship since time immemorial: provocatively introduced by Heraclitus ('good and evil are one'), it has deeply impacted Aquinian theology and Hegelian dialectics, culminating in Ludwig Wittgenstein's insistence on mutual determination of positive and negative utterances.[59] But in actual verbal communication, the power of minimal contrasts is not as strong as it seems. Suffice to say that positive terms, which appear in spoken and written language far more often than their negative correlates, are also often unmarked: '*tall*' in '*How tall is John now?*' is meant to be a generic reference to John's height rather than the opposite of '*short*'.[60] Notwithstanding this fact, there is nothing in the words '*Hellenes*' and '*Barbarians*' themselves that suggests that they are a minimal pair, or a pair at all: from the linguistic point of view, both terms are free-floating signifiers of some vague identities whose coupling is a matter of chance. Put differently, language as a sign system gives us little reason why '*Barbarians*' should be opposed to, or even appear alongside, '*Hellenes*'.

These theoretical considerations are largely confirmed by the figures provided in tables 0.5. and 0.6. Koselleck presents AC '*Hellenes*' and '*Barbarians*' as a binary opposition par excellence: in his article, both terms appear in the same passage in 59.2 per cent of all cases and nearly three-quarters (71.1 per cent) of those joint appearances are contrasts. The

Table 0.5. Bundling of AC in Koselleck's article and the collected works of Plato, Friedrich Nietzsche and Lothrop Stoddard.

Single (X) *'Barbarians'/'barbarity'*	**Single (Y)** *'Hellenes'*	**Bundled (X+Y)** *'Hellenes and/or Barbarians'*	
22 (28.9%)	9 (11.9%)	45 (59.2%)	Koselleck
40 (16.5%)	143 (58.8%)	60 (24.7%)	Plato
Single (A) *'Under-Humans' ['Inhumans']*	**Single (B)** *'Super-Humans'*	**Single (C)** *'Humans' / 'Humanity'*	
3 (2%)	7 (4.7%)	113 (75.3%)	Koselleck
45 (0.4%)	183 (1.8%)	10,069 (97.5%)	Nietzsche
32 (12.3%)	4 (1.6%)	217 (84.1%)	Stoddard

Bundled (A+B) *'Under-Humans' ['Inhumans'] + 'Super-Humans'*	**Bundled (A+C)** *'Under-Humans' ['Inhumans'] + 'Humans'*	**Bundled (B+C)** *'Super-Humans' + 'Humans'*	**Bundled (A+B+C)** *'Under-Humans' ['Inhumans'] + 'Humans' + 'Super-Humans'*	
10 (6.7%)	5 (3.3%)	8 (5.3%)	4 (2.7%)	Koselleck
4 (0.04%)	0 (0%)	27 (2.6%)	1 (0.01%)	Nietzsche
0 (0%)	4 (1.6%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	Stoddard

Table 0.6. Differentiation and non-differentiation between AC in Koselleck's article and the collected works of Plato.

Differentiation *'. . . contradistinction between Hellenes and barbarians . . .'*	**Non-differentiation** *'. . . the whole world of Hellenes and Barbarians . . .'*	
32 (71.1%)	13 (28.9%)	Koselleck
33 (55.0%)	27 (45.0%)	Plato

negative term bears the brunt of conceptual asymmetry – '*Barbarians*' – in Koselleck's text far more often than its opposite. This, however, is not corroborated by the data extracted from Plato's dialogues: in full accordance with the linguistic information provided above, Plato most commonly employs the positive term '*Hellenes*' as a standalone notion unrelated to any opposite (58.8 per cent of all appearances). Whenever the words '*Hellenes*' and '*Barbarians*' do appear together in his oeuvre, they do form

a contradistinction in most cases (55 per cent), but the percentage of the conjunctive constructions '*Hellenes*' and '*Barbarians*' comes a close second (45 per cent).

The limited potential of the 'semantic oppositional structures' is even more apparent in the triad '*Under-Humans*' ['*Inhumans*'] – '*Humans*' – '*Super-Humans*' (which could also be regarded as a combination of the privative (['*Inhumans*'] vs '*Humans*') and the equipollent ('*Under-Humans*' vs '*Super-Humans*') oppositions. Koselleck himself employs the word '*Humans*' – mostly as a positive unmarked term – far more often than its three derivatives combined (75.3 per cent of all cases). The relative frequency of this lexeme is even higher in the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche and Lothrop Stoddard, where it almost becomes a linear function of the overall textual volume. Remarkably, whereas the bundled AC from this set in Koselleck's text constitute almost a fifth (18 per cent) of their occurrences altogether, they are negligible in the works of the German radical philosopher Nietzsche and the American racist publicist Stoddard, each of whom are fixated on the respectively positive (Nietzsche) and negative (Stoddard) opposites to '*Humans*'.

All in all, the data presented calls into question the very word combination 'asymmetrical counter-concepts'. There is simply no evidence that the semantic asymmetries between self- and other-descriptions so vividly described and convincingly exemplified by Koselleck depend either on the pairing of concepts or on their specific opposition to each other in discourse. Simply speaking, the word '*Barbarian*', as well as its derivatives, can be an asymmetrical concept on its own, either in contraposition to or in conjunction with other somehow comparable terms. The respective examples furnished by conceptual history are Friedrich Engels's popular opposition of '*socialism*' and '*barbarity*', and Quintilian's sequence '*Barbarians, Romans, Greeks*'.[61] Under some circumstances, the concept in question may even cease being asymmetrical: the Roman poet Plautus had little trouble calling his own language 'barbarian'.[62] So, if conceptual asymmetry is not brought about by conceptual pairing or contrariety (and can even be lost at some cultural crossroads), where does it come from?

The answer could be obtained by juxtaposing three different AC that were deployed under very different circumstances and yet share some essential properties:

- the philosopher Edmund Burke rejoices 'this *happy* day' in a public speech on 3 November 1774 immediately following his election to the House of Commons;[63]

- the Count Pierre Bezukhov, one of the main protagonists of Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (1869), provokes a duel with his insulter, Fyodor Dolokhov, by calling the latter a 'scoundrel' (*negodi͡ai*);[64]
- Geert Wilders, the leader of the Dutch far-right Party for Freedom, calls Moroccan immigrants 'scum' (*uitschot*) during a walkabout in Spijkenisse, just south of Rotterdam, on 2 February 2017.[65]

In all the three cases, the speaker makes a biased reference to persons or events that are ratified by some (Burke's electors, Dolokhov's ill-wishers and Dutch xenophobes) and not by others (those who voted against Burke in Bristol, Dolokhov and his friends, Moroccan immigrants and Dutch liberals). While the verbal opposites of '*happy*', '*scoundrel*' and '*scum*' do not appear in the texts discussed, the interactional contrast between the users of the contestable term and their interlocutors withholding its ratification is apparent. This state of affairs dispels the illusion of some special semantic relations within AC, laying bare the communicative foundations of conceptual asymmetries. In other words, AC do not unite or disunite concepts, but, apparently, pit the sender of the message '*You are a Barbarian*' against some of its recipients who are unable to challenge this manifestly absurd and inconclusive deprivation of interactive identity. Far from being conceptual pairs observed from a single perspective, AC appear to be single utterances looked at from two different angles.[66] At one point, Koselleck seems to be moving in this direction, disputing the semantic relation between the terms 'Aryan' and 'non-Aryan' and declaring the meaning of the latter to be dependent on the 'power position' of its utterer.[67]

Acknowledging the need to clarify relations between conceptual asymmetry and conceptual contrariety (Heli Rantala, Ana Isabel González Manso), the contributors in the volume carefully pick apart the linguistic, discursive, sociocultural and communicative foundations of AC. Whereas the negative prefix '*anti-*' expectedly plays a significant role in the formation of *contrary* opposites to the Self, connoting aggression and danger ('*anti-popular*' vs '*popular*'), the marked reference to the extraterritorial unknown ('*zarubezhnyĭ*' – an adjective that literally means '*beyond the border*') provides a milder, *contradictory* frame for the contradistinction between the 'Soviet' Self and the 'bourgeois' Other (Kirill Kozlovski). In the latter case, the neutral modality of asymmetry leaves some room for ideological fine-tuning depending on the political climate in the Soviet Union.

Such under-specification of Otherness in AC seems to be pervasive, which highlights the value of contextual determination of the respective

meanings. Typically, linguistic and cultural factors join hands in reducing the unavoidable fuzziness of the negative terms. For instance, the meaning of the negative affixation in such references to the Ottoman 'barbarians' as '*infidel*' or '*impious*' is raised from harmless deontic inferiority to existential threat (Alexandra Sfoini) by both compulsive intra-linguistic intensification of prefixal negation (see above) and the monopolistic tendencies of monotheism.[68] The sociocultural production of AC out of random minimal pairs is even more apparent in the common racist instrumentalization of the visual difference between the presence and the absence of light.[69] Designating the skin of European people as 'white' and drawing upon the colour's associations with wisdom and purity, Carl Linnaeus contrasts this self-description to the image of Africans, whose apparent 'blackness' is automatically meant to signify foolishness and immorality (Monica Libell). Finally, the syntagmatic structures in discourse could amplify the asymmetries predetermined in the hypertext of the epoch. Although the cumulative conjunction '*and*' in the phrase '*formalism and realism, internationalism and cosmopolitism*' obscures contradistinctions between the first and the second terms in the respective pairs, the anaphoric amplification of the similarly built paired structures draws specific attention to the juxtapositions of the terms marked positively ('*realism*', '*internationalism*') and negatively ('*formalism*', '*cosmopolitism*') in the Soviet ideological discourse, turning adjacencies into contrasts (Kirill Kozlovski).

Some of the studies collected in the volume subscribe to Koselleck's idea of generative structures enabling the serial reproduction of AC (Wiktor Marzec; Nere Basabe and María Luisa Sánchez-Mejía). Such series do arise with some regularity when sociohistorical circumstances routinely reproduce analogous large-scale communicative asymmetries in related cultures: the label '*Barbarians*' is employed by ancient Greeks and Romans in a rather similar way, notwithstanding the complete reversal of the actors in question.[70] However, in many cases, the bonds keeping conceptual pairs together turn out to be loose, optional or arbitrary: outside of a specific sociocultural environment seen through the eyes of the privileged speaker – the '*Hellene*' of sorts – it is not easy to see why '*formalism*' is the opposite of '*realism*', or what '*infidel*' actually means. The relative insignificance of standard verbal semantics for the meanings of conceptual asymmetries becomes particularly noticeable in cases in which singular asymmetrical terms are employed by disjoint – if not incompatible – groups: although the major political actors in Holland after the Second World War held widely diverse political views, they readily, if tacitly, cooperated in stuffing the term '*communism*' with as many diabolic connotations as possible (Wim de Jong). By the same token,

Sabino Arana makes up for the weak national identity of his people by equating '*Basque*' with '*anti-Spanish*' (Iñaki Iriarte López). In both cases, the ordinary topology of AC – a homogeneous '*us*' pitted against a scattered '*them*' – is turned on its head, which does not seem too strange: '*Barbarians*', after all, were referred to as such by the future '*Hellenes*' before the latter came up with the common name for themselves.[71]

'Asymmetrical Counter-Concepts': Identity Tags – Nouns with Pejorative Meanings?

In addition to exposing the interactional background of conceptual asymmetries, the example from Edmund Burke's speech challenges a couple of implicit assumptions regarding their nature. Whereas the quotations in Koselleck's article overwhelmingly present AC as nouns that disparagingly identify the Other (see table 0.4), the word '*happy*' is an adjective that signifies not the alien negative identity but the speaker's own feelings. Of course, a single quotation has negligible representativeness, but the impression it conveys chimes with other examples and theoretical considerations (including those presented above). Thus, the shock experienced by Pyrrhus in front of the orderly Roman armies found its expression in the differentiation between the eminently present '*Barbarians*' and the conspicuous lack of '*barbarous*' behaviour in their highly disciplined actions (see above). Placed in the limelight by Michel de Montaigne (who was clearly impressed by Plutarch's account of the episode), the distinction has, in practice, always been strong enough to allow for the independent use of the respective behavioural and other references to all things barbarian expressed by nouns ('*Barbarei*'), verbs ('βαρβαρίζω') and adjectives ('*barbare*').[72] In all probability, Koselleck's restrictive application of the term 'asymmetrical concepts' to the nouns with the identity semantics was first and foremost motivated by his special interest in this specific variant and not the internal properties of AC.

The same could be said about the allegedly preferred modality of the AC. Koselleck's de facto insistence on their pejorative semantics stems, at least in part, from the other set of his self-imposed limitations discussed in the previous paragraph: if conceptual asymmetries were equated to the unratified identity ascriptions, then it would be quite likely that the bulk of such non-consensual summary identifications would fall into the outside realm populated by unknown, dangerous and hostile beings. However, the case of '*Super-Humans*' counters this assumption: not only is it an AC – and an identity tag at that – with a positive modality, but, in relation to its counter-pole '*Under-Humans*'/'*Inhumans*', it shows up

somewhat more often in Koselleck's texts and significantly more often in Nietzsche's texts (see table 0.4.). As has been mentioned before, the topical preferences of the narratives in which AC pop up are certainly capable of exercising an influence upon their dominant modality: unlike the paranoid conservative Stoddard, obsessed with the threat posed by the inferior race to the existing culture (placed squarely in the domain of his 'Self'), the hysterical revolutionary Nietzsche was pinning his faith to the arrival of superior human beings (with which, in turn, he was hoping to be associated). So there is also apparently a correlation between the modality of AC ('positive' vs 'negative') and the teleology of the narrative ('progress' vs 'downfall') in which they are embedded. Furthermore, the available statistical data on the political speeches of Joseph Stalin, Adolf Hitler and Franklin D. Roosevelt highlights the relative parity between the numbers of positive and negative AC, confirming the results of the most recent cross-linguistic investigation of modal bipolarity.[73] It also establishes correspondences between their modalities and the surrounding political systems: while the siege mentality of Nazism and Bolshevism favours the construction of composite external threats (such as '*international Jew*' or the '*capitalist surroundings*'), the reflexive messianism of the United States hinges on unratified messianic claims that are projected inwards ('*fine and successful future*').[74] All things considered, the interactional grounding of AC ensures their remarkable lexical and semantic openness, allowing for micro- and macro-contextual variations in their grammar, modality and referential modes.[75] In this sense, the nouns that disapprovingly refer to the imaginary group identities of the outsiders are no more than one particular variation of AC among many others.

Without doubt, AC as identity tags do feature prominently in this volume, although, in some cases, their identifying potential is rather underwhelming: the contradistinction between '*Christians*' and '*Heathens*' in the *The Song of Roland*, an eleventh-century French epic poem, does not play much of a role in distinguishing heroes from villains (Paul Paradies). However, the difference between identities (expressed by nouns) and properties (articulated by adjectives), stressed by Pyrrhus, draws attention to the flexible and productive variety of AC, which, so far, has not attracted much scholarly attention. Predictably, the shift from '*Barbarians*', '*infidels*', and '*enemies of the people*' to '*barbaric*', '*infidel*' and '*anti-popular*' undermines the clear-cut division between the omnipotent identifier and the passive identified: the traits associated with Other could pop up in the vicinity of Self, triggering, depending on the circumstances, repression or reflection (Kirill Kozlovski; Nere Basabe

and María Luisa Sánchez-Mejía). As for the reduction of AC to terms with pejorative semantics, some interesting evidence to the contrary is provided by the novel identity markers '*Euskaria*'/'*euscaros*', invented by Basque nationalists from scratch and generally unfamiliar not only to the Spanish Other (disputing the existence of such an identity in the first place) but also to the Basque Self (Iñaki Iriarte López). In this example of radical social constructionism, the basic communicative asymmetry between '*us*' producing AC and '*them*' forced to accept them was complicated by social stratification that relegated much of the Basque population to the state of silent otherness as far as their group identity was concerned.

Conclusion

In this Introduction, Reinhart's Koselleck's notion of 'asymmetrical counter-concepts' was subjected to some preliminary elucidation and scrutiny, aimed at making his theory fit for a large-scale application in the subsequent chapters. Some of his intuitions about AC – for example, their deictic roots – turned out to have even broader implications than the original theoretical blueprint suggested. Yet others – such as logical rigidity, grammatical regularity and obligatory coupling – appear upon close inspection to be unnecessarily restrictive. Overall, the communicative construction of interactional settings, real or imagined, was found to be of greater importance than the specific wording of AC or their coupling with semantic opposites. Perhaps most importantly, the influence of such factors as narrative frame or sociopolitical context has been tentatively established. It is up to the authors of this book to develop, qualify and dispute these ideas, weaving together the tangled web of asymmetrical counter-concepts in European discourse.

Kirill Postoutenko is Senior Researcher in the Special Research Area 1288 (Practices of Comparison) at Bielefeld University, Germany, and Adjunct Associate Professor (Docent) of Russian Literature and Culture at the University of Helsinki, Finland. He has held research and teaching appointments at the universities of Munich and Constance (Germany), Columbia University and the University of Southern California (United States), IEA and ENS/Rue d'Ulm (France), Queen Mary, University of London (United Kingdom), the University of the Basque Country (Spain), the University of Helsinki (Finland) and the Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies (Denmark). He is the author and editor of eight books and ninety articles devoted to the history of Russian poetry and

literary criticism, the history of media and communication in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, conceptual history and the social history of identity.

Notes

1. See Reinhart Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe' (1975), in Reinhart Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989), 211–59.
2. On 2 March 1993, the German Academy of Language and Poetry (Göttingen, Germany) invited Reinhart Koselleck to take part in its public meeting scheduled for 15 and 16 October of the same year and devoted to the 'images of enemy' (*Feindbilder*). While preparing for the meeting, Koselleck wrote on the margins of the invitation, 'Language', and then, on a separate piece of paper, 'What is the role of language? Not the language but the spoken word' (German Literary Archive (DLA), Marbach, Germany, Reinhart Koselleck Papers). The same progression from the abstract notion of language to its specific deployment in communication is manifest in Koselleck's work on the article based on his talk at the meeting: 'the concepts of enemy (*Feindbegriffe*) are contained in both – in language and in word, in the spoken and the written speech' (Reinhart Koselleck, 'Feindbegriffe' (1993), in Reinhart Koselleck, *Begriffsgeschichten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010), 276). The last seven words of the sentence (*in der gesprochenen und geschriebenen Rede*) were added to the typescript of the article just before it went into production (German Literary Archive (DLA), Marbach, Germany, Reinhart Koselleck Papers).
3. See the popular exposition of the latter view in Algirdas J. Greimas, *Sémantique structurale: recherche de méthode* (Paris: PUF, 1986), 262 and Claude Lévi-Strauss, 'The Structural Study of Myth', *The Journal of American Folklore* 68, no. 270 (1955), 443, and its thoughtful criticism in Claude Bremond, *Logique du récit* (Paris: Seuil, 1973), 92–93, and Frederic Jameson, *The Ideologies of Theory,* Vol. 2 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 22–23.
4. See Koselleck's letter to Helene Ritzerfeld from 6 April 1983 (German Literary Archive (DLA), Marbach, Germany, Reinhart Koselleck Papers).
5. Andreas Poltermann, *Darstellung und historische Reflexion* (Göttingen: Verein zur Förderung Gesellschaftstheoretischer Studien, 1985), 36, 47; Roberto Ventura, '"Unsere Vendée". Der Mythos von der Französischen Revolution und die Konstitution nationalkultureller Identität in Brasilien (1897–1902)', in Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Ursula Link-Heer (eds), *Epochenschwellen und Epochenstrukturen im Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachhistorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985), 454; Gesa Siebert-Ott, ‚Sprachliche Homogenität und kollektive Identität', in Frank Liedtke, Martin Wengeler and Karin Böke (eds), *Begriffe besetzen. Strategien des Sprachgebrauchs in der Politik* (Hamburg: Springer, 1991), 368; Klaus Lichtblau, *Das Zeitalter der Entzweiung: Studien zur politischen Ideengeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Philo, 1999), 51; Jussi A. Kurunmäki, *Representation, Nation and Time: The Political Rhetoric of the 1866 Parliamentary Reform in Sweden* (Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2000), 65–66; João Feres Jr, 'Contribuição a uma tipologia das formas de desrespeito: para além do modelo hegeliano-republicano', *Dados* 45, no. 4 (2002), 555–66; Hubert Treiber,

'Anmerkungen zu Alfred von Martins (1882–1979) typisierender Betrachtungsweise', *Saeculum* 57, no. 1 (2006), 150; Mikkel Thorup, *Fornuftens perversion: modoplysning og 200 ars krig mod fornuftens herredomme* (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsvorlag, 2008), 21–22; Marçal de Menezes Paredes, 'A Ibéria como mal-de-origem', *Revista de História das Ideias* 31 (2010), 338; Stephanie Seidl and Julia Zimmermann, 'Jenseits des Kategorischen. Konzeptionen des "Heidnischen" in volkssprachigen literarischen und chronikalischen Texten des 13. Jahrhunderts', in Michael Borgolte, Julia Dücker and Marcel Müllerburg (eds), *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 326–81; Kay Junge and Kirill Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011); David Armitage, 'What's the Big Idea? Intellectual History and the Longue Durée', *History of European Ideas* 38, no. 4 (2012), 506; Peter Strohschneider, 'Fremde in der Vormoderne. Über Negierbarkeitsverluste und Unbekanntheitsgewinne', in Anja Becker (ed.), *Alterität als Leitkonzept für historisches Interpretieren* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012), 387–416; Niklas Olsen, *History in the Plural. An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 189–90; Philipp Altmann, 'Studying Discourse Innovations: The Case of the Indigenous Movement in Ecuador', *Historical Social Research* 40, no. 3 (2015), 161–84; Elias José Palti, 'Temporalidade e refutabilidade dos conceitos políticos', *Revista da Faculdade de Direito da UFRGS, Porto Alegre* 35 (2016), 12; Ernst Müller and Falko Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2016), 316–18; Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi, 'Introduction', *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2017), 10; Étienne Balibar, *Passions du concept* (Paris: Découverte, 2020), 243–64; Rikke Alberg Peters, 'Kampen om sammenhængskraften – En analyse af begrebet sammenhængskraft i den offentlige debat fra 1994 til 2010', *Slagmark – Tidsskrift for idéhistorie* 70 (2018), 129–56; Pablo Sánchez León, *Popular Political Participation and the Democratic Imagination in Spain: From Crowd to People, 1766–1868* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020); Christof Dipper, 'Der Gelehrte als Schüler. Der Briefwechsel Reinhart Kosellecks mit Carl Schmitt', in Manfred Hettling and Wolfgang Schieder (eds), *Reinhart Koselleck als Historiker* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021), 87–111. Here, as in subsequent footnotes, I have only referred to examples of substantial engagement with AC and have also allowed myself to select only one text by each author.

6. Kjell Olsen, 'The Touristic Construction of the "Emblematic" Sámi', in Anna-Leena Siikala, Barbro Klein and Stein R. Mathisen (eds), *Creating Diversities Folklore, Religion and the Politics of Heritage* (Helsinki: SKS, 2005), 292–305; Bernhard Struck, 'Terra Incognita, European Civilisation and Colonised Land: Poland in Mid-eighteenth Century to Mid-nineteenth Century German Travel Accounts', in Hagen Schulz-Forberg (ed.), *Unravelling Civilisation: European Travel and Travel Writing* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 155–79; Christoph Marx, 'Gedenken, Geschichte und Versöhnung in Südafrika und Zimbabwe', *Africa Spectrum* 41, no. 2 (2006), 161; Leander Schneider, 'The Maasai's New Clothes: A Developmentalist Modernity and Its Exclusions', *Africa Today* 53, no. 1 (2006), 116.
7. Roberto dos Santos Bártholo, *Homo industrialis eine Untersuchung über die wirtschaftsethischen Grundlagen der industriellen Weltzivilisation* (Munich: Fink, 1982), 84; Michael Harbsmeier, 'Reisebeschreibungen als mentalitatsgeschichtliche Quellen: Überlegungen zu einer historisch-anthropologischen Untersuchung frühneuzeitlicher deutscher Reisebeschreibungen', in Hans Jürgen Teuteberg (ed.), *Reiseberichte als Quellen europäischer Kulturgeschichte* (Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1982), 3–4, 20; Peter J. Brenner, 'Interkulturelle Hermeneutik. Probleme einer Theorie kulturellen Fremdverstehens', in Peter Zimmermann (ed.), *Interkulturelle Germanistik. Dialog der Kulturen auf Deutsch?* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989),

39, 50; Arno Borst, *Barbaren, Ketzer und Artisten. Welten des Mittelalters* (Munich: Piper, 1990), 12; Thorsten Sadowsky, 'Reiseerfahrung und bürgerliche Mentalität: Das Bild vom josephinischen Wien in den Berichten deutscher Reisender in den Jahren 1780–1790', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 47/48 (1992), 229–62; Hubert Orlowski, 'Die Ideologie des West-Ost-Gefalles und das Fremdheitssyndrom', in Alois Wierlacher (ed.), *Kulturthema Fremdheit. Leitbegriffe und Problemfelder kulturwissenschaftlicher Fremdheitsforschung* (Munich: Iudicum, 1993), 463–70; Angela Enders, 'Stereotyp und Vorurteil. Das Türkenbild westeuropäischer Reisender des 16. Jahrhunderts', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Germanistenverbandes* 42, no. 1 (1995), 37–44; Michael Jeismann, *La patrie de l'ennemi. La notion d'ennemi national et la représentation de la nation en Allemagne et en France de 1792 à 1918* (Paris: CNRS, 1997); Herfried Münkler and Bernd Ladwig, 'Dimensionen der Fremdheit', in Herfried Münkler and Bernd Ladwig (eds), *Furcht und Faszination. Facetten der Fremdheit* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997), 101; Almut Höfert, 'The Order of Things and the Discourse of the Turkish Threat', in Almut Höfert and Armando Salvatore (eds), *Between Europe and Islam: Shaping Modernity in a Transcultural Space* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 39–70; Marina Münkler, *Erfahrung des Fremden. Die Beschreibung Ostasiens in den Augenzeugenberichten des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2000), 147–221; Shingo Shimada, 'Überlegungen zum Konzept "Asien"', in Sefik Alp Bahadir (ed.), *Kultur und Region im Zeichen der Globalisierung: wohin treiben die Regionalkulturen?* (Neustadt an der Aisch: Degener, 2000, 156–57; Volker Scior, *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lübeck* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002); Noyan Dinçkal, *Istanbul und das Wasser. Zur Geschichte der Wasserversorgung und Abwasserentsorgung von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1966* (Munich; R. Oldenbourg, 2004), 101; Gregor Schiemann, 'Natur – Kultur und ihr Anderes', in Friedrich Jaeger and Jürgen Straub (eds), *Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften* 2 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004), 60; David Fraesdorff, *Der barbarische Norden: Vorstellungen und Fremdheitskategorien bei Rimbert, Thietmar von Merseburg, Adam von Bremen und Helmold von Bosau* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005); Sarvepalli Gopal, *Living Together Separately: Cultural India in History and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 147; William O'Reilly, 'Das Bayernbild Irlands, 1798–1898', in Konrad Amann (ed.), *Bayern und Europa: Festschrift für Peter Claus Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 197; Jürgen Osterhammel, *Europe, the "West" and the Civilizing Mission* (London: German Historical Institute, 2006), 7; Arno Herzig, 'Das Bild vom Juden in der deutschen Historiographie und Staatstheorie von der Reformationszeit bis zum ausgehenden 19. Jarhundert', in Burghart Schmidt (ed.), *Menschenrechte und Menschenbilder von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Hamburg: DOBU 2006), 94–110; Tobias Jentsch, *Da/zwischen. Eine Typologie radikaler Fremdheit* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2006), 21; Arno Strohmeyer, 'Wahrnehmungen des Fremden', in Michael Rohrschneider and Arno Strohmeyer (eds), *Wahrnehmungen des Fremden Differenzerfahrungen von Diplomaten im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 10; Melanie Urban, *Kulturkontakt im Zeichen der Minne die Arabel Ulrichs von dem Türlin* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007), 24; Riccardo Pozzo and Marco Sgarbi, *Eine Typologie der Formen der Begriffsgeschichte* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2010), 104; Noé Cornago, *Plural Diplomacies: Normative Predicaments and Functional Imperatives* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2013); Emmanuel Jousse, 'Le socialisme sans frontière. Les internationalismes ouvriers de 1864 à 1914', in Éric Anceau, Raymond Boudon and Olivier Dard (eds), *Histoire des internationales* (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2017), 69–98; Markus Winkler, *Barbarian: Explorations of a Western Concept in Theory, Literature, and the Arts*, vol. I (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2018), 24–29.

8. John Borneman, 'American Anthropology as Foreign Policy', *American Anthropologist* 97, no. 4 (1995), 663–72; Regina Bendix and Herman Roodenburg, *Managing Ethnicity:*

Perspectives from Folklore Studies, History and Anthropology (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000), 162; Nilüfer Göle and Ludwig Ammann, *Islam in Public: Turkey, Iran and Europe* (Istanbul: Bilgi University Press, 2006), 55–59.

9. Wolfgang Bach, *Geschichte als politisches Argument* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1977), 81; Harald Weinrich, *Wege der Sprachkultur* (Munich: DVA, 1985), 202–3; Ernst-Richard Schwinge, *Goethe und die Poesie der Griechen* (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1986), 20; Stephan Maksymiuk, *The Court Magician in Medieval German Romance* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), 36; Robert S. Leventhal, 'The Critique of the Concept: Lessing, Herder, and the Semiology of Historical Semantics', in Wilfried Malsch, Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (eds), *Herder Yearbook/Herder Jahrbuch 1996* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1997), 93, 101; Christoph Sauer, *Der aufdringliche Text. Sprachpolitik und NS-Ideologie in der 'Deutschen Zeitung in den Niederlanden'* (Wiesbaden: DUV, 1998), 218; Ulfried Reichardt, *Alterität und Geschichte: Funktionen der Sklavereidarstellung im amerikanischen Roman* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2001), 39, 47, 60; Zoltán Kenyeres, 'Ästhetizismus und Ethizismus', in Maria Erb, Magdolna Orosz und László Tarnói (eds), *"Und Thut ein Gnügen Seinem Ambt": Festschrift für Karl Manherz zum 60. Geburtstag* (Budapest: ELTE germanistisches Institut, 2002), 315–22; Karin Liebhart, Elisabeth Menasse and Heinz Steinert, 'Fremdbilder – Feindbilder – Zerrbilder. Zur Wahrnehmung und diskursiven Konstruktion des Fremden', in Karin Liebhart, Elisabeth Menasse and Heinz Steinert (eds), *Fremdbilder – Feindbilder – Zerrbilder. Zur Wahrnehmung und diskursiven Konstruktion des Fremden* (Klagenfurt: Drava 2002), 10; Christina Parnell, 'Einleitung', in Christina Parnell (ed.), *Ich und der/die Andere in der russischen Literatur* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002), 20; Barbara Sabel, *Toleranzdenken in mittelhochdeutscher Literatur* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 2003); Stefan Höppner, *Zwischen Utopia und Neuer Welt. Die USA als Imaginationsraum in Arno Schmidts Erzählwerk* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2005), 57–58; Walter Schmitz and Michael Neumann, 'Schlesische Grenzkämpfe: Zur literarischen Semiotik eines geteilten Landes in den 1920er Jahren', in Walter Schmitz and Clemens Vollnhals (eds), *Völkische Bewegung – Konservative Revolution – Nationalsozialismus – Aspekte einer politisierten Kultur. Kultur und antidemokratische Politik in Deutschland* (Dresden: Thelem, 2005), 91–114; Marcel Sturm, *Goethes Weg nach Weimar. Zur Kontinuität und Diskontinuität des Sturm und Drang in den Jahren 1770–1790* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007), 25; Ruth Florack, *Bekannte Fremde: zu Herkunft und Funktion nationaler Stereotype in der Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 56; Izabela Surynt, '"Gottes Freunde", "Aller Welt Feinde" und Märtyrer der Nation. Zur Figur des Freikorpskämpfers bei Ernst von Salomon', in Hans Feger et al. (eds), *Terror und Erlösung. Robert Musil und der Gewaltdiskurs der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 172; Matheus Torreão Farias, 'O Jornalismo Mestiço de Gabriel García Márquez', *Estudios de Jornalismo* 4 (2015), 120.
10. Stephan Muschick, *Für Schweden in Europa. Die diskursive Konstruktion europäischer Gemeinschaft im "Zeitalter des Nationalismus" (1890–1918)* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2001), 76–77; Niels Åkerstrøm Andersen, *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2003), 48–58; Nathalie Karagiannis, *Avoiding Responsibility: The Politics and Discourse of European Development* (London: Pluto Press, 2004), 153, 160; Iwona Jakubowska-Branicka, 'Language as a Tool Creating and Dividing Communities. [The] Dangerous Use of Asymmetric Counterconcepts', *Psychology of Language and Communication* 18, no. 1 (2014), 22–40; Ina Shakhrai, 'The Legitimization of Authoritarian Rule through Constructed External Threats: Russian Propaganda during the Ukrainian Crisis', *East European Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (2015), 34–35.
11. Christina Lutter, *Politische Kommunikation an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1989), 72–73; Martin Forstner, 'Das Fremde als Problem

der intra- und interkulturellen Kommunikation im Zeitalter der Globalisierung – insbesondere der arabisch-islamischen Welt', in Peter Rusterholz and Rupert Moser (eds), *Wie verstehen wir Fremdes?* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 11–108.

12. Niklas Luhmann, *Soziologische Aufklärung* 4 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987), 20–21; Diana Wong, 'Fremdheitsfiguren im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs. Am Beispiel der Asylzuwanderung nach Deutschland', in Joachim Matthes (ed.), *Zwischen den Kulturen?: die Sozialwissenschaften vor dem Problem des Kulturvergleichs* (Göttingen: Schwartz, 1992), 405–19; Horst Walter Blanke, *Politische Herrschaft und soziale Ungleichheit im Spiegel des Anderen* (Kamen: Spenner Verlag, 1997), 34; Maurizio Ricciardi, *Ferdinand Tönnies, sociologo hobbesiano. Concetti politici e scienza sociale in Germania tra Otto e Novecento* (Bologna: Società editrice il Mulino, 1997), 56; Jurgen Rudolph, *Reconstructing Identities: A Social History of the Babas in Singapore* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998), 52–55; Marcel Linden, 'Heimatliebe, Patriotismus, Internationalismus', in Wilfried Belschner et al. (eds), *Wem gehört die Heimat?* (Hamburg: Springer, 1999), 201–7; Elena Esposito, *La memoria sociale. Mezzi per comunicare e modi di dimenticare* (Bari: Laterza, 2001), 53; Ulrich Beck, *Der kosmopolitische Blick, oder, Krieg ist Frieden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004), 83, 102; Michael Hinz, *Der Zivilisationsprozess: Mythos oder Realität?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 160–61; Peter von Moos, Öffentliches und Privates, Gemeinsames und Eigenes (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2005); Harald Müller, '"Specimen eruditionis". Zum Habitus der Renaissance-Humanisten und seiner sozialen Bedeutung', *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Gelehrten im späten Mittelalter* 73 (2010), 137; Nicolò Addario, 'Il conflitto, dalla lotta di classe ai nuovi movimenti: e poi?', *Riflessioni Sistemiche* 4 (2011), 8.
13. Ulrich K. Preuß, *Revolution, Fortschritt und Verfassung: Zu einem neuen Verfassungsverständnis* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994), 100; Gangolf Hübinger, 'Individuum und Gemeinschaft in der intellektuellen Streitkultur der 1920er Jahre', in Roman Köster et al. (eds), *Das Ideal des schönen Lebens und die Wirklichkeit der Weimarer Republik* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009), 4; Cornel Zwierlein and Annette Meyer, 'Einleitung', in Cornel Zwierlein and Annette Meyer (eds), *Machiavellismus in Deutschland* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 15; Zoran Oklopcic, 'Comparing as (Re-) Imagining: Southern Perspective and the World of Constitutions', in Maxim Bönnemann, Michael Riegner and Philipp Dann (eds), *The Global South and Comparative Constitutional Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 86–109; Elisa Olivito, '(Dis)Eguaglianza, città e periferie sociali: la prospettiva costituzionale', *Rivista AIC* 1 (2020), 3.
14. Wolfgang Stegemann, 'Antisemitische und rassistische Vorurteile in Titus 1,10–16', *Kirche und Israel* 11, no. 1 (1996), 46–61; Hubert Frankemölle, *Jüdische Wurzeln christlicher Theologie* (Berlin: Philo, 1998), 27, 325–26; Hansjörg Schmid, *Gegner im 1. Johannesbrief? Zu Konstruktion und Selbstreferenz im johanneischen Sinnsystem* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002), 107; Siegfried Wiedenhofer, 'Identitätssicherung und Dialogfähigkeit im religiosen Gedächtnis', in Markus Witte (ed.), *'Der' eine Gott und die Welt der Religionen* (Würzburg: Religion & Kultur-Verlag, 2003), 318; Anton Cuffari, *Judenfeindschaft in Antike und Altem Testament* (Berlin: Philos, 2007), 75–77; Matthias Koenig, 'Religiose Pluralitat und Demokratie in Europa', in Lidwina Meyer (ed.), *Recht, Religion, Politik. Auf dem Weg zu einer Anerkennung des Islam in Deutschland* (Loccum: Evangelische Akademie Loccum, 2007), 168; Christoph Schaefer, 'Judentum und Gnosis? Die Gegnerpolemik im Titusbrief als Element literarischer Konstruktion', in Hans-Ulrich Weidemann and Wilfried Eisele (eds), *Ein Meisterschüler: Titus und sein Brief. Michael Theobald zum 60. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2008), 67.
15. Hans-Werner Boresch, '"Zersetzender Intellektualismus" und "apodiktischer Glaube". Die Nationalsozialisten in der Tradition des Antirationalismus', in Brunhilde Sonntag

(ed.), *Die dunkle Last. Musik und Nationalsozialismus* (Cologne: Bela, 1999), 84–85; Jens Loenhoff, 'Implizites Wissen und epistemische Praxis', in Anna Langenbruch et al. (eds), *Wissenskulturen der Musikwissenschaft* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2016), 120.

16. Dietmar Schirmer, 'Die Kategorie Geschlecht als kultureller Code. Über Exklusion, Inklusion und Demokratisierung', in Eva Kreisky and Birgit Sauer (eds), *Geschlechterverhältnisse im Kontext politischer Transformation* (Hamburg: Springer, 1998), 210; Ina Lelke, 'Die Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften und die 'arbeitende Geselligkeit', in Theresa Wobbe (ed.), *Frauen in Akademie und Wissenschaft: Arbeitsorte und Forschungspraktiken 1700–2000* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002), 83; Simon Möller, 'Erst "Emanze" – heute "politisch korrekt". Mediale Modernisierungsstrategien misogyner Rede', in Andrea Geier and Ursula Kocher (eds), *Wider die Frau: zu Geschichte und Funktion misogyner Rede* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008), 183–206.
17. See Luhmann, *Soziologische Aufklärung*; Feres Jr, 'Contribuição a uma tipologia das formas de desrespeito'; Postoutenko and Junge, *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck*; Strohschneider, 'Fremde in der Vormoderne'; Müller and Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik*, and the contributions in this volume.
18. See Robert M.W. Dixon, *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? And Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 67.
19. Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 214–15.
20. Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 259.
21. See Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 214–15; Koselleck, 'Feindbegriffe', 280–81. It might be of interest that the note on the intimate relations between AC and spatial deixis ('*Ihnen-Außen Abgrenzungen*') was added to the latter text just before it went to print (see the proofs preserved at German Literary Archive (DLA), Marbach, Germany, Reinhart Koselleck Papers).
22. See Jean L. Cohen and Andrew A. Arato, *Civil Society and Political Theory* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994), 201–56; Jan-Friedrich Missfelder, 'Die Gegenkraft und ihre Geschichte: Carl Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck und der Bürgerkrieg', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 58, no. 4 (2006), 310–36; Timo Pankakoski, 'Conflict, Context, Concreteness: Koselleck and Schmitt on Concepts', *Political Theory* 38, no. 6 (2010), 749–79; Niklas Olsen, 'Carl Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck and the Foundations of History and Politics', *History of European Ideas* 37, no. 2 (2011), 197–208; Niklas Olsen, '"Af alle mine lærere har Schmitt været den vigtigste". Reinhart Kosellecks intellektuelle og personlige relationer til Carl Schmitt', *Historisk Tidsskrift* 104, no. 1 (2012), 30–60.
23. John Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (London: A & C Black, 1920), 137.
24. Baruch Spinoza, *Ethica, ordine geometrico demonstrata/Ethik in geometrischer Ordnung dargestellt* (Hamburg: Meyner, 1677/2010), 238.
25. See respectively Dimitrij Tschižewskij, 'Typen der Hegelschen Negation', in Harald Weinrich (ed.), *Positionen der Negativität* (Munich: Fink, 1975), 476; Gregory Bateson, 'Comments', in Harvey B. Sarles (ed.), *Language and Human Nature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), 70–71, and Jacques Derrida, *Positions* (Paris: Minuit, 1972), 56–57, 60.
26. See the discussion Kirill Postoutenko and Olga Sabelfeld, 'Temporal Comparisons in Parliamentary Interaction: Studying Time References in a Deliberative Environment', *Time and Society* 30, no. 4 (2021), 598–618.
27. See Charles E. Frye, 'Carl Schmitt's Concept of the Political', *The Journal of Politics* 28, no. 4 (1966), 821; Hans Blumenberg, *Vollzähligkeit der Sterne* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), 346, 348.
28. See, for instance, Suzanne Saïd, 'Greeks and Barbarians in Euripides' Tragedies: The End of Differences?', in Thomas Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh:

Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 99–100; Bernd Neumann, 'Über die Angst des Vorkriegs', in Bernd Neumann and Gernot Wimmer (eds), *Der Erste Weltkrieg auf dem deutsch-europäischen Literaturfeld* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2017), 27.

29. See, for instance, Humberto Maturana and Francesco J. Varela, *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980), 79–80.
30. See Ludwig von Bertalanffy, *General System Theory* (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1969), 41.
31. See, for instance, Leon Chernyak and Alfred I. Tauber, 'The Dialectical Self: Immunology's Contribution', *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 129 (1991), 148.
32. See Norbert Elias and John L. Scotson, *The Established and the Outsiders* (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1965), pp. 144–45.
33. See Robert Hertz, 'The Pre-eminence of the Right Hand: A Study in Religious Polarity', in Rodney Needham (ed.), *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 13; Kirill Postoutenko, 'From Asymmetries to Concepts', in Junge and Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck*, 220–21.
34. See, for instance, Martin Buber, *Das dialogische Prinzip* (Gerlingen: Lambert Schneider, 1954/1997), 68.
35. See Ludwig Wittgenstein, 'Bemerkungen über die Farben', in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Werkausgabe* 8 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1951/1989), 30; Ernst Tugendhat, *Selbstbewusstsein und Selbstbestimmung: Sprachanalytische Interpretationen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979), 87; Donald Davidson, *Intersubjective, Subjective, Objective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 38.
36. See Paul Chilton, *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2004), 59.
37. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1755/1985), 94. For the modern summary, see Matt Davies, *Advances in Stylistics: Oppositions and Ideology in News Discourse* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 93.
38. See George A. Akerlof, 'The Market for Lemons: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84, no. 3 (1970), 489; Postoutenko, Kirill, 'Asymmetrical Concepts and Political Asymmetries: A Comparative Glance at 20th Century Democracies and Totalitarianisms from a Discursive Standpoint', in Junge and Postoutenko, *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck*, 94–95.
39. See Ilona Opelt and Wolfgang Speyer, 'Barbar', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 10 (1967), 257.
40. (Plat. *Rep*. 5.470); Carl Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1963), 29.
41. (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 16.5).
42. See Ana Kotarcic, *Aristotle on Language and Style: The Concept of Lexis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 75.
43. See Koselleck, 'Feindbegriffe', 277–78.
44. See Harold Garfinkel, *Seeing Sociologically: The Routine Grounds of Social Action* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2006), 187.
45. See Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 222–23; Virginia J. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 268.
46. See Mechtild Rössler, *'Wissenschaft und Lebensraum'. Geographische Ostforschung im Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1990), 86.
47. See Laurence R. Horn, *A Natural History of Negation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 273.

48. See Paul J. Alexander, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley, CA: California University Press, 1985), 194; Kirill Postoutenko, 'Der Antichrist und seine Widersacher', in Kay Junge et al. (eds), *Kippfiguren. Ambivalenz in Bewegung* (Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2013), 144–45.
49. See Nikolai S. Trubetskoy, *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (Prague: Cercle linguistique de Prague, 1939), 63; Roman Jakobson, 'Verbal Communication', *Scientific American* 227 (1972), 78–80.
50. See Horn, *A Natural History of Negation*, 22.
51. See Jerry Boucher and Charles E. Osgood, 'The Pollyanna Hypothesis', *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 8, no. 1 (1969), 1–8; Michael Israel, 'The Pragmatics of Polarity', in Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward (eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (New York: Blackwell, 2004), 711.
52. See Juan Luis García-Alonso, '"Whoever Is Not Greek Is a Barbarian"', in Ana Paula Arnaut (ed.), *Identity(ies): A Multicultural and Multidisciplinary Approach* (Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2017), 9–26.
53. Wilfried Nippel, *Griechen, Barbaren und Wilde* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1990), 42.
54. Herbert H. Clark, 'Word Associations and Linguistic Theory', in John Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics* (Baltimore, MD: Penguin, 1970), 275; Joost van de Weijer et al., 'Antonym Canonicity: Temporal and Contextual Manipulations', *Brain and Language* 128, no. 1 (2014), 1–2.
55. See Niklas Luhmann and Peter Fuchs, *Reden und Schweigen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989), 71; Christiane Fellbaum, 'Co-occurrence and Antonymy', *International Journal of Lexicography* 8, no. 4 (1995), 287; Sebastian J. Crutch et al., 'The Role of Polarity in Antonym and Synonym Conceptual Knowledge: Evidence from Stroke Aphasia and Multidimensional Ratings of Abstract Words', *Neuropsychologia* 50, no. 11 (2012), 2641.
56. See Charles E. Osgood, *Lectures on Language Performance* (New York: Springer, 1980), 140; Hanna Marczewska, Michal Zagrodzki and Ida Kurcz, 'Asymmetry of Dimensions in Language Knowledge', *Advances in Psychology* 39 (1986), 83; Davies, 'Advances in Stylistics', 94.
57. See Nippel, *Griechen, Barbaren und Wilde*, 27.
58. See Koselleck, 'Feindbegriffe', 314.
59. See respectively Bruno Snell (ed.), *Heraklit. Fragmente* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1965), 20; Reinhold Rieger, *Contradictio. Theorien und Bewertungen des Widerspruchs in der Theologie des Mittelalters* (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 443–44; Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1960), 10; Ludwig Wittgenstein, 'Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus', in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Werkausgabe* 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1921/1995), 7–85.
60. See, for instance, Linda R. Waugh, 'Marked and Unmarked: A Choice between Unequals in Semiotic Structure', *Semiotica* 38, no. 3–4 (1982), 305; Edwin L. Batistella, *The Logic of Markedness* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 17.
61. See respectively Junius [Rosa Luxemburg], *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (Zürich: Verlagsdruckerei Union, 1916), 11, and Opelt and Speyer, 'Barbar', 263.
62. See: Allan A. Lund, *Zum Germanenbild der Römer: eine Einführung in die antike Ethnographie* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1990), 12.
63. Edmund Burke, *Political Tracts and Speeches* (Dublin: Wm. Wilson, 1777), 354.
64. Leo Tolstoy, *Sobranie sochnenïĭ* 5 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennai͡a literatura, 1980), 27.
65. Robin McKie, 'Far-Right Leader Geert Wilders Calls Moroccan Migrants "Scum"', *The Observer*, 18 February 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/18/geert-wilders-netherlands-describes-immigrants-scum-holland.

66. See Kirill Postoutenko, 'Asymmetrical Concepts and Political Asymmetries: A Comparative Glance at 20th Century Democracies and Totalitarianisms from a Discursive Standpoint', in Junge and Postoutenko, *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck*, 84–85.
67. Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 218.
68. See Jan Assmann, *Die Mosaische Unterscheidung oder der Preis des Monotheismus* (Munich: Fink, 2003), 47.
69. See Waugh, 'Marked and Unmarked', 309–10; Horn, *A Natural History of Negation*, 36; Edna Andrews, *Markedness Theory: The Union of Asymmetry and Semiosis in Language* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), 158–59; Israel, 'The Pragmatics of Polarity', 708; M. Lynne Murphy and Roberta Piazza, 'Linguistic Semantics and Historical Semantics', in Junge and Postoutenko, *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck*, 60–61; Postoutenko, 'Der Antichrist und seine Widersacher', 152.
70. See Koselleck, 'Feindbegriffe', 276.
71. See Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', 218.
72. See Michel de Montaigne, *Essais* (Paris: PUF, 1595/1965), 83; Strohschneider, 'Fremde in der Vormoderne', 404–5.
73. See Winfried Nöth, 'Symmetries and Asymmetries Between Positive and Negative Emotion Words', in Wilhelm G. Busse (ed.), *Anglistentag 1991* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1992), 75.
74. See Postoutenko, 'Asymmetrical Concepts and Political Asymmetries', 103–5.
75. See Murphy and Piazza, 'Linguistic Semantics and Historical Semantics', 55.

References

Addario, Nicolò, 'Il conflitto, dalla lotta di classe ai nuovi movimenti: e poi?', *Riflessioni Sistemiche* 4 (2011), 5–17.

Akerlof, George A., 'The Market for Lemons: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84, no. 3 (1970), 488–500.

Åkerstrøm Andersen, Niels, *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2003).

Alberg Peters, Rikke, 'Kampen om sammenhængskraften – En analyse af begrebet sammenhængskraft i den offentlige debat fra 1994 til 2010', *Slagmark – Tidsskrift for idéhistorie* 70 (2018), 129–56.

Alexander, Paul J., *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1985).

Altmann, Philipp, 'Studying Discourse Innovations: The Case of the Indigenous Movement in Ecuador', *Historical Social Research* 40, no. 3 (2015), 161–84.

Andrews, Edna, *Markedness Theory: The Union of Asymmetry and Semiosis in Language* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990).

Armitage, David, 'What's the Big Idea? Intellectual History and the Longue Durée', *History of European Ideas* 38, no. 4 (2012), 493–507.

Assmann, Jan, *Die Mosaische Unterscheidung oder der Preis des Monotheismus* (Munich: Fink, 2003).

Bach, Wolfgang, *Geschichte als politisches Argument* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1977).

Balibar, Étienne, *Passions du concept* (Paris: Découverte, 2020).

Bateson, Gregory, 'Comments', in Harvey B. Sarles (ed.), *Language and Human Nature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), 69–72.
Batistella, Edwin L., *The Logic of Markedness* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
Beck, Ulrich, *Der kosmopolitische Blick, oder, Krieg ist Frieden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004).
Bendix, Regina, and Herman Roodenburg, *Managing Ethnicity: Perspectives from Folklore Studies, History and Anthropology* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000).
Blanke, Horst Walter, *Politische Herrschaft und soziale Ungleichheit im Spiegel des Anderen* (Kamen: Spenner Verlag, 1997).
Blumenberg, Hans, *Vollzähligkeit der Sterne* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997).
Boresch, Hans-Werner, '"Zersetzender Intellektualismus" und "apodiktischer Glaube". Die Nationalsozialisten in der Tradition des Antirationalismus', in Brunhilde Sonntag (ed.), *Die dunkle Last. Musik und Nationalsozialismus* (Cologne: Bela, 1999), 64–91.
Borneman, John, 'American Anthropology as Foreign Policy', *American Anthropologist* 97, no. 4 (1995), 663–72.
Borst, Arno, *Barbaren, Ketzer und Artisten. Welten des Mittelalters* (Munich: Piper, 1990).
Boucher, Jerry, and Charles E. Osgood, 'The Pollyanna Hypothesis', *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 8, no. 1 (1969), 1–8.
Bremond, Claude, *Logique du récit* (Paris: Seuil, 1973).
Brenner, Peter J., 'Interkulturelle Hermeneutik. Probleme einer Theorie kulturellen. Fremdverstehens', in Peter Zimmermann (ed.), *Interkulturelle Germanistik. Dialog der Kulturen auf Deutsch?* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989), 35–55.
Buber, Martin, *Das dialogische Prinzip* (Gerlingen: Lambert Schneider, 1954/1997).
Burke, Edmund, *Political Tracts and Speeches* (Dublin: Wm. Wilson, 1777).
Burnet, John, *Early Greek Philosophy* (London: A & C Black, 1920).
Chernyak, Leon, and Alfred I. Tauber, 'The Dialectical Self: Immunology's Contribution', *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 129 (1991), 109–56.
Chilton, Paul, *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2004).
Clark, Herbert H., 'Word Associations and Linguistic Theory', in John Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics* (Baltimore, MD: Penguin, 1970), 271–86.
Cohen, Jean L., and Andrew A. Arato, *Civil Society and Political Theory* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994).
Cornago, Noé, *Plural Diplomacies: Normative Predicaments and Functional Imperatives* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2013).
Crutch, Sebastian J., et al., 'The Role of Polarity in Antonym and Synonym Conceptual Knowledge: Evidence from Stroke Aphasia and Multidimensional Ratings of Abstract Words', *Neuropsychologia* 50, no. 11 (2012), 2636–2644.
Cuffari, Anton, *Judenfeindschaft in Antike und Altem Testament* (Berlin: Philos, 2007).
Davidson, Donald, *Intersubjective, Subjective, Objective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Davies, Matt, *Advances in Stylistics: Oppositions and Ideology in News Discourse* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014).

de Menezes Paredes, Marçal, 'A Ibéria como mal-de-origem', *Revista de História das Ideias* 31 (2010), 337–62.
Derrida, Jacques, *Positions* (Paris: Minuit, 1972).
Dinçkal, Noyan, *Istanbul und das Wasser. Zur Geschichte der Wasserversorgung und Abwasserentsorgung von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1966* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2004).
Dipper, Christoph, 'Der Gelehrte als Schüler. Der Briefwechsel Reinhart Kosellecks mit Carl Schmitt', in Manfred Hettling and Wolfgang Schieder (eds), *Reinhart Koselleck als Historiker* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021), 87–111.
Dixon, Robert M.W., *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? And Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010).
dos Santos Bártholo, Roberto, *Homo industrialis eine Untersuchung über die wirtschaftsethischen Grundlagen der industriellen Weltzivilisation* (Munich: Fink, 1982).
Elias, Norbert, and John L. Scotson, *The Established and the Outsiders* (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1965).
Enders, Angela, 'Stereotyp und Vorurteil. Das Türkenbild westeuropäischer Reisender des 16. Jahrhunderts', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Germanistenverbandes* 42, no. 1 (1995), 37–44.
Esposito, Elena, *La memoria sociale. Mezzi per comunicare e modi di dimenticare* (Bari: Laterza, 2001).
Fellbaum, Christiane, 'Co-occurrence and Antonymy', *International Journal of Lexicography* 8, no. 4 (1995), 281–303.
Feres Jr, João, 'Contribuição a uma tipologia das formas de desrespeito: para além do modelo hegeliano-republicano', *Dados* 45, no. 4 (2002), 555–76.
Florack, Ruth, *Bekannte Fremde: zu Herkunft und Funktion nationaler Stereotype in der Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).
Forstner, Martin, 'Das Fremde als Problem der intra- und interkulturellen Kommunikation im Zeitalter der Globalisierung – insbesondere der arabisch-islamischen Welt', in Peter Rusterholz and Rupert Moser (eds), *Wie verstehen wir Fremdes?* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 11–108.
Fraesdorff, David, *Der barbarische Norden: Vorstellungen und Fremdheitskategorien bei Rimbert, Thietmar von Merseburg, Adam von Bremen und Helmold von Bosau* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005).
Frankemölle, Hubert, *Jüdische Wurzeln christlicher Theologie* (Berlin: Philo, 1998).
Frye, Charles E., 'Carl Schmitt's Concept of the Political', *The Journal of Politics* 28, no. 4 (1966), 818–30.
García-Alonso, Juan Luis, '"Whoever Is Not Greek Is a Barbarian"', in Ana Paula Arnaut (ed.), *Identity(ies): A Multicultural and Multidisciplinary Approach* (Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2017), 9–26.
Garfinkel, Harold, *Seeing Sociologically: The Routine Grounds of Social Action* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2006).
Gopal, Sarvepalli, *Living Together Separately: Cultural India in History and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
Göle, Nilüfer, and Ludwig Ammann, *Islam in Public: Turkey, Iran and Europe* (Istanbul: Bilgi University Press, 2006).

Greimas, Algirdas J., *Sémantique structurale: recherche de méthode* (Paris: PUF, 1986).

Harbsmeier, Michael, 'Reisebeschreibungen als mentalitatsgeschichtliche Quellen: Überlegungen zu einer historisch-anthropologischen Untersuchung frühneuzeitlicher deutscher Reisebeschreibungen', in Hans Jürgen Teuteberg (ed.), *Reiseberichte als Quellen europäischer Kulturgeschichte* (Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1982), 1–31.

Hertz, Robert, 'The Pre-eminence of the Right Hand: A Study in Religious Polarity', in Rodney Needham (ed.), *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 3–31.

Herzig, Arno, 'Das Bild vom Juden in der deutschen Historiographie und Staatstheorie von der Reformationszeit bis zum ausgehenden 19. Jarhundert', in Burghart Schmidt (ed.), *Menschenrechte und Menschenbilder von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Hamburg: DOBU 2006), 94–110.

Hinz, Michael, *Der Zivilisationsprozess: Mythos oder Realität?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002).

Hobbes, Thomas, *Elementa philosophica de Cive* (Amsterdam: Daniel Elzevier, 1647).

Höfert, Almut, 'The Order of Things and the Discourse of the Turkish Threat', in Almut Höfert and Armando Salvatore (eds), *Between Europe and Islam: Shaping Modernity in a Transcultural Space* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 39–70.

Höppner, Stefan, *Zwischen Utopia und Neuer Welt. Die USA als Imaginationsraum in Arno Schmidts Erzählwerk* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2005).

Horn, Laurence R., *A Natural History of Negation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

Hübinger, Gangolf, 'Individuum und Gemeinschaft in der intellektuellen Streitkultur der 1920er Jahre', in Roman Köster et al. (eds), *Das Ideal des schönen Lebens und die Wirklichkeit der Weimarer Republik* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009), 3–13.

Hunter, Virginia J., *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982).

Israel, Michael, 'The Pragmatics of Polarity', in Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward (eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (New York: Blackwell, 2004), 701–23.

Jakobson, Roman, 'Verbal Communication', *Scientific American* 227 (1972), 72–80.

Jakubowska-Branicka, Iwona, 'Language as a Tool Creating and Dividing Communities. [The] Dangerous Use of Asymmetric Counterconcepts', *Psychology of Language and Communication* 18, no. 1 (2014), 22–40.

Jameson, Frederic, *The Ideologies of Theory* 2 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

Jeismann, Michael, *La patrie de l'ennemi. La notion d'ennemi national et la représentation de la nation en Allemagne et en France de 1792 à 1918* (Paris: CNRS, 1997).

Jentsch, Tobias, *Da/zwischen. Eine Typologie radikaler Fremdheit* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2006).

Jousse, Emmanuel, 'Le socialisme sans frontière. Les internationalismes ouvriers de 1864 à 1914', in Éric Anceau, Raymond Boudon and Olivier Dard (eds), *Histoire des internationales* (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2017), 69–98.

Junge, Kay, and Kirill Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011).
Junius [Luxemburg, Rosa], *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (Zürich: Verlagsdruckerei Union, 1916).
Karagiannis, Nathalie, *Avoiding Responsibility: The Politics and Discourse of European Development* (London: Pluto Press, 2004).
Kenyeres, Zoltán, 'Ästhetizismus und Ethizismus', in Maria Erb, Magdolna Orosz and László Tarnói (eds), *"Und Thut ein Gnügen Seinem Ambt": Festschrift für Karl Manherz zum 60. Geburtstag* (Budapest: ELTE germanistisches Institut, 2002), 315–22.
Koenig, Matthias, 'Religiose Pluralitat und Demokratie in Europa', in Lidwina Meyer (ed.), *Recht, Religion, Politik. Auf dem Weg zu einer Anerkennung des Islam in Deutschland* (Loccum: Evangelische Akademie Loccum, 2007), 167–80.
Koselleck, Reinhart, 'Feindbegriffe' (1993), in Reinhart Koselleck, *Begriffsgeschichten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010), 274–84.
——, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe' (1975), in Reinhart Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989), 211–59.
Kotarcic, Ana, *Aristotle on Language and Style: The Concept of Lexis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).
Kurunmäki, Jussi A., *Representation, Nation and Time: The Political Rhetoric of the 1866 Parliamentary Reform in Sweden* (Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2000).
Lelke, Ina, 'Die Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften und die "arbeitende Geselligkeit"', in Theresa Wobbe (ed.), *Frauen in Akademie und Wissenschaft: Arbeitsorte und Forschungspraktiken 1700–2000* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002), 65–90.
Leventhal, Robert S., 'The Critique of the Concept: Lessing, Herder, and the Semiology of Historical Semantics', in Wilfried Malsch, Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (eds), *Herder Yearbook/Herder Jahrbuch 1996* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1997), 93–110.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 'The Structural Study of Myth', *The Journal of American Folklore* 68, no. 270 (1955), 428–44.
Lichtblau, Klaus, *Das Zeitalter der Entzweiung: Studien zur politischen Ideengeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Philo, 1999).
Liebhart, Karin, Elisabeth Menasse, and Heinz Steinert, 'Fremdbilder – Feindbilder – Zerrbilder. Zur Wahrnehmung und diskursiven Konstruktion des Fremden', in Karin Liebhart, Elisabeth Menasse and Heinz Steinert (eds), *Fremdbilder – Feindbilder – Zerrbilder. Zur Wahrnehmung und diskursiven Konstruktion des Fremden* (Klagenfurt: Drava 2002).
Linden, Marcel, 'Heimatliebe, Patriotismus, Internationalismus', in Wilfried Belschner et al. (eds), *Wem gehört die Heimat?* (Hamburg: Springer, 1999), 201–7.
Loenhoff, Jens, 'Implizites Wissen und epistemische Praxis', in Anna Langenbruch et al. (eds), *Wissenskulturen der Musikwissenschaft* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2016), 115–30.
Luhmann, Niklas, *Soziologische Aufklärung* 4 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987).

Luhmann, Niklas, and Peter Fuchs, *Reden und Schweigen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989).
Lund, Allan A., *Zum Germanenbild der Römer: eine Einführung in die antike Ethnographie* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1990).
Lutter, Christina, *Politische Kommunikation an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1989).
Maksymiuk, Stephan, *The Court Magician in Medieval German Romance* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996).
Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1960).
Marczewska, Hanna, Michal Zagrodzki and Ida Kurcz, 'Asymmetry of Dimensions in Language Knowledge', *Advances in Psychology* 39 (1986), 69–93.
Marx, Christoph, 'Gedenken, Geschichte und Versöhnung in Südafrika und Zimbabwe', *Africa Spectrum* 41, no. 2 (2006), 155–74.
Maturana, Humberto, and Francesco J. Varela, *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980).
McKie, Robin, 'Far-Right Leader Geert Wilders Calls Moroccan Migrants "Scum"', *The Observer*, 18 February 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/18/geert-wilders-netherlands-describes-immigrants-scum-holland.
Mishkova, Diana, and Balázs Trencsényi, 'Introduction', *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2017), 1–11.
Missfelder, Jan-Friedrich, 'Die Gegenkraft und ihre Geschichte: Carl Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck und der Bürgerkrieg', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 58, no. 4 (2006), 310–36.
Möller, Simon, 'Erst "Emanze" – heute "politisch korrekt." Mediale Modernisierungsstrategien misogyner Rede', in Andrea Geier and Ursula Kocher (eds), *Wider die Frau: zu Geschichte und Funktion misogyner Rede* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008), 183–206.
Müller, Ernst, and Falko Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2016).
Müller, Harald, '"Specimen eruditionis." Zum Habitus der Renaissance-Humanisten und seiner sozialen Bedeutung', *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Gelehrten im späten Mittelalter* 73 (2010), 117–51.
Münkler, Herfried, and Bernd Ladwig, 'Dimensionen der Fremdheit', in Herfried Münkler and Bernd Ladwig (eds), *Furcht und Faszination. Facetten der Fremdheit* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997), 11–40.
Münkler, Marina, *Erfahrung des Fremden. Die Beschreibung Ostasiens in den Augenzeugenberichten des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2000), 147–221.
Murphy, M. Lynne, and Roberta Piazza, 'Linguistic Semantics and Historical Semantics', in Kay Junge and Kirill Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck: Historical Semantics and Beyond* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011), 51–80.
Muschick, Stephan, *Für Schweden in Europa. Die diskursive Konstruktion europäischer Gemeinschaft im "Zeitalter des Nationalismus" (1890–1918)* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2001).

Neumann, Bernd, 'Über die Angst des Vorkriegs', in Bernd Neumann and Gernot Wimmer (eds), *Der Erste Weltkrieg auf dem deutsch-europäischen Literaturfeld* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2017), 15–34.
Nippel, Wilfried, *Griechen, Barbaren und Wilde* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1990).
Nöth, Winfried, 'Symmetries and Asymmetries Between Positive and Negative Emotion Words', in Wilhelm G. Busse (ed.), *Anglistentag 1991* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1992), 72–80.
Oklopcic, Zoran, 'Comparing as (Re-)Imagining: Southern Perspective and the World of Constitutions', in Maxim Bönnemann, Michael Riegner and Philipp Dann (eds), *The Global South and Comparative Constitutional Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 86–109.
Olivito, Elisa, '(Dis)Eguaglianza, città e periferie sociali: la prospettiva costituzionale', *Rivista AIC* 1 (2020), 1–58.
Olsen, Kjell, 'The Touristic Construction of the "Emblematic" Sámi', in Anna-Leena Siikala, Barbro Klein and Stein R. Mathisen (eds), *Creating Diversities Folklore, Religion and the Politics of Heritage* (Helsinki: SKS, 2005), 292–305.
Olsen, Niklas, '"Af alle mine lærere har Schmitt været den vigtigste." Reinhart Kosellecks intellektuelle og personlige relationer til Carl Schmitt', *Historisk Tidsskrift* 104, no. 1 (2012), 30–60.
——, 'Carl Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck and the Foundations of History and Politics', *History of European Ideas* 37, no. 2 (2011), 197–208.
——, *History in the Plural. An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012).
Opelt, Ilona, and Wolfgang Speyer, 'Barbar', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 10 (1967), 251–90.
O'Reilly, William, 'Das Bayernbild Islands, 1798–1898', in Konrad Amann (ed.), *Bayern und Europa: Festschrift für Peter Claus Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005).
Orlowski, Hubert, 'Die Ideologie des West-Ost-Gefalles und das Fremdheitssyndrom', in Alois Wierlacher (ed.), *Kulturthema Fremdheit. Leitbegriffe und Problemfelder kulturwissenschaftlicher Fremdheitsforschung* (Munich: Iudicum, 1993), 463–70.
Osgood, Charles E., *Lectures on Language Performance* (New York: Springer, 1980).
Osterhammel, Jürgen, *Europe, the "West" and the Civilizing Mission* (London: German Historical Institute, 2006).
Palti, Elias José, 'Temporalidade e refutabilidade dos conceitos políticos', *Revista da Faculdade de Direito da UFRGS, Porto Alegre* 35 (2016), 4–23.
Pankakoski, Timo, 'Conflict, Context, Concreteness: Koselleck and Schmitt on Concepts', *Political Theory* 38, no. 6 (2010), 749–79.
Parnell, Christina, 'Einleitung', in Christina Parnell (ed.), *Ich und der/die Andere in der russischen Literatur* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002).
Poltermann, Andreas, *Darstellung und historische Reflexion* (Göttingen: Verein zur Förderung Gesellschaftstheoretischer Studien, Göttingen, 1985).
Postoutenko, Kirill, 'Asymmetrical Concepts and Political Asymmetries: A Comparative Glance at 20th Century Democracies and Totalitarianisms from a Discursive Standpoint', in Kay Junge and Kirill Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical*

Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck: Historical Semantics and Beyond (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011), 81–114.

——, 'Der Antichrist und seine Widersacher', in Kay Junge et al. (eds), *Kippfiguren. Ambivalenz in Bewegung* (Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2013), 143–53.

——, 'From Asymmetries to Concepts', in Kay Junge and Kirill Postoutenko (eds), *Asymmetrical Concepts after Reinhart Koselleck: Historical Semantics and Beyond* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011), 195–250.

Postoutenko, Kirill, and Olga Sabelfeld, 'Temporal Comparisons in Parliamentary Interaction: Studying Time References in a Deliberative Environment', *Time and Society* 30, no. 4 (2021), forthcoming.

Pozzo, Ricardo, and Marco Sgarbi, *Eine Typologie der Formen der Begriffsgeschichte* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2010).

Preuß, Ulrich K., *Revolution, Fortschritt und Verfassung: Zu einem neuen Verfassungsverständnis* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994).

Reichardt, Ulfried, *Alterität und Geschichte: Funktionen der Sklavereidarstellung im amerikanischen Roman* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2001).

Ricciardi, Maurizio, *Ferdinand Tönnies, sociologo hobbesiano. Concetti politici e scienza sociale in Germania tra Otto e Novecento* (Bologna: Società editrice il Mulino, 1997).

Rieger, Reinhold, *Contradictio. Theorien und Bewertungen des Widerspruchs in der Theologie des Mittelalters* (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

Rössler, Mechtild, *'Wissenschaft und Lebensraum.' Geographische Ostforschung im Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1990).

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1755/1985).

Rudolph, Jurgen, *Reconstructing Identities: A Social History of the Babas in Singapore* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998).

Sabel, Barbara, *Toleranzdenken in mittelhochdeutscher Literatur* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 2003).

Sadowsky, Thorsten, 'Reiseerfahrung und bürgerliche Mentalität: Das Bild vom josephinischen Wien in den Berichten deutscher Reisender in den Jahren 1780–1790', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 47/48 (1992), 229–62.

Saïd, Suzanne, 'Greeks and Barbarians in Euripides' Tragedies: The End of Differences?' in Thomas Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 62–100.

Sánchez León, Pablo, *Popular Political Participation and the Democratic Imagination in Spain: From Crowd to People, 1766–1868* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020).

Sauer, Christoph, *Der aufdringliche Text. Sprachpolitik und NS-Ideologie in der 'Deutschen Zeitung in den Niederlanden'* (Wiesbaden: DUV, 1998).

Schaefer, Christoph, 'Judentum und Gnosis? Die Gegnerpolemik im Titusbrief als Element literarischer Konstruktion', in Hans-Ulrich Weidemann and Wilfried Eisele (eds), *Ein Meisterschüler: Titus und sein Brief. Michael Theobald zum 60. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2008), 55–80.

Schiemann, Gregor, 'Natur – Kultur und ihr Anderes', in Friedrich Jaeger and Jürgen Straub (eds), *Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften* 2 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004), 60–75.

Schirmer, Dietmar, 'Die Kategorie Geschlecht als kultureller Code. Über Exklusion, Inklusion und Demokratisierung', in Eva Kreisky and Birgit Sauer (eds), *Geschlechterverhältnisse im Kontext politischer Transformation* (Hamburg: Springer, 1998), 194–219.

Schmid, Hansjörg, *Gegner im 1. Johannesbrief? Zu Konstruktion und Selbstreferenz im johanneischen Sinnsystem* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002), 107.

Schmitt, Carl, *Der Begriff des Politischen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1963).

Schmitz, Walter, and Michael Neumann, 'Schlesische Grenzkämpfe: Zur literarischen Semiotik eines geteilten Landes in den 1920er Jahren', in Walter Schmitz and Clemens Vollnhals (eds), *Völkische Bewegung – Konservative Revolution – Nationalsozialismus – Aspekte einer politisierten Kultur. Kultur und antidemokratische Politik in Deutschland* (Dresden: Thelem, 2005), 91–114.

Schneider, Leander, 'The Maasai's New Clothes: A Developmentalist Modernity and Its Exclusions', *Africa Today* 53, no. 1 (2006), 101–31.

Schwinge, Ernst-Richard, *Goethe und die Poesie der Griechen* (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1986).

Scior, Volker, *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lübeck* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002).

Seidl, Stephanie, and Julia Zimmermann, 'Jenseits des Kategorischen. Konzeptionen des "Heidnischen" in volkssprachigen literarischen und chronikalischen Texten des 13. Jahrhunderts', in Michael Borgolte, Julia Dücker and Marcel Müllerburg (eds), *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 326–81.

Shakhrai, Ina, 'The Legitimization of Authoritarian Rule through Constructed External Threats: Russian Propaganda during the Ukrainian Crisis', *East European Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (2015), 29–54.

Shimada, Shingo, 'Überlegungen zum Konzept "Asien"', in Sefik Alp Bahadir (ed.), *Kultur und Region im Zeichen der Globalisierung: wohin treiben die Regionalkulturen?* (Neustadt an der Aisch: Degener, 2000), 155–68.

Siebert-Ott, Gesa, 'Sprachliche Homogenität und Kollektive Identität', in Frank Liedtke, Martin Wengeler and Karin Böke (eds), *Begriffe besetzen. Strategien des Sprachgebrauchs in der Politik* (Hamburg: Springer, 1991), 355–73.

Snell, Bruno (ed.), *Heraklit. Fragmente* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1965).

Spinoza, Baruch, *Ethica, ordine geometrico demonstrata/Ethik in geometrischer Ordnung dargestellt* (Hamburg: Meyner, 1677/2010).

Stegemann, Wolfgang, 'Antisemitische und rassistische Vorurteile in Titus 1, 10–16', *Kirche und Israel* 11, no. 1 (1996), 46–61.

Stoddard, Lothrop, *The Revolt against Civilization – The Menace of the Underman* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922).

Strohmeyer, Arno, 'Wahrnehmungen des Fremden', in Michael Rohrschneider and Arno Strohmeyer (eds), *Wahrnehmungen des Fremden Differenzerfahrungen von Diplomaten im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

Strohschneider, Peter, 'Fremde in der Vormoderne. Über Negierbarkeitsverluste und Unbekanntheitsgewinne', in Anja Becker (ed.), *Alterität als Leitkonzept für historisches Interpretieren* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012), 387–416.

Struck, Bernhard, 'Terra Incognita, European Civilization and Colonised Land: Poland in Mid-eighteenth Century to Mid-nineteenth Century German Travel Accounts', in Hagen Schulz-Forberg (ed.), *Unravelling Civilization: European Travel and Travel Writing* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 155–79.

Sturm, Marcel, *Goethes Weg nach Weimar. Zur Kontinuität und Diskontinuität des Sturm und Drang in den Jahren 1770–1790* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007).

Surynt, Izabela, '"Gottes Freunde", "Aller Welt Feinde" und Märtyrer der Nation. Zur Figur des Freikorpskämpfers bei Ernst von Salomon', in Hans Feger et al. (eds), *Terror und Erlösung. Robert Musil und der Gewaltdiskurs der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 169–82.

Thorup, Mikkel, *Fornuftens perversion: modoplysning og 200 ars krig mod fornuftens herredomme* (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsvorlag, 2008).

Tolstoy, Lev, *Sobranie sochnenïĭ* 5 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennai͡a literatura, 1980).

Torreão Farias, Matheus, 'O Jornalismo Mestiço de Gabriel García Márquez', *Estudios de Jornalismo* 4 (2015), 120–35.

Treiber, Hubert, 'Anmerkungen zu Alfred von Martins (1882–1979) typisierender Betrachtungsweise', *Saeculum* 57, no. 1 (2006), 131–60.

Trubetskoy, Nikolai S., *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (Prague: Cercle linguistique de Prague, 1939).

Tschižewskij, Dimitrij, 'Typen der Hegelschen Negation', in Harald Weinrich (ed.), *Positionen der Negativität* (Munich: Fink, 1975), 475–76.

Tugendhat, Ernst, *Selbstbewusstsein und Selbstbestimmung: Sprachanalytische Interpretationen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979).

Urban, Melanie, *Kulturkontakt im Zeichen der Minne die Arabel Ulrichs von dem Türlin* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007).

van de Weijer, Joost, et al., 'Antonym Canonicity: Temporal and Contextual Manipulations', *Brain and Language* 128, no. 1 (2014), 1–8.

Ventura, Roberto, '"Unsere Vendée." Der Mythos von der Französischen Revolution und die Konstitution nationalkultureller Identität in Brasilien (1897–1902)', in Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Ursula Link-Heer (eds), *Epochenschwellen und Epochenstrukturen im Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachhistorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985), 441–66.

von Bertalanffy, Ludwig, *General System Theory* (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1969).

von Moos, Peter, *Öffentliches und Privates, Gemeinsames und Eigenes* (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2005).

Waugh, Linda R., 'Marked and Unmarked: A Choice between Unequals in Semiotic Structure', *Semiotica* 38, no. 3–4 (1982), 299–318.

Weinrich, Harald, *Wege der Sprachkultur* (Munich: DVA, 1985).

Wiedenhofer, Siegfried, 'Identitätssicherung und Dialogfähigkeit im religiosen Gedächtnis', in Markus Witte (ed.), *'Der' eine Gott und die Welt der Religionen* (Würzburg: Religion & Kultur-Verlag, 2003), 315–30.

Winkler, Markus, *Barbarian: Explorations of a Western Concept in Theory, Literature, and the Arts*, vol. I (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2018).

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 'Bemerkungen über die Farben', in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Werkausgabe* 8 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1951/1989), 7–112.

Wong, Diana, 'Fremdheitsfiguren im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs. Am Beispiel der Asylzuwanderung nach Deutschland', in Joachim Matthes (ed.), *Zwischen den Kulturen?: die Sozialwissenschaften vor dem Problem des Kulturvergleichs* (Göttingen: Schwartz, 1992), 405–19.

Zwierlein, Cornel, and Annette Meyer, 'Einleitung', in Cornel Zwierlein and Annette Meyer (eds), *Machiavellismus in Deutschland* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 1–23.