



PREŠOVSKÁ UNIVERZITA V PREŠOVE
Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove
Opera Philosophica 25/2020



Slávka KOPČÁKOVÁ (ed.)

SÚRADNICE ESTETIKY, UMENIA A KULTÚRY V

Estetická výchova a prax vyučovania estetiky v kontextoch
európskeho estetického myslenia 19. a 20. storočia –
dialóg s tradíciou a súčasné koncepcie

Studia Aesthetica XX.

PREŠOV 2020

SÚRADNICE ESTETIKY, UMENIA A KULTÚRY V

Estetická výchova a prax vyučovania estetiky v kontextoch európskeho estetického myslenia 19. a 20. storočia – dialóg s tradíciou a súčasné koncepcie
Studia Aesthetica XX.

Editorka: doc. PaedDr. Slávka Kopčáková, PhD.

Autori: Piroška Balogh, Renata Beličová, Věra Beranová, Roman Dykast, Gergely Fórizs, Lisa Giombini, Tomáš Hlobil, Renáta Kočišová, Slávka Kopčáková, Eva Kušnířová, Adrián Kvokačka, Lukáš Makky, Daniela Matysová, Slávka Oriňáková, Martina Petříková, Max Rynänen, Barbora Řebíková, Dagmar Strmeňová, Tomáš Timko, Jaroslav Vencálek, Pavol Zubal

Recenzentky: prof. Mgr. Markéta Štefková, PhD.
doc. Mgr. Sandra Zákutná, PhD.

Apretácia textu: doc. PaedDr. Slávka Kopčáková, PhD.

Za obsah príspevkov a ich jazykovú úpravu zodpovedajú autori.

Táto publikácia vznikla v rámci riešenia projektu VEGA č. 1/0051/19 „*Hudba a dramatické umenie v koncepciách estetickej teórie a estetickej výchovy na území Slovenska v 19. a 20. storočí*“.

Všetky práva vyhradené. Toto dielo ani žiadna jeho časť sa nesmie reprodukovať, ukladať do informačných systémov ani inak rozširovať bez predchádzajúceho súhlasu majiteľov autorských práv, s výnimkou citovania podľa STN ISO 690.

© Slávka Kopčáková (ed.), autori, 2020

© Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Filozofická fakulta, 2020

ISBN 978-80-555-2516-7 (printová verzia)

ISBN 978-80-555-2517-4 (elektronická verzia)

OBSAH/CONTENT

ÚVOD.....	7
I. ESTETIKA, ESTETICKÉ MYSLENIE A VYUČOVANIE ESTETIKY V 19. STOROČÍ – TRADÍCIA A HISTORICKÉ KONTEXTY	12
KONKURSY NA RAKOUSKÉ STOLICE ESTETIKY V DOBĚ PŘEDBŘEZNOVÉ. PŘÍKLAD FRANZE FICKERA / <i>OPEN COMPETITION EXAMS (KONKURSPRÜFUNGEN) FOR THE AUSTRIAN CHAIRS OF AESTHETICS AT THE TIME OF THE PRE-MARCH. EXAMPLE OF FRANZ FICKER</i>	
Tomáš HLOBIL	13
GEORG ALOYS SZERDAHELY AND THE BEGINNING OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION AT THE ROYAL HUNGARIAN UNIVERSITY BETWEEN 1774–1882	
Piroska BALOGH	27
METHODOLOGY IN JOHANN LUDWIG SCHEDIUS' <i>PRINCIPIA PHILOCALIAE</i> (1828)	
Gergely FÓRIZS	50
VLIV ESTETICKÝCH TEORIÍ NA VÝUKU HUDEBNĚTEORETICKÝCH DISCIPLÍN V PRVNÍ POLOVINĚ 19. STOLETÍ: NA PŘÍKLADU UČEBNIC ANTONÍNA REJCHY / <i>INFLUENCE OF AESTHETIC THEORIES ON TEACHING MUSIC-THEORETICAL DISCIPLINES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY: ON THE EXAMPLE OF TEXTBOOKS BY ANTONÍN REJCHA</i>	
Roman DYKAST	69
ŠKOLSKÁ ESTETIKA A ESTETICKÁ VÝCHOVA V KONTEXTE UHORSKÉHO EVANJELICKÉHO ŠKOLSTVA 1. POLOVICE 19. STOROČIA (NA PŘÍKLADE DIELA TOBIASA GOTTFRIEDA SCHRÖERA) / <i>SCHOOL AESTHETICS AND AESTHETIC EDUCATION WITHIN HUNGARIAN EVANGELICAL EDUCATION IN THE 1ST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY (USING THE EXAMPLE OF TOBIAS GOTTFRIED SCHRÖER'S WORK)</i>	
Slávka KOPČÁKOVÁ	87

GRAMATICKÝ SPIS TOBIASA GOTTFRIEDA SCHRÖERA SYNTAXIS LATINA VO VZŤAHU K JEHO NÁHLADOM NA ESTETIKU A PEDAGOGIKU / <i>THE GRAMMAR FILE SYNTAXIS LATINA BY TOBIAS GOTTFRIED SCHRÖER IN RELATION TO HIS UNDERSTANDING OF AESTHETICS AND PEDAGOGY</i>	
Slávka ORIŇÁKOVÁ	111
LITERÁRNE ČÍTANKY T. G. SCHRÖERA AKO REFLEXIA WEIMARSKEJ KLASIKY A TRADÍCIE LITERÁRNEHO SALÓNU NEMECKÉHO ROMANTIZMU / <i>LITERARY READERS OF T. G. SCHRÖER AS REFLECTION OF THE WEIMAR CLASSICS AND TRADITIONS OF THE LITERARY SALON OF GERMAN ROMANTICISM</i>	
Pavol ZUBAL	135
II. ESTETICKÁ VÝCHOVA VO VÄZBE NA ESTETICKÉ MYSLENIE V 20. STOROČÍ – TEÓRIA, PRAX A INŠTITÚCIE ..	
PRAGMATIKA HUDOBNEJ ENKULTURÁCIE. POZNÁMKY K ESTETICKEJ VÝCHOVE A VZDELÁVANIU INŠPIROVANÉ MYSLENÍM JOZEFA KRESÁNKA / <i>THE PRAGMATICS OF MUSICAL ENCULTURATION. SOME NOTES ON AESTHETICS EDUCATION INSPIRED BY JOZEF KRESÁNEK'S THINKING BOUT MUSIC</i>	
Renáta BELIČOVÁ	153
TRADICE ESTETICKÉHO MYŠLENÍ JAKO VÝCHODISKO CELOSPOLEČENSKÉHO PROGRAMU ESTETICKÉ VÝCHOVY / <i>TRADITION OF AESTHETIC THINKING AS A STARTING POINT OF THE NATIONWIDE PROGRAM OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION</i>	
Věra BERANOVÁ	165
MOŽNÁ ŠTRUKTURALISTICKÁ A POST ŠTRUKTURALISTICKÁ KONCEPCIA ESTETICKEJ VÝCHOVY / <i>POSSIBLE STRUCTURALIST AND POST-STRUCTURALIST CONCEPTION OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION</i>	
Lukáš MAKKY	176
DISPONIBILITA ESTETICKEJ VÝCHOVY V SÚČASNOSTI / <i>AVAILABILITY OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION TODAY</i>	
Adrián KVOKAČKA	190
ČEMU NÁS UČÍ ESTETICKÁ CITLIVOSŤ A MUSÍME SE JÍ UČIŤ? / <i>WHAT AESTHETIC SENSIBILITY TEACH US AND DO WE HAVE TO LEARN IT?</i>	
Daniela MATYSOVÁ	200

ESTETICKO-VÝCHOVNÉ POSLANIE VZDELÁVACÍCH SPOLKOV NA SLOVENSKÝCH STREDNÝCH ŠKOLÁCH PO ROKU 1918 / <i>AESTHETIC AND EDUCATIONAL MISSION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AT SLOVAK SECONDARY SCHOOLS AFTER 1918</i>	
Eva KUŠNÍROVÁ	218
ESTETICKÉ A SPOLOČENSKÉ VÝCHODISKÁ MESTSKEJ HUDOBNEJ ŠKOLY V PREŠOVE (1921) / <i>AESTHETIC AND SOCIETAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CITY MUSIC SCHOOL IN PREŠOV (1921)</i>	
Renáta KOČIŠOVÁ	230
III. PRÍSPEVOK VIZUÁLNYCH ŠTÚDIÍ, ĽUDOVEJ TRADÍCIE A LITERATÚRY K PRAXI ESTETICKEJ A UMELECKEJ VÝCHOVY	245
INFORMED AESTHETIC ATTITUDE. CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION	
Barbora ŘEBÍKOVÁ	246
RETHINKING ART EDUCATION: THE ART SCHOOL THEORY TEACHER AS AN EXECUTIVE PRODUCER	
Max RYYNÄNEN	262
HERITAGE IN DANGER. ON THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF RUINS AND RECONSTRUCTIONS	
Lisa GIOMBINI	273
SPOLEČENSKO-POLITICKÁ ÚLOHA UMĚNÍ NA PŘÍKLADU VÝTVARNÉ TVORBY FRANTIŠKA VESELÉHO / <i>SOCIAL-POLITICAL ROLE OF ART EXPLAINED IN THE EXAMPLE OF ART WORKS BY FRANTIŠEK VESELÝ</i>	
Jaroslav VENCÁLEK	290
SPRIEVODNÝ PROGRAM K VÝSTAVÁM VÝTVARNÉHO UMENIA AKO FORMA EDUKÁCIE PUBLIKA / <i>THE ACCOMPANYING PROGRAM TO ART EXHIBITIONS AS A FORM OF EDUCATION</i>	
Tomáš TIMKO	309
TRADIČNÁ ĽUDOVÁ KULTÚRA NA SLOVENSKU A JEJ MIESTO V ESTETICKEJ VÝCHOVE / <i>TRADITIONAL FOLK CULTURE IN SLOVAKIA AND ITS PLACE IN AESTHETIC EDUCATION</i>	
Dagmar STRMEŇOVÁ	320

ESTETICKÉ ASPEKTY LITERATÚRY PRE DETI A MLÁDEŽ
V KONTEXTE OSVIETENSKEJ ŠKOLSKEJ LITERATÚRY /
*AESTHETIC ASPECTS OF LITERATURE FOR CHILDREN
AND YOUTH IN THE CONTEXT OF ENLIGHTENMENT SCHOOL
LITERATURE*

Martina PETRÍKOVÁ..... 331

METHODOLOGY IN JOHANN LUDWIG SCHEDIUS' *PRINCIPIA PHILOCALIAE* (1828)

Gergely FÓRIZS

Abstract: Johann Ludwig Schedius (1768–1847) became professor of aesthetics at the University of Pest (Hungary) in 1792. He taught aesthetics and ancient Greek until his retirement in 1843. In 1828, as an established academic, he had published a Latin monograph entitled *Principia philocaliae seu doctrinae pulchri* (*Principles of Philocalia or the Science of Beauty*), which was used as a university coursebook.

My thesis is that in his book Schedius adopted the eclectic method of compilation and production of knowledge widespread among Central European scholars during the 18th and even in the early 19th century. The two basic pillars of philosophical eclecticism are the rejection of elitist, authority-based knowledge, and the support of scholarly co-operation instead. In this paper, I will show how Schedius forged his philocalia out of the age-old history of the “science of beauty”, while I will also discuss his eclectic treatment of Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of the Power of Judgment*.

Keywords: eclecticism, science of beauty, philocalia, university aesthetics, Immanuel Kant, Habsburg Empire, Kingdom of Hungary.

The *Principia philocaliae* in the literature

Born in the Hungarian city of Győr, Johann Ludwig Schedius (1768–1847),¹ came from a German speaking Lutheran family. He became professor of aesthetics at the University of Pest in 1792, following his studies in Göttingen between 1788 and 1791. He taught aesthetics and ancient Greek until his retirement in 1843. Schedius was traditionally regarded as a second-rank aesthete, as a “mediator of German culture” (Doromby 1933) with no original insights. His 1828 magnum opus, the *Principia philocaliae seu doctrinae pulchri* (*Principles of Philocalia or the Science of Beauty*), written in Latin and also used as a university coursebook in its time, has been deemed by the historiography to be an

¹ For a detailed account on Schedius’ scholarly career, König (2003).

“eclectic” work. This term, until very recently, has been used pejoratively, referring to unoriginal syncretism. Max Schasler’s history of aesthetics, for instance, categorised Schedius’s work as an example of early 19th-century aesthetic theories that were “eclectic in their material” – inspired by, but not closely linked to Schelling’s identity philosophy.² This verdict was largely upheld in the 20th-century Hungarian scholarship as well (Jánosi 1916; Nagy 1983, pp. 273-318).

This consensual approach was challenged only by Piroska Balogh (2007) in her monograph.³ Balogh rejects the dominant narrative in the histories of aesthetics built on canonical figures and the principle of progress, according to which the backbone of the narrative is constituted by the succession of distinct systems, produced by the ‘great figures’ of aesthetics. Meanwhile, the ‘smaller names’ and the representatives of methodological eclecticism in particular are expelled from the canon, and become supporting actors on the peripheries, mere followers of the greats. Balogh (2007) is neither concerned with assigning a place to Schedius’ aesthetics in this big narrative, nor with assessing its value based on the work’s afterlife. Instead, she aims at reconstructing the work’s contemporary contexts as well as its internal logic. In Balogh’s view, the main feature of the *Philocalia* is a “methodological interdisciplinarity” (Balogh 2007, p. 388) that is a direct result of Schedius’ holistic view towards the sciences of *humanitas*. Thus, philocalia, the science of beauty, becomes the science of “humanitas” as well, offering a perspective equally “relevant to every phenomenon of the human world.” The fact that the very same model of organism grounds Schedius’ social and aesthetic theory also follows from this view (Balogh 2007, p. 392). In the following, I will try to continue this interpretive thread by revealing the methodological principles of this integrative anthropological thinking.⁴

The primary contexts of the motto of the *Principia philocaliae*

The following quote from Aristotle’s *Politics*, used by Schedius as his motto at the beginning of his work, will serve as my starting point:

² „Ihr gemeinsames Merkmal [ist] eine Art stofflicher Eklekticismus” Schasler (1872, s. 872).

³ Balogh (2007), Balogh (2018, pp. 142-147).

⁴ Balogh (2007, p. 406 f).

Δεῖ τοῖς ἱκανῶς εἰρημένοις χρῆσθαι· τὰ δὲ παραλελειμμένα πειρᾶσθαι ζητεῖν⁵

“Hence we should use the results of previous discovery when adequate, while endeavouring to investigate matters hitherto passed over.”⁶

Now, the first question is what motivated Schedius to assign such a prominent place to a seemingly trivial methodological consideration. To answer this, we must examine the primary contexts of the quoted part. Aristotle’s original sentence appears as a methodological conclusion at the end of a passage about the origins of political institutions, where he argues that the “necessary” institutions were originally meant to respond to eternal human needs. Thus, Aristotle writes, “all other political devices also have been discovered repeatedly, or rather an infinite number of times over, in the lapse of ages”.⁷ Transplanting this part to the beginning of an aesthetic treatise suggests an interdisciplinary view, according to which the institutions of art and society are both the manifestations of human creative force and of *humanitas*.⁸ In the part that introduces the history of the science of philocalia, Schedius (1828, p. 179; 2005, p. 375) explicitly asserts that investigating the causes of beauty – both on an individual and a social level – is one of the universal human needs, like an unreflected “force of nature”. The fact that the very same Aristotelian motto appears at the beginning of Schedius’ *On Nationality*,⁹ a treatise elaborating his organic notion of state, also reflects the unity of the politic and the aesthetic in his thought.¹⁰

The second important context of the motto is the tradition of eclectic philosophy. This context is suggested by the fact that the quote from Aristotle expresses a similar idea than that of Saint Paul that came to be seen as the dictum stating the principles of eclectic philosophy. These principles are the assessment of the entirety of the historical tradition (of philosophy), and the sorting of this tradition from a particular point of

⁵ Schedius (1828 [without pagination]); see also the Hungarian translation: Schedius (2005, p. 253).

⁶ Aristotle: *Politics*, 1329b.35 (VII, 10.) Transl. H. Rackham.

⁷ Aristotle: *Politics*, 1329b.35 (VII, 10.) Transl. H. Rackham.

⁸ This context of Schedius’s motto has already been pointed out in Balogh (2007, p. 311).

⁹ Schedius (1817, p. 57).

¹⁰ For a detailed analysis Balogh (2004, p. 1232), Balogh (2017, p. 311).

view: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (Paul I. Thessalonians 5: 21.)

This saying and the Horatian adage, expressing the ideal of original, anti-dogmatic thinking ("Nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri" – "I am not bound over to swear allegiance to any master" *Epistles*, 1. 1. 14), became the formulas that express the essence of eclecticism for centuries. As Martin Gierl (1999, p. 69 f.) sums it up: "These instructions [...] elucidate the two essential aspects of eclecticism perfectly well. First, it was opposed to elitist, minority-held and authority-linked knowledge [...]. Second, there was support for new forms of scholarly co-operation, exemplified by courteous dealings between scholars and by a new treatment of knowledge."

It is also noteworthy, however, that compared to Paul's instruction, Schedius' Aristotle-motto includes a third aspect: after having selected the "adequate" results of previous inquiries, contributing to the tradition by examining "matters hitherto passed over", thus, adding a new step to the method. However, such an extended, three-phase methodology is hardly a novelty in the eclectic tradition. For example, Schedius' predecessor as Professor of Aesthetics, György Alajos Szerdahely, expounded the same model of scientific inquiry in his *Aesthetica*, when he laid down, following Cicero, his eclectic methodological principles: the collection and selection of previous authors' ideas must be followed by an original contribution; one must add something to the common legacy.¹¹ In the eclectic tradition, this scientific attitude is expressed by the bee, a metaphor that can be traced back to Seneca¹² and was given its full-fledged form by Francis Bacon: as opposed to the one-sidedly empirical ant-scientist, concerned only with "heaping up" stuff, and the dogmatic spider-scientist, developing a web relying entirely on himself, one should strive for, just like a bee, "fashioning" the "extracted matter" by one's own efforts.¹³ The fact that Schedius chose Aristotle to support his

¹¹ Szerdahely, Georgius: Prooemium. In: Szerdahely (1778), Part 1 [without pagination]. His quotations from Cicero are: „In locus coactis scriptoribus, quod quisque commodissime praecipere videbatur, excerptimus”; „et ex nostro quoque nonnihil in commune contulimus”. Marcus Tullius Cicero: *De inventione*, II, 4 and II, 8. Cf. Fórizs (2013, p. 198).

¹² Albrecht (1994, p. 52-56, 166).

¹³ Bacon, Francis: *The New Organon* [*Novum Organum*], 95 (Bacon 1999, p. 128). With the words of the monographer of eclectic philosophy: „Dem Thema der Eklektik scheint am ehesten Bacons Fassung des Bienenvergleichs nahezukommen.” (Albrecht 1994, p. 166, footnote 5).

eclectic methodological stance should not come as a surprise either, since one of the other oft-cited eclectic slogans can be traced back to him: “Amicus Platon, amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amica veritas”.¹⁴ (‘We must prefer truth before every friend’.)

Given the immediate context of the motto from the *Politics*, covering new, “hitherto passed over” matters becomes possible and necessary, because, according to the Aristotelian account, one must consider two stages of the development of mankind: in the first stage, the immediate necessities are decisive, and it is the immutability of these basic needs that gives birth, again and again, to the same institutions. After having these needs satisfied, however, the accessories of “things contributing to refinement and luxury” emerge in a novel stage of progress.¹⁵ At this point, there is some space for new approaches to *humanitas* that have not been probed hitherto. In his preface, Schedius reveals that one of the goals of his work is to prove that Hungary is already in this second stage of progress, which means that beside dealing with practical affairs (such as the “Turkish problem”), we should also be able to create scientific works that treat “the laws of the sublime and the beautiful” in an abstract manner.¹⁶

The third context of the motto is the work *Philocalia* itself. This leads us to investigate the practice through which the three-phase process – shown as an exemplar of the scientific process in the motto – is embodied in the work. The basic units of Schedius’ treatise are the paragraphs devoted to specific problems (264 altogether), which are then organized into subchapters and chapters. Most paragraphs are constructed to be polyphonic: Schedius’ own theoretical views on the subject and his suggestions, written in normal-sized letters, can be read at the beginning of the paragraph, usually followed by brief commentaries and bibliographical information, written in small-sized letters, that give context to his theses. From the point of view of eclectic methodology,

¹⁴ Albrecht (1994, p. 37) and Weidemann (1998, p. 268).

¹⁵ „We may almost take it therefore that all other political devices also have been discovered repeatedly, or rather an infinite number of times over, in the lapse of ages; for the discoveries of a necessary kind are probably taught by need itself, and when the necessities have been provided it is reasonable that things contributing to refinement and luxury should find their development; so that we must assume that this is the way with political institutions also.” (Aristotle: *Politics*, 7.1329b).

¹⁶ Schedius, Ludovicus: Praefatio (Schedius 1828 [without pagination]; 2005, p. 255).

dividing the paragraphs in such a way has a particular significance: the small-sized parts are responsible for collecting and assorting the knowledge about a certain subject as it was produced and reserved by tradition, while the parts set in normal-sized letters comprise the author's own claims. It is the latter parts that reflect his new, peculiar contribution to the tradition. At this point, we arrive at the often-recurring question concerning eclectic methodology: how is it possible to obey Paul's instruction and "prove all things" or to follow Aristotle in surveying all the "results of previous discovery"? A usual 18th-century answer would be the utilization of *historia literaria*, i.e. to organize the historical material according to synchronic and diachronic coordinates, which can give the reader some guidelines to find her own way through the material without becoming a devout follower of one particular master.¹⁷ Schedius' commentaries aim to fulfil this function: they are not meant to survey nullified antecedents, neither to enumerate authorities to support his own agenda. Instead, they consider alternative approaches to the topic that are distinct from his position. For example, the commentary in §21 – a paragraph about the definition of "absolute beauty" – is filled with references to ancient and modern authors who used the term in a different sense: the list goes from Schedius' contemporaries like Wilhelm Traugott Krug and Auguste Hilarion de Kératy to Plotinus, the ancient Stoics, and Plato (Schedius 1828, p. 12 f.; 2005, p. 267 f.). Schedius does not go into details about the various views he mentions, making it the task of the inquiring reader to look them up.

In the Preface, Schedius reflects on his own methodology: "I have tried from the beginning to discuss these issues logically and coherently, and without mentioning or rebutting the differing opinions of others unless they are serious impediments to the doctrine hereby explicated." (Schedius 1828; 2005, p. 256). The context mapped earlier in this paper suggests that this statement does not exclude all opposing views from the inquiry; it only indicates that it will not discuss them in detail except from some instances that we will see later on. By contrast, Schedius continues, "The views of those learned gentlemen [...] whose authority might increase the weight and credibility of my arguments will be cited more frequently, so that I can proceed on the path I have chosen more firmly."

¹⁷ See Gierl (1997, p. 514 ff.).

(Schedius 1828; 2005, p. 256). It is not to say, however, that he wants to be seen as a follower of esteemed masters. Instead, Schedius argues that he will pay more attention to the acclaimed theoretical antecedents that inspired his own views. Thus, authority (*auctoritas*) here is not a master to be devoutly followed and who has the last word, but a predecessor who started something worthy to be continued. The next sentence is also important, because it clarifies that – instead of giving a final answer to the problems under scrutiny – Schedius wishes to submit the results of his inquiry to the learned public before continuing writing it: “Upon this groundwork thus laid down [...] I will not hesitate to erect the systems of the particular fine arts, *as soon as it earns the approval of more experienced authors as well.*” (Schedius 1828; 2005, p. 256). [My italics, G. F.]

The chapter about the history of philocalia

According to the classical philologist Olof Gigon (1965), philosophers belonging to the eclectic tradition “consciously build on the results of their predecessors and conceive their own systems as the culminations of the evolution of the problem”. This approach, however, as Michael Albrecht (1994, p. 36) points out, does not confine the tradition into the historical past; instead, it implies the idea of tradition as a timeless inventory, since for the eclectics, “there are partial aspects of truth to be found in every thinker”. That is to say, it is not metaphysics but historical facts from various time periods and places that constituted the foundation of eclectic systems.¹⁸ According to this view, scientific development should be understood not as an accumulative process that unfolds through gradual corrections but with reference to the whole of the scientific field, the older as well as the more recent developments.¹⁹ Thus, a particular eclectic system develops from its own history, but not as the final result of a lineal process: instead, it is the conclusion drawn from a vast array of historical resources. *On the history of philocalia*, Schedius’ last chapter, is an excellent example of the application of this principle.

¹⁸ Schmidt-Biggemann (1988, s. 32).

¹⁹ Albrecht (1994, s. 165 f.). A formulation of this idea can be found in Francis Bacon’s *Novum Organum*: „truth is to be sought for not in the felicity of any age, which is an unstable thing, but in the light of nature and experience, which is eternal”. Bacon, Francis: *The New Organon* [*Novum Organum*], 56 (Bacon 1999, p. 101).

In the first paragraph, Schedius offers a conceptual framework: he differentiates between the external and the internal history of science. The former refers to the review of scientific works ("Bücherkunde"), while the latter delineates "the beginnings, progress, and famous relations of science, and the efforts made for the betterment and affirmation of these relations". The goal of internal history is to help us understand the "present internal state of science" (Schedius 1828, p. 177; Schedius 2005, p. 374). Through this differentiation, Schedius draws on the twofold tradition of *historia literaria*, mentioning next to the bibliographic history another variant, which can be traced back to Francis Bacon. Instead of the knowledge of books, the emphasis here is put on the analysis of the progress of science.²⁰ However, Schedius adds that the two methods are "to be applied together", and he immediately makes an effort to do so.

First, Schedius lists the scholarship of the science of beauty, the science he calls philocalia, but – probably because of the lack of space – he does not mention aesthetic theories proper but only encyclopaedic and comprehensive works from previous decades (the last being a work from 1827) (Schedius 1828, p. 177; Schedius 2005, p. 374). He then turns to the "internal history" of the discipline. Following Aristotle's twofold institutional history mentioned above, Schedius first differentiates between two historical phases: the initial treatment of the beautiful responds to basic human drives but lacks any rational reflection, unlike later scientific analyses. He quotes Cicero's *De oratore* to describe the first phase, when people, driven by a "force of nature", make a judgment of "what is right and wrong in art and reasoning", but "without any art or reasoning" ("sine ulla arte aut ratione").²¹ According to Schedius, the dual approach to beauty (disembodied and embodied) already emerged during this phase, and remained relevant throughout the entire history of "philocalia". This twofold approach to beauty resulted, on the one hand, in mythical stories about the miraculous force of beauty, and, on the other, in the canon of Greek sculpture, founded upon the sensual distinction

²⁰ „[Literary history is] a just story of learning, containing the antiquities and originals of knowledges and their sects, their inventions, their traditions, their diverse administrations and managings, their flourishings, their oppositions, decays, depressions, oblivions, removes, with the causes and occasions of them [...], throughout the ages of the world." Bacon (1858, p. 69), Gierl (1997, p. 519).

²¹ Marcus Tullius Cicero: *De oratore*, III, 50. Transl. J. S. Watson. Schedius (1828, p. 179; 2005, p. 375.)

between the beautiful and the ugly (Schedius 1828, p. 180; Schedius 2005, p. 376). Later it was Plato and Aristotle, who gave a scientific exposition of these two ways of explaining beauty. The former wrote about the “shining” of the eternal ideas of beauty in beautiful objects, while the latter was only concerned with beauty that affected the human senses (Schedius 1828, p. 181; p. 376).

In the next step, Schedius briefly traces the historical developments of the two approaches, following the Platonic tradition from the Academics through Plotinus to Picco Mirandola, and the Aristotelian tradition from the Peripatetics through the Scholastics to “today’s philosophers”. According to Schedius, the 18th-century systems of the science of beauty (Du Bos, Chr. Wolff, Crousaz, Hutcheson, André, Batteux, Burke, Hogarth, Home, and Diderot are mentioned by name) are the heirs of the latter sensualist tradition. This tradition culminated in Baumgarten, who coined the term “aesthetics” for the science of sensitive cognition (Schedius 1828, p. 182 f.; Schedius 2005, pp. 377–379). The last of the aesthetic systems mentioned by Schedius is that of Kant, who, in his *Third Critique*, tried to “expose the faults [of Baumgarten’s system], and to give a more accurate explanation of the essence of beauty and its impact on human nature, while denying that there is some highest principle of beauty that can serve as the foundation for the science of beauty” (Schedius 1828, p. 183; Schedius 2005, p. 379). The last sentence of the volume merely alludes to the aesthetic systems that came after Kant, delaying their analysis to a later time.

Examining Schedius’ historical survey was necessary, because I believe that it can shed light on the implicit agenda of his work, i.e. his desire to eclectically synthesize the main tendencies inherent in the history of the discipline. The teleological design of his history of science is reflected in the title of the chapter as well: *On the history of philocalia* (“De historia philocaliae”). What it actually means is the “pre-history of philocalia”, which discipline – and the term itself – was created by Schedius himself. Even though the term φιλόκαλος (‘one who examines beauty, one who aspires to know beauty’) has its ancient antecedents, which are listed in §9 (Schedius 1828, p. 4; Schedius 2005, p. 262), Schedius borrows the term to designate a new discipline that includes both “calleologia” and “aesthetica”: the science of absolute beauty (inspired by Plato) on the one hand, and the doctrine of relative, sensual beauty (inspired by Aristotle)

on the other (Schedius 1828, p. 5 f.; Schedius 2005, p. 263). Thus, philocalia aims to synthesize the efforts made by earlier generations of scholars to understand beauty: based on the methodology implied, Schedius introduces his new discipline as the product of a community that was moulded into a new form by his systematization, helping certain potentials inherent in the tradition to their fullest realization. The historical survey at the end of the work delineates these potentials, while their culmination is to be found in the very book introducing the concept of philocalia. However, Schedius' survey is also concerned with that part of the tradition that seems to be – as Schedius puts it in the *Preface* – “serious impediments to the doctrine hereby explicated” (Schedius 1828 [without pagination]; Schedius 2005, p. 256). This “serious impediment” that cannot be fitted into the long history of the doctrine of beauty is none other than Kant's aesthetics.

An eclectic approach to the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*

As we have seen above, the closing chapter of the *Principia philocaliae* that surveys the history of the discipline of philocalia ends with mentioning the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, which puts Kant's work in the position of the immediate antecedent of Schedius' opus:

“At the beginning of the last century, men studying such subjects [i.e. the various kinds of beauty and the fine arts] were almost simultaneously obsessed by the same desire to organise them into a proper system [...]. Finally, it was Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (†1762) who fully succeeded, and gave the name aesthetics to his doctrine, which proved to be such a success that since then everyone who is concerned with this discipline has been following in his footsteps. In 1790, however, Immanuel Kant in his *Critik der Urtheilskraft* tried to expose the faults of this system, and to give a more accurate explanation of the essence of beauty and its impact on human nature, while denying that there is some highest principle of beauty that can serve as the foundation for the science of beauty. Since then, philosophers have been obsessed with the new passion of building aesthetic systems, but their efforts will be presented elsewhere” (Schedius 1828, p. 183f.; Schedius 2005, p. 378 f.).

In this longitudinal section, Kant is presented as a breaker of tradition. While Baumgarten represents and fulfils a long historical tradition (running back at least to Aristotle) that encompasses authors trying to give a scientific description of the functions of the human mind, capable of responding to sensual beauty, Kant is introduced as an individualist denier of the earlier consensual paradigm. In particular, Schedius refers to §44 of the *Third Critique*, where Kant rejects the idea that there can be a science of beauty: “There is neither a science of the beautiful, only a critique, nor beautiful science, only beautiful art. For if the former existed, then it would be determined in it scientifically, i.e., by means of proofs, whether something should be held to be beautiful or not; thus the judgment about beauty, if it belonged to a science, would not be a judgment of taste” (Kant 2000, p. 184).

Kant had already proposed this thesis in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where he had explicitly connected it with the critique of the Baumgartian approach: “The Germans are the only ones who now employ the word ‘aesthetics’ to designate that which others call the critique of taste. The ground for this is a failed hope, held by the excellent analyst Baumgarten, of bringing the critical estimation of the beautiful under principles of reason, and elevating its rules to a science. But this effort is futile. For the putative rules or criteria are merely empirical as far as their sources are concerned and can therefore never serve as *a priori* rules according to which our judgment of taste must be directed; rather the latter constitutes the genuine touchstone of the correctness of the former” (Kant 1998, p. 173).

In his summary, Schedius points out the difference between Kant’s *Third Critique* and his own position that preserves its links to the Baumgartian tradition, but this opposition is not intensified, even if their antagonism is clear. In the Kantian dichotomous system, science and art are separated, because while science has rules that can be given conceptually, “beautiful art is art of genius” that “cannot itself describe or indicate scientifically how it brings its product into being” (Kant 2000, p. 186 f.). In the case of such products of genius, “nature (that of the subject) [...] gives the rule to art” (Kant 2000, p. 219). In Schedius’ philocalia, on the contrary, science and art, object and subject are not separated from one another so strictly. As a result, the subject becomes the bearer of undivided “human nature, i.e. perfect humanity”. Instead of

being bound to the particularity of sensible human beings, beauty, i.e. “inner, subjective beauty”, is humanity itself (Schedius 1828, p. 2 f.; 2005, p. 259 f.), encompassing the entire world of human intellect and affections. Meanwhile the sciences, understood broadly, “are built upon this foundation of humanity” (Schedius 1828, p. 2; Schedius 2005, p. 260).

Schedius elaborates this anti-Kantian view with the help of Aristotle in §15 of the *Philocalia*, in a chapter dedicated to laying down the groundwork for the new discipline: “Beauty as a thing or object stems from a different source than beauty as a science, or scientific discipline. As for the science of beauty, it stems from the same source as any other science, including philosophy, under which discipline philocalia belongs: the intellect. Aristotle aptly writes that λέγω γὰρ νοῦν ἀρχὴν ἐπιστήμης [intellect is the originaive source (*arché*) of science²²], Post. I. 33; and also that Ἐπικοινωνοῦσι δὲ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐπιστῆμαι ἀλλήλαις κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ – κοινὰ δὲ λέγω οἷς χρῶνται ὡς ἐκ τούτων ἀποδεικνύοντες [In virtue of the common elements of demonstration – I mean the common axioms which are used as premises of demonstration, not the subjects nor the attributes demonstrated as belonging to them – all the sciences have communion with one another²³], Post I, 11. c. We believe, that the most fertile source of beauty can be found in human nature.”

There is no consensus among classical-philologists in how to interpret Aristotle's quoted segments,²⁴ but in Schedius' reading *nous* [intellect] refers to non-demonstrative knowledge, something that is common in each science. In the Aristotelian context, *nous* is bound up with sensitive cognition, since it refers to the inductive origins of general concepts.²⁵ When Schedius mentions that the source of beauty must be “human nature” (*natura humana*), he refers both to beauty as an object and to beauty as a science, and as he adds in the next paragraph, we can access *a posteriori* to the former, while *a priori* to the latter (Schedius 1828, p. 8; Schedius 2005, p. 264). Invoking the *nous* doctrine in this context probably functions as a link between the two modes of knowledge. At the

²² Quotation from: Aristotle: *Posterior Analytics*, I, 33. (Aristotele 2019).

²³ Quotation from: Aristotle: *Posterior Analytics*, I, 11. (Aristotele 2019).

²⁴ Cf. Perelmutter (2010), in particular: p. 239 f.

²⁵ „[T]he doctrine of nous should provide us [...] with Aristotle's answer to the question: what powers must be ascribed to the human psyche if it is to be capable of induction, that is, if it is to acquire from sense experience a stable grasp of the universal concepts or essences required for science?” (Kahn 1981, p. 404).

same time, by choosing the “common elements” (κοινοὶ τοποὶ) or “common axioms”²⁶ of human intellect to be the foundation of science, Schedius joins the tradition of eclecticism that – turning from speculation to topoi and to experiential knowledge – gathers practical knowledge from historical experience, while replaces metaphysics with commonsense reasoning.

A more direct reference to Kant can be found in §141, a paragraph that contains Schedius’ definition of genius, while also proposing an argument in the spirit of the commonsense tradition. According to the proposed argument, the genius “attaches the material to himself with intimate and equal ties, while [...] defining and controlling it”, meanwhile he is aware of “the intrinsic relationship between intellect and material.” His activity is, however, not individualistic: “The pursuit of the intellect to impinge on the material [...] will necessarily be appropriate to other minds of a similar nature that follow similar laws. Thus, whatever comes from the genius can be regarded as *exemplary* and *normative*.” (Schedius 1828, p. 81; Schedius 2005, p. 308 f.). At the end of the paragraph, Schedius instructs his reader to compare his argument with two bibliographical sources, the first of which is §46 of the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, entitled “Beautiful art is art of genius”. According to Kant’s definition proposed there: “The primary characteristics”, of genius must be “originality”, but, “since there can also be original nonsense, its products must at the same time be models, i.e. exemplary, and, while not themselves the result of imitation, they must yet serve others in that way” (Kant 2000, p. 186).

The Kantian view of genius as the breaker and creator of tradition is clearly adversary to Schedius’ position according to which the exemplariness of genius is founded upon a living community between him and his audience, a community of the like-minded, i.e. it is not individualistic or subjective. Instead of contradicting Kant directly, Schedius refers his reader to the second literary source, the part starting with §10 in Jean Paul’s *Vorschule der Ästhetik*, where the German aesthete (Jean Paul 1804, p. 54) combats Kant’s view, explicated in §46 of the *Third Critique*, that genius is distinctive of the arts. In contradistinction, Jean Paul attributes to the genius the simultaneous cultivation of all the powers of the mind, and argues that genius can be

²⁶ Aristotle: *Posterior Analytics*, I. 11. (Aristotele 2019).

productive both in the fields of philosophy and poetry. Furthermore, Jean Paul argues that the virtue of “thoughtfulness” (*Besonnenheit*) attributed to the cultivated, all-rounded genius is mimetic by nature, and gives us the cultural ideal of “the ancient world of learning” as an example.²⁷

Thus, Schedius abstains from openly confronting his notion of genius with that of Kant, but nevertheless gives his reader bibliographical references that can illuminate the conflicting views presented by scholarship, and that can put the doctrine of his *Principia philocaliae* into context. One of Schedius' remarks from a few pages earlier might also be relevant here, where he praises Kant's subtle distinction between the mental powers suited for the sciences and the arts but adding that he failed to give an exposition that is accurate enough (Schedius 1828, p. 72; Schedius 2005, p. 302).

Similarly, at other occasions of explicit criticism, Schedius nibbles at the inaccuracy of Kant's exposition. For example, when it comes to the “disinterested satisfaction” (*Wohlgefallen ohne Interesse*) (Kant 2000, p. 91.) that characterizes judgments of taste, the philosopher of Königsberg, Schedius argues, failed to differentiate “precisely enough” between “the appetite of the interest and the desire to take possession of the beautiful object” (Schedius 1828, p. 123 f., Schedius 2005, p. 337). Schedius, however, also alludes here to Herder's criticism of Kant in his *Kalligone* (Herder 1800, p. 193 ff.), which might indicate that Schedius' own concerns with Kant were not confined to the imprecise wording of his disinterestedness argument. In the part referred to by Schedius, Herder argues that beauty can never be disinterested, because “how could I take pleasure in something that does not interest me?” However, Herder also proposes a distinction between self-interest (*Eigennutz*) and one's “pure” interest in the beautiful (Herder 1800, p. 195 f.). This distinction is not meant to amend the Kantian terminology; instead, Herder wants to support with it the age-old doctrine – traced back to Homer and Plato in the previous chapter – concerning the interrelatedness of beauty and

²⁷ „[D]er Mensch achtet [...] nur das, was nicht mechanisch nachzuahmen ist; die Besonnenheit aber scheint eben immer nachzuahmen und mit Willkür und Heucheln göttliche Eingebung und Empfindung nachzuspielen und folglich – aufzuheben. Und hier braucht man die Beispiele ruchloser Geistesgegenwart nicht aus dem Denken [...], sondern die alte gelehrte Welt reicht uns besonders aus der rhetorischen und humanistischen [...] zu Exempeln.” (Jean Paul 1804, p. 60 f.)

morality that was set aside by Kant's notion of disinterested judgment of taste.

At other occasions, Schedius agrees with Kant. For instance, he welcomes Kant's idea of "coupling the graceful exclusively with relative beauty" (Schedius 1828, p. 97; Schedius 2005, p. 324), or that of regarding beauty as the symbol of morality (Schedius 1828, p. 97; Schedius 2005, p. 324). This latter idea plays an important part in the Kantian agenda of utilizing the power of aesthetic judgment to connect the empirical and the intelligible worlds.²⁸ Since Schedius did not presuppose such a discrepancy, for him, human nature, as an object of "absolute beauty", i.e. beautiful as well as good (καλοκάγαθός), has a different systematic status, than in Kant's *Critique*. This difference, however, is not emphasised by Schedius, which leaves the task of recognizing it, again, to the inquiring reader.

Concusion

I have demonstrated in this paper that Schedius considers his *Principia philocaliae* as the synthesis of two historical traditions of the doctrine of beauty, uniting the tradition that focuses on absolute (ideal) beauty (i. e. *calleologia*) with the one that focuses on relative (sensual) beauty (i. e. *aesthetica*). Schedius believes that the groundwork of his synthesising science of beauty is human nature in its twofold bodily and spiritual nature. I defined the methodology of the work as eclectic, that is to say that Schedius seeks to find or create a consensus in the historical tradition of aesthetics. Schedius follows two different paths. On the one hand, he gives an extensive survey and compiles the elements of the various systems of aesthetics compatible with his notion of philocalia. On the other hand, he delineates greater tendencies in the historical development of science that resulted in the prerequisites for the synthesising project of philocalia. Besides, Schedius also reflects on alternative approaches to the beautiful that cannot be fitted into the pre-history of philocalia, such as Kant's transcendental aesthetics. But even in this case, he tries to integrate to a certain extent the system worked out in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* to his discourse of philocalia. He does this by uprooting certain parts from the Kantian system and fitting them into his own argument

²⁸ See Kant (2000, s. 225 f.), Felten (2004, s. 103 ff.).

(e.g. the argument concerning beauty as the symbol of morality), or by abstaining from direct and open confrontations with Kantian principles that would break the desired consensus, and merely pointing them out instead (e.g. the doctrine of disinterestedness), while also referring his readers to the neohumanist critiques of Kant (e.g. Herder, Jean Paul). As a result, Kantian teachings, incompatible with the philocalia-project in themselves, are also drawn into the scientific discourse, sometimes through the strong criticism levelled against them. This methodology, at the same time, neither forces Schedius on the defensive, nor does it compel him to proclaim dissensus. Finally, Kant's famous view, according to which "There isn't a science of the beautiful", is implicitly countered by the very existence of the *Principia philocaliae*, and how the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* is fitted into its pre-history.

Thus, Schedius' philocalia is an example of a system that grew out of historical traditions, creating their synthesis. It is an eclectic system, since it compiles from every part of these traditions: driven by the desire for consensus, it considers all previous efforts to understand the subject under scrutiny, without rejecting any doctrine on principle. The other sign of eclecticism is that just as he rejects the idea that any of his learned predecessors' works gave some sort of a conclusion, Schedius does not think that his own synthesising achievement has the final say either. Rather, he presents his work as a contribution to the common endeavour of a scientific community, whose goal is to understand human nature as fully as possible through a dynamic process that cannot be brought to a close.

Translated by Botond Csuka

Bibliography:

- ALBRECHT, M., 1994. *Eklektik. Eine Begriffsgeschichte mit Hinweisen auf die Philosophie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- ARISTOTELE, 2019. *Posterior Analytics*. Translation G. R. G. Mure's [online]. [cit. 2019-09-24]. Available at: <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/>
- BACON, F., 1858. *Proficiency and Advancement of Learning, Divine and Human*. Ed. Th. MARKBY. London: Parker, Son, and Bourn.

- BACON, F., 1999. *Selected Philosophical Works*. Ed. Rose-Mary Sargent. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett.
- BALOGH, P., 2004. „Coniunctio interna organica”. Schedius Lajos állam- és társadalomelmélete a kora-reformkorból [Internal Organic Connection. Johann Ludwig Schedius's Theory on the State and the Society from the Early Nineteenth Century]. In: *Századok*. Vol. 138, No. 5, pp. 1229-1253.
- BALOGH, P., 2007. *Ars scientiae. Közelítések Schedius Lajos János tudományos pályájának dokumentumaihoz* [Ars scientiae. Approaches to Documents of Johann Ludwig Schedius' Scholarly Career] Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó.
- BALOGH, P., 2017. The Reception of Edmund Burke's Aesthetics in Hungary. In: M. FITZPATRICK, and P. JONES, eds. *The Reception of Edmund Burke in Europe*. London [etc.]: Bloomsbury, pp. 297-312.
- BALOGH, P., 2018. Aesthetics at the Royal University of Hungary (1774–1843). In: P. BALOGH, and G. FÓRIZS, eds. *Anthropologische Ästhetik in Mitteleuropa 1750–1850 / Anthropological Aesthetics in Central Europe 1750–1850*. Hannover: Wehrhahn, pp. 133–152.
- DOROMBY, K., 1933. *Schedius Lajos mint német-magyar kultúrközvetítő* [Ludwig Schedius as a Mediator between Hungarian and German Culture]. Budapest: Pfeifer.
- FELTEN, G., 2004. *Die Funktion des sensus communis in Kants Theorie des ästhetischen Urteils*. München: Wilhelm Fink.
- FÓRIZS, G., 2013. Szerdahely György Alajos Aestheticájának alapelvei [The Principles of Georgius Szerdahely's Aesthetics]. In: *Irodalomtörténet*. Vol. 94, No. 2, pp. 187-206.
- GIERL, M., 1997. *Pietismus und Aufklärung. Theologische Polemik und Kommunikationsreform der Wissenschaft am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GIERL, M., 1999. Compilation and Production of Knowledge in the Early German Enlightenment. In: H. BÖDEKER, P. H. REILL, and J. SCHLUMBOHM, eds. *Wissenschaft als kulturelle Praxis, 1750–1900*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 69-104.
- GIGON, O., 1965. Eklektizismus. In: C. ANDERSEN et al., eds. *Lexikon der alten Welt*. Zürich/Stuttgart: Artemis Verlag, Section 795.
- HERDER, J. G., 1800. *Kalligone. Vom Angenehmen und Schönen. Erster Theil*. Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch.
- JÁNOSI, B., 1916. *Schedius Lajos aesthetikai elmélete* [The Aesthetic Theory of Johann Ludwig Schedius]. Budapest: MTA.

- JEAN PAUL, 1804. *Vorschule der Aesthetik, nebst einigen Vorlesungen in Leipzig über die Parteien der Zeit. Erste Abtheilung*. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes.
- KAHN, Ch. H., 1981. The Role of *nous* in the Cognition of First Principles in Posterior Analytics II 19. In: E. BERT, ed. *Aristotle on Science. The "Posterior Analytics". Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium Aristotelicum Held in Padua in 1978*, pp. 385-414.
- KANT, I., 1998. *Critique of Pure Reason*. PAUL GUYER, Allen W. WOOD, translated and edited. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.
- KANT, I., 2000. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Paul GUYER, ed.; Paul GUYER, and Eric MATTHEWS, transl. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.
- KÖNIG, Chr., ed., 2003. Schedius, Johann Ludwig. In: Ch. KÖNIG, ed. *Internationales Germanistenlexikon 1800–1950*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, Volume 3, pp. 1578-1581.
- NAGY, E., 1983. *A magyar esztétika történetéből. Felvilágosodás és reformkor* [History of Hungarian Aesthetics. Enlightenment and Reform-Age]. Budapest: Kossuth.
- PERELMUTER, Z., 2010. *Nous and Two Kinds of Epistêmê in Aristotle's "Posterior Analytics"*. In: *Phronesis*. Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 228-254.
- SCHASLER, M., 1872. *Kritische Geschichte der Aesthetik. Grundlegung für die Aesthetik als Philosophie des Schönen und der Kunst. Zweite Abtheilung. Von Fichte bis auf die Gegenwart*. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- SCHEDIUS, L., 1817. A' Nemzetiségről [On Nationality]. In: *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* [Scholarly Collection]. Vol. 1, pp. 57-61.
- SCHEDIUS, L., 2005. A philokaliának, azaz a szépség tudományának alapelvei [Principles of Philocalia or the Science of Beauty]. In: P. BALOGH, ed., transl. *Doctrina pulcri. Schedius Lajos János széptani írásai*. [Doctrina pulcri. Johann Ludwig Schedius's Writings on Aesthetics]. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, pp. 253-379.
- SCHEDIUS, L., 1828. *Principia philocaliae, seu doctrinae pulcri* [Principles of Philocalia or the Science of Beauty]. Pest: Hartleben.
- SCHMIDT-BIGGEMANN, W., 1988. *Theodizee und Tatsachen. Das philosophische Profil der deutschen Aufklärung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- SZERDAHELY, G., 1778. *Aesthetica Sive Doctrina Boni Gustus* [Aesthetics or the Doctrine of Good Taste]. Pest: Typis Regiae Universitatis.
- WEIDEMANN, H., 1998. Platon über die Dialektik von Freundschaft und Liebe. (Lysis 212 a 8 – 213 d 5). In: E. RAINER, ed. *Amicus Plato*

magis amica veritas. Festschrift für Wolfgang Wieland zum 65. Geburtstag. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, s. 268-276.

✉ **Dr. Gergely Fórizs PhD.**
Research Centre for the Humanities, Budapest
Institute for Literary Studies
Forizs.Gergely@btk.mta.hu