

## Fixing the Facts. Protocols and Their Social Usage

Hans Dieter Huber

*schreibt recht sein protokoll der kadhi mit bedacht,  
so wird er nicht von rechtsdoctoren ausgelacht.*

Rückert, Bostan 11, 25

### Preliminary Remarks

Should one wish to inform oneself about protocols, the question then presents itself as to which ontological status one ought to attribute to the phenomenon. Generally speaking, two possibilities present themselves: the realistic and the idealistic. The realistic position is based on the assumption that protocols are given and exist independently of the view and the construction of a living organism. Accordingly, protocols are documents; they are real, authentic, and contain truth. The idealistic position, by contrast, assumes that protocols are artefacts and constructions of living organisms which thereby regulate the form of their living together. Thus, a protocol would not exist without the social construction of a living organism. The living organism in its social, political and communal constitution generates protocols by means of its living activity and orientation. Protocols are, thus, not real and given but rather invented, generated, and manufactured. Their truth and authenticity is, therefore, relative and in need of interpretation.

One type of this idealistic position is the nominalist variant. According to this position, a protocol is, in the first place, a linguistic concept. However, a concept is not necessarily identical with the word which denotes the concept and stands for it. This is owing to the different languages which write the concept in various different ways: *Protokoll* (German), *protocol* (English, Dutch), *protocolo* (Spanish, Portuguese), *protokol* (Danish) or *protocollo* (Italian). Hence, protocol is a linguistic concept which possesses different constituent and performative functions.<sup>1</sup> For Ludwig Wittgenstein, the meaning of a concept lies in its use. By using the concept of protocol correctly we necessarily understand its meaning. In order to be able to attribute this meaning, we must pay attention to the respective ways in which it is actually used.

Secondly, a protocol is a special kind of text which possesses a specific function in a certain context.<sup>2</sup> There are approximately eight different social contexts of use in which protocols play an important role:<sup>3</sup> sessions of political bodies, sessions of church bodies, scientific events and analyses, the legal system, corporate law, diplomacy, literature, and the internet. The range of protocol forms extends from verbatim note taking of all statements, for most of which a special form of shorthand is used, to a briefly written protocol of results which are restricted to a reproduction of the essential contents and resolutions in the form of a report. Protocols are highly standardized texts, the formal design of which is determined by their notarial and truth-endowing function. This can be guaranteed by signature or by the neutrality and credibility of those responsible for the recording, namely either a clerk or a notary. Contemporary German language distinguishes three meanings attributed to the concept of protocol: the oldest and most familiar aspect of meaning is the verbatim note taking of a negotiation or court hearing, usually of a political or official nature as, for example, a session, a court hearing or questioning of a witness. The second context of meaning concerns the introductory and final formulations of monarchical documents. The historian Theodor von Sickel introduced the concept of protocol as a technical term for the scientific study of documents in 1863. The protocol of a document cites the name, date, and place and thereby contextualizes the proper legal procedure which is fixed in the document itself. One is thus able to distinguish between an initial and final protocol.<sup>4</sup> Thirdly, a further meaning of protocol pertains to the full range of all rules governing diplomatic activity. This variant was developed only at a later period, namely, at the end of the 18th century and was borrowed from the French language.

### **The History of the Concept of Protocol, Told in Nebulous Outline**

Every concept has its own history. It develops in different languages in different ways, at various speeds, and with various meanings. Since concepts are themselves contingent, historical constructions whose usage changes within different cultures and over the centuries, an attempt will be made to provide an initial outline sketch and fragments of a conceptual history of the protocol in the following.

The concept of *protocol* is borrowed from the Middle Latin *protocollum* which, in turn, is a borrowing from the Middle Greek *protokollon*. The word is composed of the concept *protos*, the first, and *kolla*, paste or glue. A protocol is thus "the first pasted" or "pre-pasted." In Byzantium, the concept initially designated the sheets pasted to the beginning of a papyrus scroll (*rotuli*) or note, on which was recorded the production of the papyrus and the name of the court official who held office at the time, the *comes sacrarum largitionum*.<sup>5</sup> Today, the concept one would use for this function would be *metadata*. The concept was then adopted by Middle Latin legal and administrative language from the Greek and, in the context of the Roman legal system, was taken up at different periods by different European languages.

### Protocols of the Roman Senate

250 The oldest protocols of Roman antiquity, handed down in the form of inscriptions though no longer themselves remaining, derive from the deliberations, resolutions, and worship by priest seminaries (17 BC and 204 AD). Documentary evidence also exists testifying to the fact that the sessions in the Roman Senate were also recorded in protocols. Since the First Consulate of Gaius Julius Caesar, these semi private recordings were initially prepared by official scribes (*exceptores*), who then summarized the comprehensive protocols (*acta*) in books and filed them in archives which were then publicly accessible. Certified copies of these protocols possessed the value of an official document.<sup>6</sup> During the post-classical period, protocols formed an important, constituent part of the public system of documentation in state and commune. State departments were, like the Senate, authorized to draft protocols which possessed the status of an official document.

### Protocols in the Middle Ages

During the Middle Ages, the concept of the protocol also designated, among others, a register in which the notaries recorded the names of their clients. There exist various early indications for the use of protocols. Thus, for example, the Carolingian Capitularis of the *Count's Tribunal/Grafengericht* made a provision for the proceedings to be protocolled by an official scribe (*cancellarius* or *notarius*).<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 conclusively determined that at court

hearings of the church a notary or an officially inaugurated scribe should be present for protocolling the proceedings.

It was from this context that there developed the general legal custom of maintaining a register in which the notaries indexed the written copy of their files concerning the public activities of a community or business. Walther von Wartburg identified the concept of protocol in French as early as 1296 as an *acte d'un précédent notaire* or as a *minute d'un acte*, as an original or written copy of a proceeding (1335).<sup>8</sup>

### Early Dictionaries of the 15th Century

In the earliest vocabularies of the late 15th century, the emergence of the concept of protocol is more the exception than the rule. And yet there were already several dictionaries in which it appears. Here, above all, a first recording, written note or copy was specified. Thus, for example, an anonymous *vocabularium* from the year 1472 reads:

*Protocol: A document or the copy of a will.*<sup>9</sup>

A similar meaning was formulated in a *vocabularium* in Strassburg around 1483:

*Protocol: A document or a copy.*<sup>10</sup>

The anonymous *vocabularium scripturarum fidelibus* of 1477 states as follows:

*Protocol: A document of which one makes a copy.*<sup>11</sup>

Here, the central meaning lies in the aspect of recording, and noting down or of transcription and copy. The protocol is a transcription or a copy. Nothing is yet mentioned about the official certification, the authenticity or the truth-content of such a transcription. Clearly, at the time this aspect was unproblematic or uncontroversial. It only began to be discussed with any degree of thoroughness at a much later date, namely in the 18th century. In Johannes Reuchlin's *Vocabularius breviloquus* of 1482, by contrast, a relatively comprehensive definition is to be found:

*A protocol is an abbreviated piece of writing about some or the other object which is recorded prior to the production of an official document. It is derived from "prothos," which means the first, and from "collum," because such a piece of writing is first attached to the front of such a document. And later one understood by it a presentation. One also referred to it as a slip of note paper.<sup>12</sup>*

In the Latin-Catalan dictionary from 1507 by Elio Antonio de Nebrija and Gabriel Busa, the definition is found:

*Protocolum. [...] lo armari del notari.<sup>13</sup>*

In the 16th century, further differentiations were made to the meaning of protocol. In the 1596 *Dictionarium Latinogermanicum* by Petrus Dasy-podius, the protocol was defined as a first, provisional recording:

*Protocollum, ge. li. The first recording.<sup>14</sup>*

The aspect of a first or preliminary recording also played a role in the second edition of John Florio's *World of Words* which, among others, was published in 1611 under the somewhat deviating title *Queen Anna's New Worlde of Worlds*:

*Protocóllo, any thing first made and needing correction. Also a booke wherein Scriueners register their writings, and Lawyers their cases.<sup>15</sup>*

However, at this point an additional specification of the context now begins to play a role, namely the milieu of the scribes and lawyers.

### **The Protocol in the 17th Century**

Most encyclopaedia and dictionaries of the 17th century emphasise the role of the protocol during negotiation. Thus, in the 1609 *Lexicon tri-lingue* by Robert Stephan of Strassburg we read:

*Protocolum, [...] A protocol [that is] a brief recording of a negotiation | which one may describe afterwards at greater length.<sup>16</sup>*

This definition became one of the standard definitions, so-to-speak, of the 17th century. It is listed in many dictionaries in practically identical wording and is to be found almost throughout the entire century. A typical definition is that of Johannes Frisius's *Dictionarium bilinguae latino-germanicum et germano-latinum* from 1672:

*Protocollum, [...] A book in which transactions are briefly recorded.*<sup>17</sup>

The *Nouveau dictionnaire françois-aleman, et aleman-françois* from Geneva in 1683 also paraphrases transaction as:

*Protocolle, s m. Minute de Notaire, Protocoll, a brief draft of an introduction and description of a resolution of a transaction. Libellionis matrices tabulae.*

Noter au protocolle, *to draft something in brief* | *to record a protocol of the transaction* | *In primores tabulas referre.*

Extraire au protocolle, *from the protocol* | *to extract a commentary* | *Ex archetypo commentario exscribere.*<sup>18</sup>

In this case, on the one hand the aspect of the abbreviated, summarized recording of a transaction is thematized while, on the other, so is the aspect whereby a commentary or index could be extracted from an earlier original. An unusually comprehensive definition or paraphrase, which is only briefly cited here, found itself in an edition of the *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* by Ambrosius Calepinus (1435–1511) from the year 1627:

*Protocolum, [...] A protocol: is | a short commentary of a complete transaction | which one can later describe at greater length. [...] Proprie dicitur illud quod breviter & succincte à tabellione notatur, ut postea per otium quoties opus, latius possit extendi. [...]*<sup>19</sup>

### **The 18th Century or: The Truth-Claim of the Protocol**

In its various encyclopaedias, the 18th century had already taken up the contextual reference of the concept with respect to the court of law, to the statements of witnesses, to truth, and to credibility and authenticity. This is of interest in connection with the presentations of the later

Michel Foucault on questions of truth, credibility, of power, and self-discipline.<sup>20</sup> Thus, for example, in the first edition of Johann Hübner's *Reales Staats-, Zeitungs- und Conversationslexicon* from the year 1739 we read the following:

*Protocollum is a book of the court of law in which one records everything which is negotiated in a Collegio or court of law. The notarii publici also have their special protocolla in which they commonly enter all those proceedings which pertain to a court of law.*<sup>21</sup>

Here we note that the concept of free enterprise is narrowed down and specified to the negotiations of a court of law and the significance of protocols. This wording is retained in the first five editions until 1764 without any additional alterations. By contrast, volume 23 of the famous *Universallexikon* by Johann Heinrich Zedler from the year 1741 includes a particularly comprehensive article on the entry *Protocol* in which it is essentially the credibility and the truth-functions of a protocol that are discussed. Here, it is worth while taking a closer look from a Foucaultian perspective.

*Protocol, protocollum is much like a court book in which one records and enters everything which takes place and is transacted there such as are done by judges and notaries. What the word, in fact, refers to is πρωτον, the first page of a piece of writing, processes or some such files to which the others are attached with colla or paste because one was hitherto in the habit of pasting page to page and of rolling the files into scrolls (in Rotulos) – which the Moscovites continue to practice. The same protocols are now attributed full authenticity if they are exclusively kept by notaries in an orderly manner.*<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, the credibility of protocols is by no means self-evident but rather constructed and produced by means of special procedures. The protocol must fulfil certain conditions and possesses a special appearance for it to be authentic and credible.

*However, such a protocol only then has such a validity when it has been prepared in an orderly and fitting manner, with no crossings out and is*

*not written over with lines, when it is neither deficient nor in any way incomplete. [...] Since a protocol which has been inappropriately prepared has no credibility [...] And, as far as solemnity or the will of the parties involved is concerned, a disfigured or incomplete protocol loses all credibility, especially in disorderly or improperly written things [...] Indeed, an incomplete protocol in which, for the same reasons, the true opinion of the parties or other conditions concerning the court proceedings cannot be observed, is absolutely null and void, and is not a protocol, and is neither evidence which one may either leave as it is or more or less believe. [...]*<sup>23</sup>

Protocols of a court of law possess greater credibility than do other documents once they have been duly prepared by a notary of the court, if they do not contain crossings out and are not incomplete. The credibility of the document is transferred to the credibility of a professionally trained author legally prescribed by the state and his – neutral – position in the legal process with regard to the different parties.

*A protocol of a court of law also deserves greater estimation than does the adverse affirmation in a decree or legal proceedings [...] only if the protocol has been completely prepared by a legal notary in a proper and more deserved manner and is thus whole: since if a part of it is disfigured and is without its necessary pieces because the party's notary had incompletely composed the assertions, nor properly identified their opinions or was mistaken in perception, one thereupon rather insists on the statements of the other members of the court and their substantiations all the more so if there are more that claim the opposite until something other is proved [...].*<sup>24</sup>

However, a transcript or copy no longer possesses the same authenticity or credibility as the original.

*The copy of a legal protocol, if it is the same age, does not fully possess the force of evidence [...] thus, the extended protocol also loses its credibility if it does not conform to the protocol in every way [...] This is because the protocol possesses a greater credibility than does that which is a copy of the same or is otherwise issued; hence, it is rather the protocol than the transcript from which it is derived that is believed in adversity [...]*<sup>25</sup>

In the French pendant to Johann Heinrich Zedler's *Universal-Lexicon*, the *Encyclopedia* of Denis Diderot and Jean LeRond d'Alembert, by contrast, an entirely different argument is put forward. In this case, the aspect of the credibility and authenticity of protocols is not considered so important or prominent.<sup>26</sup>

Similarly, during the same century in France and clearly for the first time, there emerged a context of meaning for the diplomatic protocol. In the *Dictionnaire universel* by Antoine Furétiere, from the year 1708, and practically identical with the so-called *Dictionnaire de Trevoux*<sup>27</sup> of 1732 we read:

*Protocolle, est aussi en usage chez les Ambassadeurs Mediateurs, & signifie le Registre où ils couchent tout ce qui se passe, & qui regarde leur Mediation.*<sup>28</sup>

This meaning, based on that of Walther von Wartburg, was apparently prepared at the beginning of the 17th century since the *Thresor de la langue francoyse* by Jean Nicot (1606) in French language. Here we read:

*recueil de formules en usage pour la correspondance officielle ou privée, selon la hiérarchie sociale des correspondants.*<sup>29</sup>

What is interesting in this connection is that protocol is now understood as a collection of formulas which express the private or official correspondence or social hierarchy of those persons corresponding. Here, the nucleus for a principle of rules is set down which describes communicative forms of expression and behavioral attitudes. Considered as a negative dialectic, this naturally means that one requires a protocol in intercultural exchange since it is no longer self-evident that foreigners will understand one another. Thus, the protocol, as a collection of behavioral formulas, only makes sense against the background of a differentiated society which knows the concept of the foreign and, in times of greater mobility, is also familiar with travel and social exchange beyond the borders of European countries and which also requires a minimum of mutual behavioral forms for intercultural com-

munication.<sup>30</sup> What this also means is that these self-evident mutual behavioral formulas no longer exist.

### Protocols in the 19th Century

From the point of view of the history of learning, it is always the moment at which a certain concept was introduced into popular dictionaries or encyclopaedias that is of special interest. In principle, this means that a certain concept has suddenly become significant in society, that it plays a role in everyday language, that it is applied and used and yet is still new and uncommon, and that for this reason it appears in the newest edition of a dictionary or is included and explained in its supplementary volume. Hence, let us take a closer look at when the concept of protocol is included in the *Brockhaus Conversations-Lexicon* and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. As we have seen in the foregoing passages, the listing of the concept of protocol in dictionaries and lexica is inconsistent and sporadic. In the popular and widely distributed lexica by Johann Hübner and Johann Heinrich Zedler, the concept makes an appearance long before the French Revolution in the first half of the 18th century.

It is certainly all the more astounding that the substantial lexica editions by David Arnold Brockhaus in Leipzig and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in Edinburgh appear not to have initially acknowledged the concept of protocol. The earliest, six-volume edition by David Arnold Brockhaus, which was begun in 1796 and brought to completion in 1808, bore the emphatic title *Conversations-Lexicon with Especial Regard to the Present Day*. Only in the fifth, 10-volume edition from 1820 does it make an appearance for the first time. Here it is defined in the following way:

*Protocol: a written composition which serves as a more detailed statement and certification of a judicial hearing. Hence, protocols comprise the statements of a person summoned for questioning, concerning an announcement which has been made, about the deliberations of an assembly concerning official affairs etc.*<sup>31</sup>

This text remained unaltered and was adopted in various editions, impressions and supplementary volumes in the following years until 1826.

The text was slightly changed in the seventh edition of 12 volumes of the year 1827. What was added, namely, was the indication of the French usage of correspondence and behavioral formulas in which a protocol designates the fixed procedure of a court hearing.

*Protocol: a committing to writing or written record of any form of negotiation. Protocols are thus made about the statements of a person summoned for questioning, about an announcement, about the deliberations of an assembly concerning official affairs. In France, by protocol one designates the formula according to which a negotiation is structured.*<sup>32</sup>

The definition of the concept of protocol was also comprehensively included in the ambitious, 33-volume *German Dictionary* by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm published in Leipzig in 1854:

258 *protocollum* (DIEF. 468a), Mid.Greek. *πρωτοκολλον*, originally the designation of the sheet pasted to the beginning of a papyrus scroll used by the Byzantines (Greek *κολλα*, glue), which must note under which imperial treasurer and by whom the papyrus was prepared (DIEZ 4 258), then that of the notary and court files attached to the chronological content of the title page, that from which the significance of a notarial document and the proceedings of a court of law are indexed in chronological order have been developed; thus, initially the notarial and court protocol (HAYME jurist. lex. 746. 239) in a criminal trial and also the interrogation protocol in a broad sense, then the business-like written recording of official negotiations, sessions, conferences (session, chamber protocol etc) vide HOLTZENDORFF *rechtslex.* 2, 299 et seq and, finally, a general chronological index...<sup>33</sup>

In the Grimm definition, the two most important contexts of the legal system and chronological recording are cited. However, the diplomatic context of use is suppressed. One has the impression that the French Revolution not only represents an epoch but also a language barrier and that the rich tradition of the 18th century is oddly no longer available to the 19th century editors of lexicæ. In terms of content, the definitions of Brockhaus and Grimm fall way below the lexicographic standards and sophistication which had been previously achieved in the early 18th century.

Similar omissions may be observed in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In this case, the fact that the concept of protocol finds absolutely no mention is even more astonishing. From the first edition of 1771 until the 10th edition, which appeared in the years 1902 and 1903, the concept was entirely missing for a period of 131 years. Only in the 11th edition from the years 1910 and 1911 does the concept appear for the first time which, from the point of view of lexicography, is somewhat late.<sup>34</sup> Many protocols in the English-speaking cultures of the 19th century play no role whatsoever or else are considered too self-evident as to warrant writing anything about them? Is it that protocols only become an important social phenomenon in the English-speaking cultures at the beginning of the 20th century?

### **Contemporary Usages of the Concept of the Protocol**

The emergence of cybernetics and the internet in the second half of the 20th century have especially contributed to substantial changes to the concept of protocol. For this reason, it is interesting to note how protocols are defined and understood in our society today. Especially helpful in this respect is a search for a definition through the search engine Google.<sup>35</sup> If one analyzes in greater detail the definitions provided, one discovers that the attempt is repeatedly made to define a protocol as a collection of rules according to which a communication situation is managed. The aspect of collection, the regulation and the management of processes of communication, the flow of information in a communication system are unambiguously in the foreground in the present day usage of the concept. Today, protocols are frequently understood as a principle of regulations or agreements which manage the flow of information within a communication system.<sup>36</sup> This meaning has also meanwhile been extended to a collection of rules for the formats and types of transmission between different computer systems.<sup>37</sup>

The successful communication between different computers in a network has become an increasingly important aspect in the use of protocols since the mid-nineteen-nineties. For the approximately 500 network protocols which we presently use in the communication between networked computers, there are basically four different levels in which the single protocols function: the network accessing level, the internet level,

the transport level, and the application level. Thus, *network access protocols* such as PPP (Point to Point Protocol), CSMA/CD or WLAN can be distinguished from *internet protocols* such as IP (Internet Protocol), ICMP (Internet Control Message Protocol), ARP (Address Resolution Protocol), from *transport protocols* such as TCP (Transmission Control Protocol), UDP (User Datagram Protocol) or SCTP (Stream Control Transmission Protocol) and from *application protocols* such as HTTP, FTP, POP3, SMTP, TELNET, NEWS, IRC.

### What Have Lexicons Ignored?

Should we at this point return to the beginning of our argument and recall our idealist-nominalist position concerning the nature of knowledge, then the interpretation of this knowledge with a number of system-theoretical or constructivist arguments now suggests itself. Protocols are always generated from the position of an internal observer who is himself directly present during the protocolling of an event. They are recordings by an observer and thus, at the same time, interpretations of reality. A protocol always has two sides. By means of its description and documentation it thereby makes an actual event observable to the outside world. And yet, precisely in doing so, it makes something else disappear: namely that which has not been recorded. A protocol distinguishes itself both by what has been recorded in the protocol as well as by that which has not been recorded, that which has been left out, suppressed, and thereby ultimately been made unobservable.

Furthermore, the concept of the protocol only makes sense when set against the background of an archive in which protocols can be introduced, in which they are recorded and from which they can be drawn on and remembered when required. In this sense, protocols are a repository of social memory in which a society records and archives the truth-content of its events. Protocols are thus forms or media of a collective memory.<sup>38</sup> Without archiving and public access, without a coded, mutually shared consensual credibility, a protocol is not a protocol but a mere piece of paper. For a written piece of paper or an electronic file to become a protocol, numerous anchoring procedures of credibility, truth, and authenticity are necessary:

First: Protocols require a neutral, trained person (a clerk, protocolist or notary), specially trained in the highly conventionalized, coded form of composing protocols which can also be commissioned by the law.

Second: Reference to the actually completed or yet to be completed event, which can be credibly documented with the help of a protocol (place, time, persons present, and accredited author/official). The protocol is a document of the protocoled or documented process. Every protocol is, thus, a document, though not every document is a protocol.

Third: The truth-claim is authorised by the signature of the author and/or other witnesses present during the events which are being protocoled, which are intended to secure the social acceptance of the wording of the true documentation of the event.

Linguistic memory began very early, namely with the first recordings of the early Sumeric protocols in cuneiform writing and on clay plaques around approximately 3100 BC in the city of Uruk, in southern Iraq. As a highly conventionalized medium of collective memory, the protocol is as old as writing itself. Protocols stand in the closest and most direct relationship to the invention of the codified system of recording, such as numeric signs, signs for objects and systems of notation for crops, goats or bread. This is genuinely astonishing. The Sumeric clay plaques contain both the name of the writer who recorded the administrative file as well as the name of an additionally accredited official. The mistrust towards the truth-content of a recording was thus already evoked practically at the birth of the writing and in conjunction with the technique of recording.<sup>39</sup> Frequently, there are double and threefold copies of the same occurrence. Therefore, without the invention of mistrust, of suspicion and bureaucracy, the invention of writing and the protocol would not be complete. One could almost say that the reason for inventing writing and the protocol is mistrust.

- 1 Cf. John Austin: *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1962.
- 2 Michael Niehaus/Hans-Walther Schmidt-Hannisa (ed.): *Das Protokoll. Kulturelle Funktionen einer Textsorte*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang 2005
- 3 B. Roll: *Protokoll*; in: Gerd Ueding (ed.): *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol.7, Tübingen: Niemeyer 2005, col. 374 et seq.
- 4 *Ibid.*, col. 372.
- 5 *Ibid.*, col. 371.
- 6 *Ibid.*, col. 373.
- 7 *Ibid.*, col. 373.
- 8 Walther von Wartburg: *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*. Basel: R.G. Zbinden & Co., 1958, vol. 9, p.480.
- 9 *Vocabularium ex quo ...*, Eitville: Nicolaus Bechtermünze 12th March 1472: "Protocollu[m] exemplare scriptu[m] u[ide]i[ci]et] eyn copie testam[ent]to."
- 10 *Ex quo vocabulario varii autentici videlicet huguitio katholicon breuiloqus papias*, Strasbourg: Georg Husner, [prior to 1483]: "Protocollu[m] exemplare scriptu[m] oder ein copie."
- 11 *Vocabularium scripturarum fidelibus*, Blaubeuren: Conrad Mancz, ca. 1477: "Protho collu[m] [...] geschriff die man abschrybt."
- 12 Johannes Reuchlin: *Vocabularius breuiloquus*. Lyon: Petrus Ungarus 1482, p. 384: "Protocollu[m]. li. est abbreviata scriptura de aliquo c[on]tracta an[te]q[uam] charta fiat. Et d[icitu]r a p[ro]thos q[uo]d est p[ri]mu[m]. Et collu[m]. q[ui]a in collis chartha[rum] p[ri]mo loco fiebat talis scriptura. Et postea habebat[ur] pro exemplari. Eadem et sceda d[icitu]r." In this connection, my special thanks go to Dr. Sven Limbeck from the Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, who assisted me in finding a solution for the abbreviations and in the translation of this passage.
- 13 *Vocabularius Aelii antonii nebrissensis*, Barcelona: Carles Amoros 1507, p. 126.
- 14 Petrus Dasypodius: *Dictionarium Latinogermanicum et vice versa Germanicolatinum*, Strasbourg: Theodosius Rihelius 1596, fol. D v 4 verso.
- 15 John Florio: *Queen Anna's New World of Words, or Dictionarie of the Italian and English*. London: Melchior Bradwood 1611, p. 407.
- 16 *Lexicon trilingue ex thesauro Roberti Stephani ...*, Strasbourg 1609, fol. LLI iij recto.
- 17 Johannes Frisius: *Dictionarium bilinguae latino-germanicum et germanolatinum*, Tiguri [Zurich]: Ex Typographeo Bodmeriano 1672, p.434.
- 18 *Nouveau dictionnaire francois-aleman, et aleman-francois, qu'accompagne le Latin, ...* Geneva 1683, p. 1144.
- 19 Ambrosius Calepinus: *Dictionarium undecim linguarum*, Basileae: apud Henricpetrinos 1627, p.1181.
- 20 Michel Foucault: *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press 1998; Michel Foucault: *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: *Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books 1990.
- 21 Johann Hübner: *Reales Staats-, Zeitungs- und Conversationslexicon*, Leipzig: Gleditsch 1739, col. 1512.
- 22 Johann Heinrich Zedler: *Großes vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*. Halle and Leipzig, vol. 23, 1741, col. 973.
- 23 *Ibid.*
- 24 *Ibid.*, col. 974.
- 25 *Ibid.*
- 26 Diderot, Denis/Jean LeRond d'Alembert (ed.): *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Sciences des Artes et des Métiers ...*, vol. 13, Paris 1765, p. 507.
- 27 *Dictionnaire universel francois et latin, vulgairement appellé Dictionnaire de Trevoux*. A Paris Chez Pierre Husson [et al] 1732, vol. 4, col. 1147
- 28 Antoine Furétiere: *Dictionnaire universel contenant généralement tous les*

mots francais .... A Rotterdam Chez Reinier Leers 1708, vol. 3, fol. Aaa3, 2 verso.

**29** Quoted by Walther von Wartburg: *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. A presentation of the Gallo-Roman fund of language. Basel: R.G. Zbinden & Co., 1958, vol. 9, p. 480. In the source cited by Wartburg (Jean Nicot: *Thresor de la langue francoyse, tant ancienne que moderne*. A Paris Chez David Dovcevr 1606, p. 522) the quote unfortunately cannot be found.

**30** This can be seen by the sudden appearance of travel guides and travel descriptions, especially in English language literature of the early 17th century.

**31** *Allgemeine deutsche Real-Encyclopädie für die gebildeten Stände. Conversations-Lexicon in zehn Bänden*. Fifth original edition. Leipzig: Brockhaus 1820, vol. 7, p. 872. The same wording is to be found in: *Supplementen zum Conversations-Lexicon für die Besitzer der ersten, zweiten, dritten und vierten Auflage*. Leipzig: Brockhaus 1820, p. 580.

**32** *Allgemeine deutsche Real-Encyklopädie für die gebildeten Stände. Conversations-Lexikon in zwölf Bänden*. Seventh edition, vol. 8, Leipzig: Brockhaus 1827, p. 912.

**33** Jacob Grimm/Wilhelm Grimm: *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig: Hirzel 1854, vol. 13, col. 2176.

**34** *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information*. Eleventh edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1911, vol. XXII, p. 476.

**35** [www.google.de](http://www.google.de), define: Protokoll, 7th July 2006.

**36** [www.akbs.de/glossar\\_p.html](http://www.akbs.de/glossar_p.html); 9th July 2006 or also [www.linuxfibel.de/glossar.htm](http://www.linuxfibel.de/glossar.htm); 9th July 2006.

**37** [www.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/library/search/dictionary/reg-p.htm](http://www.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/library/search/dictionary/reg-p.htm), , 7th July 2006.

**38** Aleida Assmann: *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Munich: C.H. Beck Verlag 1999; Maurice Halbwachs: *Das kollektive*

*Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1985.

**39** Here, one could almost start with the historical beginning of the sub-media space of suspicion, as developed by Boris Groys, particularly in view of the 20th century. Boris Groys: *Unter Verdacht. Eine Phänomenologie der Medien*. Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag 2000.