

MS. GALL. OCT. 37

Binding:

Binding made of marbled paper. Considering the fact that the protective cards are not made of mould-made paper, the binding was made in the second quarter of the 19th century at the earliest.

History:

The manuscript is an autograph: various shades of ink, changeable duct of the writing, two different formats of paper, numerous corrections. Moreover, there are no doubts about the form of the title: *Journal de ma vie commencé à Genève le 27. Janvier 1815. l'année de mon âge 22.^e et 5/12. le 18.^e mois de mon ministère.* [signed:] *D.^l Andrié.* [and added later:] *terminé le 1.^{er} mai 1816.* (fol. 1r^o). The manuscript was made in the years 1815-1816, in Geneva. Its author is Jean-François-Daniel Andrié (1792-1866); he was ordained in 1813; he was a deacon in Môtiers (1813-1814), a minister in Ponts (1816-1830) and in Locle (1830-1843); he went to Berlin where he became a minister of the French Church; he held this office until his death (cf. «Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse», tome premier, Neuchâtel 1921, p. 329). Therefore, the manuscript was initially in the possession of the author and it was then included in the collection of Karl Lecoq and later on in the collection of a professor from Bonn: Wilhelm Erman. It was registered in the accession register of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin on the 22nd of February 1926, under the number 1926. 150.

Content:

This journal is probably included only in this manuscript. It was made with the passing of time, day by day. It includes the period of the author's studies, before he became a minister. Some months are described with much detail. The journal mainly refers to the year 1815, whereas the events of the year 1816 are described only on the last three pages. Considering the fact that Jean-François-Daniel Andrié was not an important figure, it is difficult to assume that there are other copies of this journal. It is therefore very probable that this journal exists

only in this particular copy. Even if there were other copies, this particular copy is an autograph and it represents the biggest textological value. The text was not published. There is nothing special about the manuscript. This is an interesting testimony of the period rather than a testimony of the author. Therefore, the manuscript should not be edited or studied in more detail.