



THE 12TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

Interdisciplinary Dimensions of Communication Science

On the Necessity of Free Speech in Science

Cristinel Munteanu¹

Abstract: In this paper we aim at developing, through both John Dewey and R.G. Collingwood's work, one of Eugenio Coseriu's ideas regarding the necessity of free speech in science. In order to adequately approach such a problem, I thought it proper to refer, first of all, to the relation between thought and speech and afterwards to the relation between the freedom of thought and freedom of speech. John Dewey accurately demonstrates that there is no authentic freedom of thought in the absence of freedom of speech. Expression as such is necessary, since, on the one hand, in order for us to clarify our own ideas, we have to verbalize them (either in an oral or written form); on the other hand, we have to communicate them to the others, to deliver them to the public debate, with a view to verifying the accuracy of these ideas, so as to correct, confirm or reject them, etc. (When dealing with aesthetic issues, Collingwood has the same opinion.) Starting from the way Dewey discussed about the relation between intuition and expression, Coseriu refers in a similar manner to the relation between theory and inquiry of facts (as it happens in linguistics, for instance).

Keywords: John Dewey; R.G. Collingwood; Eugenio Coseriu; freedom of speech; freedom of thought; intuition; expression

1. In an ample interview, given in Romanian, Eugenio Coseriu refers to an ethical issue of science which he exposes as follows: "The professional duty of the one who knows something and who had some (scientific) information is to pass it to everybody. Keeping a piece of information to oneself, so as not to be found by one's colleague, is not appropriate. (...) The man of culture, who has to be a moral being, fully aware of the moral of culture, would immediately inform the others. He would say: «Here is what I found. New ideas. Here it is! Read it! We will immediately multiply it, so that everybody can read it». This is how I would do it, for example. (...) Especially when the information is scarce. Ideas are not lost when shared. *Science is a form of communication.* If I have an idea and I share it with you, it is not the same as giving you 100 lei and no longer having it." (Coseriu, 2004, p. 61).

1.1. Where does the morality of such an attitude stem from, or, better said, what exactly justifies the necessity to adopt such ethical behaviour? I assume there is no deontological code to include the following rule: *Scientists are obliged to share the others the valuable ideas which they acquired as a result of their own study or from other sources.* One could say, for example: "Well, on the one hand, I am in competition with others, and on the other hand, I do not trust the morality of some of my colleagues (What if they steal my ideas?)... By no means should I share the important thoughts that trouble me to the others, before publishing them in a book or an article!"

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Danubius University of Galati, Faculty of Communication and International Relations, Address: 3 Galati Boulevard, 800654 Galati, Romania, Tel.: +40.372.361.102, fax: +40.372.361.290, Corresponding author: cristinel.munteanu@univ-danubius.ro.

1.2. Could this be interpreted as naivety on Coseriu's part? I doubt it. There is an ethics of science that does not need to be recorded or legislated in any way, since, as it happens in other cases, as well, it stems from the intrinsic, normal nature of cultural activities. I think that the principle formulated by Coseriu is related to the necessity of expression (as well as of its freedom), obligatorily correlated with the necessity of freedom of thought, when it comes to science and philosophy, but not only. I will try, in what follows, to clarify and develop this point of view by referring to both John Dewey and R.G. Collingwood's theory.

2. In his book, *Freedom and Culture*, Dewey states that, in some persons' case, scientific ethics has developed to such an extent that it is absolutely normal for them to share the discoveries made by them to other specialists from the same field of research (Dewey, 1989a, p. 116). However, as the American philosopher remarks, such a responsible attitude is not widespread enough, due to some internal and external circumstances which have influenced the development of modern science: on the one hand, the deliberate withdrawal of scientists from society in order to preserve the purity of science, defending it from practical needs; on the other hand, the persecutions (coming from Inquisition, dictatorships, etc.) which prevented them from freely performing their activity. (Dewey, 1989a, pp. 116-117)

2.1. Here is a self-evident quotation, in which John Dewey refers to these issues, fighting against certain prejudices and, at the same time, supporting the necessity of free speech: "It has often been assumed that freedom of speech, oral and written, is independent of freedom of thought, and that you cannot take the latter away in any case, since it goes on inside of minds where it cannot be got at. No idea could be more mistaken. Expression of ideas in communication is one of the indispensable conditions of the awakening of thought not only in others, but in ourselves. If ideas when aroused cannot be communicated they either fade away or become warped and morbid. The open air of public discussion and communication is an indispensable condition of the birth of ideas and knowledge and of other growth into health and vigor." (Dewey, 1963, p. 297) Dewey deals with two aspects here: (1) on the one hand, in order to clarify our own ideas to ourselves, we have to verbalize them (either in writing or orally), (2) on the other hand, with a view to verifying the accuracy of these ideas, in order to correct, nuance or confirm them, we have to communicate them to the others as well, we have to entrust them to public debate.¹

2.1.1. Let us observe, first of all, that the irrepressible necessity of verbalizing our thoughts, with a view to make them clearer than they are inside our mind, is felt by simple speakers, as well. Otto Jespersen, a famous Danish linguist, provides some examples to illustrate the feminine verbal volubility. Jespersen is slightly ironic in his comments, but, in my opinion, many of the quotations provided are worth being taken more seriously: "A woman's thought is no sooner formed than uttered. Says Rosalind, «Do you know I am a woman? When I think, I must speak» (*As You Like It*, III. 2. 264). And in a modern novel a young girl says: «I talk so as to find out what I think. Don't you? Some things one can't judge of till one hears them spoken» (Housman, *John of Jingo*, 346)." (Jespersen, 1964, p. 253)

¹ In Albert Einstein's case, probably due to his particular field of investigation, the first phase seems to involve a rather nonverbal semiosis (as Thomas A. Sebeok rightly remarks): "It would be well to recall that Einstein originally constructed his model of the universe out of nonverbal signs, «of visual and some of muscular type». As he wrote to a colleague in 1945: «The words or the language, as they are written or spoken, do not seem to play any role in my mechanism of thought. The psychological entities which seem to serve as elements in thought are certain signs and more or less clear images which can be "voluntarily" reproduced and combined». Later, «only in a secondary stage», after long and hard labour to transmute his nonverbal construct into «conventional words and other signs», was he able to communicate it to others." (Sebeok, 2001, p. 23).

2.1.2. Even the ancient Latin formula (frequently mentioned in the didactic literature), *docendo discitur*, refers, in fact, to the same thing: while teaching the others, you teach yourself (not only due to the fact that you have to prepare better, as a teacher, but also, because, by teaching, by speaking to the others, you get to master that specific subject).

2.1.3. Obviously, the relation between thought and speech is not one of equality (from a quantitative point of view). One may start from the premise that people should think more and speak less. Thus, the Romanian folk wisdom coined the phrase “*ce-i în gușă, și-n căpușă*” (literally: “what is in the crop is also in the tick”), which characterizes the sincere people, who say exactly what they think. The characterization is certainly a pejorative one and it must have stemmed from the usual life experience (it is not recommended to always say what you think), and not out of intuition or of a politician’s ability (according to Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand, language is meant to hide our thoughts, not to reveal them).

2.2. The same necessity to express thoughts and interior images is true for artists, as well. In Coseriu’s philosophy of language, art, unlike language, is not characterized by that universal called (by A. Pagliaro) *alterity*. An artist does not need the other people’s approval for the works he creates. On the other hand, the same artist feels the urge to express himself (by using a certain substance), because only in this way can he clarify himself the “artistic” content of his conscience.

This thing is held with relevant arguments by R.G. Collingwood, an important British philosopher. Even if he does not use a certain term to designate either «alterity» or its absence from the work of art, he explains very well how the communication between the artist and his public/audience takes place: “If what he wishes to do is to express his emotions intelligibly, he has to express them in such a way as to be intelligibly to himself; his audience is then in the position of persons who overhear him doing this. Thus the stimulus-and-reaction terminology has no applicability to the situation.” (Collingwood, 1958, p. 111) Thus, the receptors turn into some persons who “eavesdrop”. Collingwood resumes the matter later on, also mentioning the idea of an identity between art and language: “For *art*, on this theory, *is the expression of emotions, or language* (my emphasis, Cr.M.). Now language as such is not necessarily addressed to anyone. The artist as such, therefore, is a person who talks or expresses himself, and his expression in no way depends upon or demands the co-operation of an audience.” (Collingwood, 1958, p. 300)

If art is an internal form of consciousness, how come the artist feels the urge to communicate his experience to other people, as well? (“It seems to be a normal part of the artist’s work that he should communicate his experience to other people”. (Collingwood, 1958, p. 300) Why does he “pour” it into a concrete substance (in “something bodily and perceptible”)? Because this thing is also part of the artistic process: “...a good painter – any good painter will tell you the same – paints things because until he has painted them he doesn’t know what they are like” (Collingwood, 1958, p. 304).

Collingwood permanently points to the difference between authentic art and art as “craft”, aimed at entertainment, naming “technical theory” any approach targeted at the latter. That is why an artist keen on true art must not look for the public’s approval in what he does: “An artist need not be a slave to the technical theory, in order to feel that his audience’s approbation is relevant to the question whether he

has done his work well or ill.” (Collingwood, 1958, p. 313); and this, despite the fact that “every artist knows that publication of some kind is a necessity to him.” (Collingwood, 1958, p. 313)¹

3. Coming back to John Dewey, I find captivating those places in his work in which he discusses about that phase (specific to those times of revolution in science), subject to a kind of unutterability, in which some ideas, some meanings, are only glimpsed, when the speech proper cannot be expressed fully, not even for the one who thinks them: “There is a peculiar intrinsic privacy and incommunicability attending the preparatory intermediate stage. When an old essence or meaning is in process of dissolution and a new one has not taken shape even as a hypothetical scheme, the intervening existence is too fluid and formless for publication, even to one’s self. (...) This process of flux and ineffability is intrinsic to any thought which is subjective and private.” (Dewey, 1958, p. 221)

3.1. Dewey is mainly interested in those thoughts which lead to a change of perspective in science (a “change of paradigm”, as we would call it today), such as, for example, the case of the scientific and philosophical revolution caused by Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859): “There is a difference in kind between the thought which manipulates received objects and essences to derive new ones from their relations and implications, and the thought which generates a new method of observing and classifying them. It is like the difference between readjusting the parts of a wagon to make it more efficient, and the invention of the steam locomotive. One is formal and additive; the other is qualitative and transformative.” (Dewey, 1958, p. 222)

3.2. Referring to freedom of thinking, Dewey draws attention to a common error, which probably comes from the individualist psychology, namely considering that thought is “a native capacity or faculty; all it needs to operate is an outer chance” (Dewey, 1963, p. 296). This mistake was, in fact, promoted by liberalism, as well: “It has been assumed, in accord with the whole theory of Liberalism, that all that is necessary to secure freedom of thought and expression is removal of external impediments; take away artificial obstructions and thought will operate.” (Dewey, 1963, p. 296)

Dewey is even clearer elsewhere: “He knows little who supposes that freedom of thought is ensured by relaxation of conventions, censorship and intolerant dogmas. The relaxation supplies opportunity. But while it is a necessary it is not a sufficient condition. Freedom of thought denotes freedom of thinking; specific doubting, inquiring, suspense, creating and cultivating of tentative hypotheses, trials or experimentings that are unguaranteed and that involve risks of waste, loss, and error.” (Dewey, 1958, p. 222)² In fact, another way of expression or, better, of exteriorization (since it is not only about verbal communication, this time) is putting ideas into practice, applying them, verifying hypotheses, etc. However, this form of exteriorization of the content of consciousness needs a certain kind of freedom, as well.³

¹ As Coseriu puts it, “there is an ethics of art, which implies, among other things, not to make any allowances out of reasons external to the artistic intuition and to create art as it should be created, which, in fact, is understood by any valuable artist, since he considers himself as a universal subject, who paints the way he should do it and who says: «This is how you do it!» and not «I paint this way because I am required this by the ones who pay me» - for example - or «This is what I am asked by the ones I need to flatter in order to gain a certain status in society» etc.” (Coşeriu, 1994, p. 165)

² When it comes to politics (or to the theory of politics), the problem of communication, of public debate proves to be even more necessary: “Reference to the place of individual thought in political theory and practice has another value. Unless subjective intents and thoughts are to terminate in picturesque utopias or dogmas irrelevant to constructive action, they are subject to objective requirements and tests.” (Dewey, 1958, pp. 220-221).

³ Dewey explains in his article *Philosophy*, published in 1934, how the freedom of speech of Ancient Greeks was possible: “Greece was distinguished from other ancient civilizations in that priests lacked political authority, having indeed become subordinate civic officers. Equally important was the fact that religious beliefs were early set forth in literature of great artistic

Knowing social phenomena is equally dependent on communication or dissemination, since only by sharing can such knowledge be obtained or tested. However, dissemination is not spreading information at random: “Seeds are sown, not by virtue of being thrown out at random, but by being so distributed as to take root and have a chance of growth. Communication of the results of social inquiry is the same thing as the formation of public opinion.” (Dewey, 1954, p. 177)

3.3. The idea of *alterity* “otherness” (in Coseriu’s terms; see above 2.2.; also cf. Munteanu, 2015), in relation with individual experience and freedom of speech, is excellently grasped by Dewey in the following fragment: “The experience has to be formulated in order to be communicated. To formulate requires getting outside of it, seeing it as another would see it, considering what points of contact it has with the life of another so that it may be got into such form than he can appreciate its meaning. Except in dealing with commonplaces and catch phrases one has to assimilate, imaginatively, something of another’s experience in order to tell him intelligently of one’s own experience.” (Dewey, 2004, pp. 5-6)

In fact, communication, fulfilled in its most elevated form, seems to manifest itself (according to Dewey) within true friendship. The way in which Dewey describes friendship evokes an old definition of it (attributed to Aristotle, for whom a friend is a soul living in two bodies), but the characterization made by Dewey is worth mentioning here for its beauty: “Friendship and intimate affection are not the result of information about another person even though knowledge may further their formation. But it does so only as it becomes an integral part of sympathy through the imagination. It is when the desires and aims, the interests and modes of response of another become an expansion of our own being that we understand him. We learn to see with his eyes, hear with his ears, and their results give true instruction, for they are built into our own structure.” (Dewey, 2005, p. 350)

4. There are, however, other ideas in Dewey’s work that are worth being signaled and fructified. For example, Eugenio Coseriu remarks, with regard to art, the difference of opinion between B. Croce and J. Dewey: “The identity of intuition and expression, according to Croce, is, in reality, a dialectical identity, that is, when you create your work, this creation turns back to intuition. The same happens with work, it becomes better by means of these movements to creation and from creation, by modifying and clarifying the intuition one gets to a total identity. An American philosopher (=John Dewey) would observe that art as experience and as creation is not indifferent. Thus, work is not, as in the case of Croce, only an internal work, but it is mainly exteriorization, namely as exteriorization is fundamental and it seems that, in general, this materialization is fundamental for all sciences of culture. And it is also true that one chooses the material that is convenient to intuition.” (Coseriu, 2004, p. 40)

Coseriu loved Dewey’s idea,¹ according to which *expression* refines *intuition*, since – applying it to science – the latter confirmed Coseriu’s conception regarding the relation between *theory and investigation of facts*.² In the sciences of culture, we start from sound intuition (Husserl’s *Urwissen*; cf. Sp. *saber originario*), namely from unreflexive knowledge which, in time, gets to be reflexive, justified knowledge. When researching certain facts, we start from a theory which, during investigations, gets to be confirmed, corrected, nuanced, etc.

merit, never in the form of dogmas. The resulting intellectual freedom furnished the primary condition for the production of philosophy.” (Dewey, 1989b, p. 20).

¹ In fact, for Dewey, science is a work or product of art (Dewey, 1958, pp. 378-381).

² see (Kabatek & Murguía, 1997, pp. 144-145).

References

- Collingwood, R.G. (1958). *The Principles of Art*. London – Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coșeriu, Eugen (1994). *Prelegeri și conferințe (1992-1993)/Lectures and Conferences (1992-1993)*. Iași: Casa Dosoftei.
- Coșeriu, Eugeniu (2004). *Universul din scoică/The Universe in a Shell*. Chișinău: Editura Știința.
- Dewey, John (1954). *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Holt and Company.
- Dewey, John (1958). *Experience and Nature*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Dewey, John (1963). *Philosophy and Civilization*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Dewey, John (1989a). *Freedom and Culture*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Dewey, John (1989b). *The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 8: 1933, Essays and **How We Think**, Revised Edition*, Edited by Jo Ann Boydston, With and Introduction by Richard Rorty, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, John (2004). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Jespersen, Otto (1964). *Language. Its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Kabatek, Johannes; Murguía, Adolfo (1997). «Die Sachen sagen, wie sie sind...». *Eugenio Coseriu im Gespräch/«To Say Things as They Are...»*. Interviews with Eugenio Coseriu. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Munteanu, Cristinel (2015). John Dewey and Eugenio Coseriu on Creativity and Alterity in Language. Some Common Points. in Sanda-Maria Ardeleanu, Ioana-Crina Coroi, Dorel Fînaru (coord.), *Limbaje și Comunicare*, Volumul XIII, Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg, pp. 86-100.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. (2001). *Signs. An Introduction to Semiotics*. Second Edition. Toronto – Buffalo – London: University of Toronto Press.



THE 12TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

**Bread Crumbs Instead of Lead Bullets – The Duel
in the Journal *Furnica/The Ant***

Fănel Teodorașcu¹

Abstract: The Journal *Furnica/The Ant* was one of those magazines in Romania that mocked the duel in their pages. The editors of this publication claimed that the honor business is the business where the “witnesses have fun, drinking and eating at the expense of” those who are fighting a duel. The same editors believed that the interest in the affairs of honor was shown especially by those individuals who lack honor. Their assertions were reinforced by the fact that many of those who “went out on the site” to solve a “matter of honor” did everything possible to avoid a real confrontation. The research of the present work encompasses the analysis of 70 articles which were published between September 1904 and October 1930.

Keywords: the history of the press; the interwar period; the duel; the newspaper; the honor

1. Introduction

The *affair of honor* is the business where “witnesses have fun, drinking and eating on the count” of those who fight in the duel. Interest in *honest businesses* shows, in particular, those individuals who lack the honor. The conviction of those who turn to *the duel* is *that two shots changed without result* can bring the fame that formerly enjoyed only the Swordsman knights². That is what the editors of the Journal “*Furnica/The Ant*” wrote about *duel* and *those involved in a duel*.

As a news subject, the duel enjoyed the appreciation of Romanian newspaper and journal readers between the end of the 19th century and the years that marked the beginning of the Second World War. *Honorary affairs* articles involving more or less known people have led readers to think of “*knights of other times who defended their honor by holding the Gospel in one hand and the sword in the other.*” (Teodorașcu, 2016, p. 269) The great number of *duel* news from newspapers and magazines has eventually led readers to consider the fight of honor as trivial. (Teodorașcu, 2016, p. 278) Despite this, *the duel* continued to exist. Between November 1940 and January 1941, some church magazines in Transylvania commented in negative terms on Bucharest officials' decision to reintroduce the duel into military regulations and to set up a school for fencing in the capital of the country.

Furnica/The Ant was one of those magazines that laughed *the duel* on their pages. As is the case with publications of this type, the audience was divided into supporters and contestants. In the *history of the Romanian press from the first beginnings until 1916*, N. Iorga, the author of the research that gave the

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Danubius University of Galati, Faculty of Communication and International Relations, Address: 3 Galati Boulevard, 800654 Galati, Romania, Tel.: +40.372.361.102, Fax: +40.372.361.290, Corresponding author: teodorascul.fanel@univ-danubius.ro.

² Toate la un loc: zece minute de distracție americană/All together: ten minutes of American amusement. *Furnica/The Ant*, year XXV, no. 7, 12 August 1930, p. 7.

name of the volume, and C. Bacalbasa, who published a study on the Romanian press in the same volume, had different positions from the magazine analyzed in our paper.

While Iorga claimed that *Furnica/The Ant* was appreciated only for some time by *a superficial part of the Romanian society*, (Iorga, 1922, p. 160) Bacalbaşa said about the same publication that this was the first genuine humoristic journal in the Romanian press: leaving the old system of making a purely political opposition from a humorous newspaper; G.G. Ranetti and N.D. Taranu made a weekly newspaper with a varied content, with very little political matter. The attempt has succeeded as the newspaper has become popular and lives on.” (Bacalbasa, 1922, p. 185) Moreover, in the article-program, *Furnica/The Ant* promised readers that it would be a magazine that is for everybody¹.

2. Pro or Con?

In Romania, the fashion of the duel was brought by wealthy young people who, after completing their studies abroad, have kept the habits acquired in the years away from home. One of the most famous Romanian duels is the one in which George Emanoil Lahovary, the owner of *L'Indépendance Roumaine*, was killed by Nicolae Filipescu, a journalist and a politician. In most cases, the challenges of the duel arose because of either violent press articles or sharp talks in Parliament. (Teodoraşcu, 2016, p. 275)

In the opinion of some important people of those times, *the duel* was a *necessary evil*, which the man, as far as possible, had to avoid. C. G. Costa-Foru, a participant in several duels as both a duelist and a witness, claimed that if a man was to choose between *duel* and *shame*, the choice of the one in this situation must be the duel:

“Now, if you were to ask me:

- Are you *for or against* the duel?

I would answer you categorically:

I was for until I came to be against. And yet, even today, if I needed it, I am ready, at any time, to prove that I cherish more honor than life and that I am happy to sacrifice it for a faith, or for an idea, either in a duel or otherwise.

When it comes to balance, which places people to choose between living a villain or shame, proving that he prefers the death of wickedness, then only the duel becomes an honorable solution.” (Costa-Foru, 1937, p. 55)

However, C.G. Costa-Foru said that in a duel the most important role has the witnesses. A duel, according to the same source, ends with the death of one of the duelists only if the witnesses have been badly chosen: “... as a leading author said in a writing on the duel, “not swords [nor] the bullets kill, but only the witnesses.” (Costa-Foru, 1937, p. 56) Costa-Foru supported his words by telling the way a duel he himself witnessed. The Duelists were N.D. Taranu, one of the two directors of the magazine *Furnica/The Ant*, and the poet Dimitrie Anghel. “The affair of honor” ended without blood being shed after Costa-Foru told the two combatants that just that day his wife gave birth to a baby girl.

¹ *Furnica/The Ant. Furnica/The Ant*, year I, no. 1, 19 September, 1904, p. 1.

Here too we will show that the poet Dimitrie Anghel called “on site” and the second director of *Furnica/The Ant*, G. Ranetti, but he refused the duel¹. Regarding all this, C.G. Costa-Foru wrote in 1912 in *Adevărul/The truth* an article² that spanned more than two columns. The text attracted the irony from the readers as the author claimed it was for the duel, but at the same time it was against the duel.

3. The Courage of the Duelist

What draws particular attention to Costa-Foru's story is Dimitrie Anghel's state before the time when he should have started his duel with N.D. Taranu: “It was the warlike appearance of a medieval knight. The poet defied of death.” (Costa-Foru, 1937, p. 56) In a work of 1919, the following statement was made: “Courage, in its simplest form, is the contempt for death.”³ A definition of courage is also found in a *national education manual for citizens and soldiers*:

“Courage is called the quality that the soldier has to bear without complaining the hardships and shortcomings he encounters in peace time and to face without fear the sufferings and dangers he encounters during the war.

Courage is manifested in various forms: strength of soul, cold blood, patience, perseverance, boldness, presence of spirit, own opinion, initiative, responsibility of deeds, severity, calm, bravery, courage, heroism, determination, energy, will.

The controversies of courage are: discouragement, sadness, disappointment, mourning, indignation, chastity, fear, terror, fright, misery, wickedness.

Each of these evils is shown in the different circumstances of life.

The man has to fight, in all ways, to earn his living; his struggle is all the more fierce with the more energy he has.” (Arifeanu, 1921, p. 93)

For the journalists from *Furnica/The Ant*, not the strength shown in wars and duels defines *courage*, but something else. Things that matter everyday life, such as *the courage* of one's own opinions, say about a man if he is courageous or not.⁴ Among the main reasons that made two men of honor to use the duel to solve a problem of honor were *swearing in the gazette*. People were politicians with journalists, as well as journalists with journalists. In most cases, the duel was only to provide the duelists with “*a pretty free ad*”⁵

With the help of stories (real or even invented) about duel and duelists, the editors at *Furnica/The Ant* sought to highlight the ridiculous situations created by the duel:

¹ George Ranetti, „Cazul «cavalerului» Anghel/The case of teh night „Anghel”. *Furnica/The Ant*, year VIII, no. 39, 31 May 1912, p. 2.

² C.G. Costa-Foru, Părerile unui spectator – Duelul/The opinions of a spectator – the Duel. *Adevărul/The truth*, XXV year, no. 8158, 30 May 1912, p. 1.

³ Gh. B.P. Curajul (Rezumat dintr-un discurs ținut în Duma din Moscova de către Ch. Richet, prof. la fac. de medicină din Paris)/Courage (Abstract from a speech held in the Duma in Moscow by Ch. Richet, professor of medicine at Paris). *Educația/Education*, year II, no. 3, March 1919, p. 82.

⁴ *** Curajul!/Courage!. *Furnica/The ant*, year I, no. 4, 10 October 1904, p. 4.

⁵ Gogu Delafefelei, Din mizeriile anului nou/ From the miseries of the new year. *Furnica/The ant*, year I, no. 17, 9 Jan. 1905, p. 6.

“Many suffered because of the duel, for it was impossible to replace their heads and their authentic hearts, broken by the bullet of a revolver or the sharp point of a sword, another head or other rubber heart or even metallic. Many were injured in their arms, ribs, and finally in any place they could reach the tip of the sword. But most of them, who make a crushing majority over the others, have settled on site. These were, of course, the best initiates in the art of the duel.

For, or both were coward and hence the distance between them was greater than the one prescribed in the rules of the duel; or the witnesses have recourse to a stratagem and put in place the bullets of lead donuts made of soft bread, - to avoid the catastrophe.”¹

In a text published on February 15, 1907, *Furnica/The Ant* presented to his readers the sensational case of Mr. Popescu, from Bușteni, who, in a single duel, fought with two at once and came out victorious: “... he sat beautiful between the two opponents, with the left hand beating with the gun, while the right hand angrily held the sword. Both opponents were “wounded to death.”² In another text, it was shown that the *Fetus* organizes for its readers a contest whose prize was “an admirable field,” where the “lucky winner” could solve its serious honour affairs.³

In most of the *battles of honor* presented in *Furnica/The Ant*, the protagonists were either military staff or MPs.

If a civilian could refuse a duel challenge, in the case of the officers, things were different. An officer had to “get out on the field” with someone who at some point insulted him, even if he did not want to do that. Otherwise, he would have to know the anger of his superiors. In this sense, we are writing a fragment from an article published in 1908:

“The victim of a stupid and barbaric prejudice, which in civil society subsists only in very few puffy heads, but unfortunately imposed rigorously in the military world constituted in the medieval cast, Major Sturdza had to fight in duel with Captain Catuneanu, who, following an article of general criticism of the habits of some of the officers, threw the first epithet of “scoundrel”.

The minutes of the duel say that one centimeter more the sword would have had penetrated deeper into Major Sturdza's cheek, the carotid would have been cut and the young officer would have fallen dead in a moment.

Then, the gentlemen of the duel, isn't it an idiocy, isn't it inhuman? [...]

It is not good for commanders, like military chiefs, to teach officers the absurd idea that a man's honor lies at the top of a sword.”⁴

There have been many cases where two politicians have “come out on the ground” to solve a “business of honor.” Most of the time, the duels “were blowing in the wind.” For such cases, witnesses were using the formula “two bullets with no result”. Nicolae Filipescu, for example, was argued by the editors at *Furnica/The Ant* that although he did nothing to avoid a duel, he preferred to “win in the field” (“Duelul Filipescu-Bădărău/The duel Filipescu-Bădărău”⁵ and “Duelul Filipescu-Cantacuzino/The

¹ Doinaru, Binefacerile duelului/ The Beat of the Duel. *Furnica/The Ant*, year I, no 16, 2 Jan. 1905, p. 8.

² Nicollo Mascalzoni, Diverse/Diverse. *Furnica/The Ant*, year III, no. 127, 15 February, 1907, p. 4.

³ Jorju Delamizilu, Premiile «Furniceii»/The “Ants” Awards. *Furnica/The Ant*, year V, no. 252, Thursday 9 July 1909, p. 2.

⁴ Jorju Delamizilu, Duelul în armată/The Duel in the army. *Furnica/The Ant*, year IV, no. 197, 19 June 1908, p. 8.

⁵ Tarascou, Duelul Filipescu-Bădărău/The duel Filipescu-Bădărău. *Furnica/The Ant*, year II, nr. 75, 1906, p. 2.

duel of Filipescu-Cantacuzino¹”). This situation was most probably explained by the fact that N. Filipescu was spiritually depressed by the regret that, in 1898, George Lahovary was killed in a duel, as we have shown above, for which he was “to 6 months imprisonment”. (Bacalbasa, 1928, p. 228)

4. Conclusions

According to the editors of *Furnica/The Ant* magazine, the duel was a way for many Romanian *men of honor* to get *free advertising*. C. G. Costa-Foru said that although he was against the duel, he would always accept to fight in a duel or witness one. The statement, though it seems strange, has an explanation. Many of those who were “on site” to solve a “problem of honor” did their best to avoid a real confrontation. In Romania, most of the duels started “on the ground” but ended at the restaurant.

5. Bibliography

Bacalbaşa, C. (1928). *Bucureşti de altădată - 1885-1900, Vol. III/Bucharest, formerly Bucharest - 1885-1900, Vol. II*. Bucharest: Editura ziarului Universul.

Costa-Foru, C.G. (1937). *Suflet de părinte. Cuvinte pentru copii și tinerime/Soul of parent. Words for Children and Youth*. Bucharest: Ed. “Adevărul” S.A.

Teodoraşcu, Fănel (2016). *The Duel in the Formerly Romanian Press – from Thrilling to Trivial*. In Iulian Boldea (Coord.), *Globalization and National Identity. Studies on the Strategies of Intercultural Dialogue. Communication, Public Relations and Journalism Section*. Tirgu Mures: Archipelag XXI Press.

Iorga, N. (1922). *Istoria presei româneşti de la primele începuturi până la 1916, Cu o privire asupra presei româneşti din zilele noastre de C. Bacalbaşa, preşedintele Sindicatului Ziariştilor/The history of the Romanian press from the first beginnings until 1916, With a look at the Romanian media today by C. Bacalbasa, the president of the Journalists' Union*. Bucharest: Atelierele Societăţii Anonime „Adevărul”

Arifeanu, Virgil (1921). *Cartea Românului. Manual de educație națională pentru cetățeni și ostași/The Romanian Book. Handbook of national education for citizens and soldiers*. Bucharest: Tipografia și Legătoria „Berbecaru”.

Severeanu, C. (1943). *Duelurile la care am asistat ca medic/Duels to which we have witnessed as a physician*. *Gazeta municipală/ The Municipal Gazette*, Year XII, nr. 553, 10 Jan. 1943.

Costa-Foru, C.G. (1912). *Părerile unui spectator – Duelul/The opinions of a spectator – the Duel*. *Adevărul/The truth*, XXV year, no. 8158, 30 May.

Gh. B.P. (1919). *Curajul (Rezumat dintr-un discurs ținut în Duma din Moscova de către Ch. Richet, prof. la fac. de medicină din Paris)/Courage (Abstract from a speech held in the Duma in Moscow by Ch. Richet, professor of medicine at Paris)*. *Educația/Education*, year II, no. 3, March.

Sadoveanu, Mihail (1944). *Anii de ucenicie/Years of Apprenticeship*. *Revista Fundațiilor Regale/Review of the Royal Foundations*, XI, October, no. 10.

Archive of the magazine *Furnica/The Ant* for the years 1904-1916, 1918-1920, 1922-1923, 1928-1930.

Archive of the *Renașterea/Renaissance* magazine for 1941.

Archive of the *Unirea/Union* magazine for the year 1940.

¹ Prințul Ghytza, „Duelul Filipescu-Cantacuzino/The duel Filipescu-Cantacuzino. *Furnica/The Ant*, year VI, no. 26, 4 March 1910, p. 2.