

### III.

## Gymnasial- und Zeitschriftenästhetik in Ungarn



Béla Mester

## The Role of Aesthetics in the Works of a Professor at a Calvinist College

A Case Study on József Rozgonyi (1756–1823)

### Introduction

József Rozgonyi has a distinguished position in the history of Hungarian philosophy. He was the first Hungarian man of letters to take advantage of the opportunities created when the Protestant *peregrinatio academica* re-opened after the 18<sup>th</sup>-century restrictions. After he returned to Hungary, he became the key figure of the Hungarian debate on Kant (1792–1822), on the anti-Kant side. Over course of the three decades of this debate, the structure of the public sphere of the scholars changed radically. The language of the debates changed from Latin to Hungarian, and, following broadly European trends, the institutional framework moved away from the schools and towards the public sphere, which was dominated by publishing houses and periodicals. It is a symbolic fact that the first work published in this debate was Rozgonyi's monograph in Latin<sup>1</sup> and the last was a study in the first Hungarian scientific periodical, also by Rozgonyi.<sup>2</sup> In this analysis, aesthetics emerged in an age characterised by the changing public sphere and the debate on Kant. Rozgonyi's philosophical opinions, including his aesthetical ideas, can be interpreted from the point of view of their role in his critique of Kant.

In a nutshell, Rozgonyi's Kant-critique was based on a derivation of Kantianism from Hume's ideas and the application of Thomas Reid critique of Hume to this restricted form of Kantianism. However, he outlined his anti-Kantian opinions in his *Dubia* (1792), which did not yet contain any reflection on Kant's *Critique of Judgement* (1790). Actually, Rozgonyi wrote his work in

\* This paper was written within the framework of the research project entitled *Narratives of the History of Hungarian Philosophy 1792–1947* (OTKA/NKFI K 104643).

1 József Rozgonyi: *Dubia de initiis transcendentalis idealismi Kantiani. Ad viros clarissimos Jacob et Reinhold*. Pest 1792.

2 József Rozgonyi: »Aristippus védelme« [Defence of Aristippus]. In: *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* 6 (1822), 7, 52–61.

1789–1790, before the publication of Kant's book. The date of his preface is 1791, and 1792 is just the date of printing,<sup>3</sup> after the difficult processes of finding sponsors and getting past the censors. The period of the Napoleonic wars was a time of silence both for Rozgonyi and for his opponents, and the publications in the last period of his life followed the structure of his first work, in which he based his anti-Kantianism on an analysis of the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the *Critique of Practical Reason*.<sup>4</sup> In this structure of ideas, his aesthetical ideas find their place as a part of his *epistemology*.

In the first part of this paper, I offer an analysis of the new structure of the public sphere both from the perspective of Kant's formulation and from the perspective of its consequences for the Hungarian case, with special regard to aesthetics. In the second part, I describe the epitome of Rozgonyi's Kant-critique with its Scottish roots and the place of Rozgonyi's thought in the history of the European and Hungarian philosophies. In the third part, I offer an overview of a problem of Hungarian philosophical historiography. However, the early reception of Kant and aesthetics as an autonomous discipline of philosophy emerged almost in the same epoch; Kant's aesthetics did not have any significant role in the Hungarian debate on Kant. In the fourth and last part, I offer an overview of Rozgonyi's two works from the point of view of the role of his aesthetical opinions in these synthetic writings. The first one is a volume of his Latin lectures held in 1812–1813, recorded by his student at the College of Sárospatak, Pál Almási Balogh.<sup>5</sup> The second one is the printed version of these lectures, published in 1819.<sup>6</sup> In the printed version, the author

3 Rozgonyi: *Dubia* (= note 1), 8. After 24 years, Rozgonyi himself thought that the earlier date of his work is important: »Dubiorum Typothetae traditum anno 1791. impressum fuit 1792.« (Dubia was sent to the press in 1791, it was printed in 1792). József Rozgonyi: *Responsio ad immodesti anonymi recensentis, crises, contra Dubia de initiis transcendentalis idealismi Kantiani*. Sárospatak 1816.

4 Actually, he again began his publishing activity with his brochure, mentioned in the previous footnote.

5 József Rozgonyi: *Clarissimi Domini Josephini Rozgonyi Philosophiae in Coll. Helv. Conf. Addict. S. Patakiensi Professoris Publici Ordinarii, Philosophia universalis. Descripta, & plurimis Interpretationibus, Exemplis & Notis, in publicis praelectionibus connotatis aucta per P.[aulum] B.[alogh] de A.[lmási]. Tomus continens Psychologiam. S. Patakini. 1812&1813*. Manuscript in the Collection of Manuscripts of the Budapest University Library, archival code: F 27. (In short: Rozgonyi: *Philosophia universalis*.) Pál Almási Balogh and his brother Sámuel later became significant figures of Hungarian philosophy as members of the group of followers of Schellingian natural philosophy. Pál Almási Balogh was the first significant historiographer of the Hungarian philosophy.

6 József Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi psychologiae empiricae et rationalis perpetua Philosophiae Criticae ratione habita*. Sárospatak 1819.

has re-structured the system of the chapters and dropped his examples from the Hungarian history, literature, language, and geography, tailoring his text for the use of an imagined international target audience. He left out almost all the aesthetical chapters of his previous lectures; however, the aesthetical part remained the same, and the following parts formed a complex discussion of Truth, Beauty, and Good. This section of my inquiry will focus on Rozgonyi's aesthetical canon in his lectures, and I will outline a hypothesis about the possible causes of the lack of the aesthetical ideas in his printed works, clearly based on the text of his previous lectures.

### The New Structure of the Scholarly Public Sphere. Kantian Reflections, and Consequences for East-Central Europe

The change in the structure of the academic public sphere in Central Europe was in synchrony with the rise of Kantianism in the region. In the following, I mention several reflections of Immanuel Kant on the change which took place in the public sphere of academic life. I then show the unexpected consequences of this change in European philosophy in general, exemplified by special Hungarian instances. Kant's reflections on the changing structures of the public sphere of the community of philosophers from our point of view contain two main formulations. The first one is the distinction between *philosophia in sensu scholastico* and *philosophia in sensu cosmopolitico*. The second one is the distinction between the *private* and *public* usage of one's (human) reason.<sup>7</sup> However, Kant talks about the historical determination of *philosophia in sensu scholastico*, and in several places, he defines it as a *historical type of knowledge*, in opposition to philosophy in its strict sense; clearly, he was conscious of the institutional background. His formulation of a mere historical knowledge of philosophy presumes an *alternative system of institutions* for philosophical knowledge. However, Kant always talks about the individuality of the usage of the reason; *thinking* has not actually lost its social aspects. The goal of philosophical thinking is not individual satisfaction, but the satisfaction or bettering of the whole of humankind. The solution to the institutional restriction of the private, individual usage of the reason of individuals

7 The first distinction appeared in several *loci* of the oeuvre, essentially in the same form, for instance in his lectures on metaphysics by the version of Karl Heinrich Ludwig Pölitiz, in his lectures on logic, and in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (in the chapter entitled *The Architectonics of Pure Reason*).

is hidden in the community; it is the publicity of thinking, or the liberty of the *public usage of human reason*. In the following, I present the consequences of this Kantian concept of the publicity of philosophy for the next generations in the different national cultures of Europe. Historians of philosophy rarely emphasise that the changed public sphere extended the importance of national vernaculars in philosophical discourse. In Kant's cultural environment, the importance and the consequences of this change of languages in German philosophy were not clear at first glance because of the large German-speaking audience of philosophy. In a more detailed analysis, 18<sup>th</sup>-century German reflections of the new structure of the academic public sphere offer a more complex picture than a naïve admiration of the new intellectual openness of the possible audiences of this epoch toward philosophy. A distinguished German Kantian thinker, professor Born in Leipzig, wrote in his correspondence with Immanuel Kant that critical philosophy is a fundamental turn in the history of Western philosophy. Consequently, its masterpieces should not remain in the *domestic* vernacular of the Germans. Rather, they must be available in Latin for the *international* audience, as well. He promptly translated and published the main works of Kantian critical philosophy.<sup>8</sup> In smaller East-Central European cultures, the new structure of the public sphere had clearer consequences: discourse on the »world philosophy«<sup>9</sup> and the nation-level discourse about the role of some philosophical elements in national cultures became evidently different, as became clear in the Hungarian case during the *Debate on Kant* (1792–1822). Its first phase (1792–1800) was characterised by the dominance of Latin and the endeavour to participate in the European philosophical discourse, and it was focused on Kantian *epistemology*. The language of this debate has gradually shifted to Hungarian, and as of the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, its argumentation focused mainly on the *ethics*.<sup>10</sup> The first phase was divided into two parts by the prohibition of the Kantianism in

8 Immanuel Kant: *Immanuelis Kantii Opera ad philosophiam criticam*. Latine vertit Fredericus Gottlob Born. Leipzig 1796–1798, vol. 1–4. The fact that Kant himself was not satisfied with the Latin terminology of Born's translation is a separate issue. From the point of view of the history of the East-Central European reception of Kant, an important chronological detail with consequences for the Kantian terminology in Latin merits mention. Born's translation was published relatively soon after the original works; it was too late to influence the vocabulary of the debates on Kant in Latin. The Hungarian example shows that the first and most important writings of the debate on Kant in Latin were written *before* Born's translation; they were based on the original German text of Kant's works, and they developed their own Latin terminology for Kant's topics.

9 World philosophy (világfilozófia) is a term in 19<sup>th</sup>-century Hungarian philosophy for Kant's *philosophia in sensu cosmopolitico*.

the Hapsburg Empire in 1795; both parts are characterised by a Latin book written not specifically for Hungarians, but for the scholarly community of Europe.<sup>11</sup> It is an important feature of this period, because of the turn in communication and language from the narrow (but international) scholarly discourse to the wider (but national) public sphere and from Latin to Hungarian in the middle of the *Debate on Kant*. Aesthetics appeared in this epoch of different turning points. It was important both in the *academic* and in the *public* sphere, and it was particularly important in the intellectual life cultivated in *national languages*. Finally, because of the role of Kant in the history of aesthetics, it had a significant place in the Hungarian reception of Kant, despite its surprisingly relative absence in the history of Hungarian philosophy. I will touch on this question later, in the third section of this paper.

## The Epitome of Rozgonyi's Kant-critique; Rozgonyi's Position in the Historiography of Philosophy

József Rozgonyi was the greatest character of the Hungarian debate on Kantian philosophy on the side of the anti-Kantians.<sup>12</sup> He graduated from the University of Utrecht, where he was a disciple of professor Hennert, who is better known

- 10 The turning point is a philosophical pamphlet which declares on its frontispiece that it is a translation from a German source with commentaries. The German source has not yet been discovered. In my opinion, there was no such source; it was a fabrication intended to imply the existence of anti-Kantians among the German philosophers. For the pamphlet see: Ferenc Budai: *A' Kánt szerént való filosofjának rostálgatása levelekben* [Letters on the Kantian Philosophy]. Pozsony 1801.
- 11 Rozgonyi: *Dubia* (= note 1); Keresztély János Horváth: *Declaratio infirmitatis fundamtorum operis Kantiani Critick der reinen Vernunft*. Buda 1797. The international target audience of these publications is clear on their frontispieces, as well. Rozgonyi dedicated his work »ad viros clarissimos Jacob [Jakob] et Reinhold« on the title page, and he began the preface with the words »Viris clarissimus Jacob [Jakob] Hallensis, Reinhold Jenensis, academiae preofessoribus.« Horváth published only this book with the note about his membership in the Academy of Göttingen on the title page.
- 12 For a detailed description of Rozgonyi's life and oeuvre see my Hungarian paper: Béla Mester: »Magyar felvilágosodás – német vagy skót? Rozgonyi József Kant-kritikája.« In: *A felvilágosodás álmai és árnyai*. Ed. Mária Ludassy. Budapest 2007, 393–446. For a shorter version in English see: Béla Mester: »József Rozgonyi's Critique on Kant.« In: *Detours. Approaches to Immanuel Kant in Vienna, in Austria, and in Eastern Europe*. Ed. Violetta L. Waibel. Wien 2015, 191–202. For the same in German see: Béla Mester: »Die Kant-Kritik des Ungarn József Rozgonyi.« In: *Umwege. Annäherungen an Immanuel Kant in Wien, in Österreich und in Osteuropa*. Ed. Violetta L. Waibel, 196–207. Wien: Vienna University Press, 2015.

in the history of mathematics than in the history of philosophy.<sup>13</sup> In his years in Utrecht, under the influence of his professor, he became a follower of the Scottish *common sense*-philosophy; his favourites were mainly Thomas Reid and James Beattie.<sup>14</sup> After having pursued further studies in London and Oxford, he became familiar with Kantian philosophy during his journey home at German universities, Jena and Halle, where he frequented Reinhold's and Jakob's lectures on Kantian philosophy.<sup>15</sup> By that time, he had become a thinker with an established system of ideas, and he was older than his young professors. Consequently, he did not change his mind under their influence. Rather, the Kantianism of his professors prompted him to write a criticism of Kantian philosophy based on his earlier philosophical opinions connected with Scottish *common sense*-philosophy. His work, entitled *Dubia*, was written in Latin and published in Hungary. From the perspective of its aims, however, it was dedicated to Reinhold and Jakob on its frontispiece and addressed to the philosophers of the world, or at least of Europe. The target audience of Rozgonyi's other Latin works was the same: European philosophers. We can find the titles of Rozgonyi's works in the catalogues of the libraries of the greatest universities of Continental Europe and a positive review on the pages of *Gelehrte Anzeigen* in Göttingen.<sup>16</sup> Rozgonyi's first book was based on the first and second

- 13 Johan Frederik (Johann Friedrich) Hennert (1733–1813) was a professor of mathematics and philosophy in Utrecht of German origin. He has published his works in Latin, and in this issue he was a model, as well, for his Hungarian disciple. (Some of his works were later published in German translation, as well, in his homeland.) For his philosophical lectures see Johan Frederik Hennert: *Aphorismi philosophici*. Trajectum ad Rhenum [Utrecht] 1781.
- 14 Thomas Reid (1710–1796) and James Bettie (1735–1803) were distinguished figures of the Scottish common-sense school.
- 15 Carl Leonhard Reinhold (1758–1823), professor at the University of Jena, was a committed Kantian thinker when he met Rozgonyi. Ludwig Heinrich von Jakob (1758–1827) was a professor of philosophy at the University of Halle. Later, he was invited by the Russian Tsar to found the University of Harkhiv (today in Ukraine). After that, he published mainly works on the practical social sciences, and has finished his philosophical activity. When he met Rozgonyi, he was one of the known Kantian professors in Germany. (In Latin texts, his name is often written as *Jacob*.)
- 16 It was published anonymously in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 83 (1821), 3, 1998–2000. Several researchers have hypothesized that it was written by Gottlob Ernst Schulze. The review was republished as a quotation within the text of the following article: Lajos Rácz: »Egy magyar és egy német antikantiánus érintkezése«. [Contacts between a Hungarian and a German anti-Kantian Philosopher]. In: *Dolgozatok a modern filozófia köréből. Emlékkönyv Alexander Bernát hatvanadik születése napjára*. Ed. Lajos Dénes. Budapest 1910, 537–549.



critical work of Kant, though he did not yet know Kant's aesthetics for the chronological reasons mentioned above. The main line of his argumentation is the following. First, he recognises the importance of Kant, saying that he marks a turn in philosophy, similar to the turn brought about by Newton in physics – at least in Continental thinking. Rozgonyi's interpretation follows a reductive method. The central concept of Kantian philosophy, i.e. *causality*, can be reduced to the Humean theory of causality. According to his interpretation, a cultural problem emerged when, in the process of the Continental import of Hume, the original Scottish context of Humean philosophy, with the set of problems faced by Hume's contemporaries and his critics (among them the *common sense*-philosophers), remained unknown. Rozgonyi's opinion implies that this reduced Continental adaptation of the Scottish tradition by Kant is a misinterpretation of the Scottish philosophy. An important endeavour of his work is to inform his Continental – mainly German and Hungarian – target audiences about the Scottish philosophy, probably unknown to them, in a provocative manner. The motto of the book is James Beattie's definition of *sound reasoning* in English (it is the only non-Latinised reference in the volume).<sup>17</sup> Later, he adds the right pronunciation of the name of his favourite Scottish author, Reid.<sup>18</sup> The essence of his argument is that Thomas Reid's critique of Hume is accurate and it is valid for Kant, whose ideas can be reduced to those of Hume. This unique point of view, rooted in his special intellectual background, is key to Rozgonyi's importance in the history of the reception of Kant. After this polemical work, his later Latin books represent the same opinions, and they were enough to prompt him to try find an anti-Kantian ally in the person of Gottlob Ernst Schulze in Göttingen.<sup>19</sup> Rozgonyi's writings in Hungarian – mainly a few short pamphlets – represent another register: he wrote them for the people, who could not read or could not read Latin with adequate facility.

- 17 »All sound reasoning must ultimately rest on the principles of common sense, that is on principle intuitively certain or intuitive probable; and consequently, common sense is the ultimate judge of truth, to which reason must continually act in subordination. Beattie's *Essay on truth*, 142.« Rozgonyi: *Dubia* (= note 1), 2. For Beattie's work see: James Beattie: *An Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*. Edinburgh 1770.
- 18 »Reid (Rid)«. Rozgonyi: *Dubia* (= note 1), 53. Probably, he is referring here to an incorrect German pronunciation of Reid's name, which was heard by him at the German universities just after he arrived from Oxford.
- 19 Gottlob Ernst Schulze (1761–1833) was a professor of philosophy at the University of Göttingen. The text of his correspondence with Rozgonyi was published in Rácz's appendix. Rácz: »Egy magyar és egy német« (= note 16).

(From the perspective of its philosophical content, the most interesting of these pamphlets, *The Priest and the Doctor around the Dying Kant*, is just a short, popularised version of his *Dubia*.)<sup>20</sup> This *functionally bilingual* communication made it possible for false interpretations to emerge in the narratives of the Hungarian philosophical tradition.<sup>21</sup> In the history of Hungarian philosophy, professor Rozgonyi was considered the 'bad guy' for a long time, a protagonist of the narrow-minded conservatives who was against Kantianism, 'the incarnated Enlightenment', and opposed the shift in the scholarly public sphere from Latin to Hungarian. It is clear, that the problem is hidden in the structure of the national canon, which was unable to describe the multilingual structure of the European network of philosophy at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The requirement of the usage of the national vernacular in all the fields of intellectual life, including philosophy, and the support of what was actually the most modern philosophical trend go hand in hand in this canon, which uses the cultural standards of the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century nation-states in its assessments of an earlier period of European intellectual history. Another reason for Rozgonyi's negative reputation is his controversy with Ferenc Kazinczy, the central figure of Hungarian belles-lettres and the leader of the movement for the linguistic reform of Hungarian vocabulary and orthography at the time. Rozgonyi's opinions about literature and the arts are known in cultural memory, as they were mentioned in Kazinczy's monumental diary and correspondence, in which Kazinczy, influenced by the disagreement between the two men and his own sympathies for Kant, assessed them negatively.<sup>22</sup>

The situation is roughly the same in the case of Rozgonyi's role in the history of the European reception of Kantianism, Humeianism, and the Scottish *common sense*-philosophy. According to the canonized historiography of philosophy, which focuses on the lines of reception, Rozgonyi's position among the other similar figures of the semi-peripheries of the history of European

20 József Rozgonyi: *A' pap és a' doctor a' sínlődő Kánt körül, vagy rövid vizsgálása, főképen a' Tiszt. Pucz Antal Úr' Elmelkedéseinek A' Kánt' Philosophiájának fő Resultátumairól, 's óldalaslag illete az erköltsi Cathecismust Író' Bétsi feleleteinek*. Sárospatak 1819.

21 For a new approach in the research on this cultural phenomenon see Piroska Balogh: *Teória és medialitás. A latinitás a magyarországi tudásáramlásban 1800 körül* [Theory and Mediality. The Role of Latin Language in Knowledge Transfer of Hungarian Kingdom about 1800]. Budapest 2015.

22 For example, see his letter sent on 27 October 1818 to Count József Dessewffy about Rozgonyi. In: *Kazinczy Ferenc levelezése*. Ed. János Váczy. Budapest 1906, vol. 16, 206. Letter N°. 3653.

philosophy was that of a follower of one of the abovementioned philosophical schools. The study simply of the reception of Kant, Hume, Reid, and Bettie in Hungarian philosophy at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries would be a research program in itself, but it would not offer a description of a phenomenon like the Hungarian debate on Kant or Rozgonyi's real position within it, as the author of a Kant-critique based on the Scottish philosophy. These topics require a more complex approach.<sup>23</sup>

### Kantianism and Aesthetics in Hungarian Philosophy in the Period of the Debate on Kant

As mentioned above, there were mainly accidental causes of the lack of aesthetical questions: Rozgonyi had finished the manuscript of his *Dubia* before the publication of the *Critique of Judgement*. In the year when his *Dubia* was published, the name of Sámuel Toperczer, a student from Hungary has appeared in Jena, as the ›respondens‹ of a significant disciple of Reinhold, Friedrich Carl Forberg, about the theme of Kant's aesthetic.<sup>24</sup> He may have been the author of an anonymous review of Rozgonyi's book, a review written from a Kantian point of view.<sup>25</sup> However, there was a well-educated Kantian opponent with aesthetical interests and an anti-Kantian thinker, who was familiar with the Scottish tradition, in which the concept of taste, politeness, refinement, and so on has a central position; aesthetics did not become a hot point of the Hungarian debate on Kant in the Protestant institutional network. In the royal, but mainly Catholic university, professors of aesthetics were not involved in the actualities of this debate publicly, at least within the domestic policy of the university. A significant critique of Kantian philosophy from the university came from

23 For a detailed analysis of these methodological problems in the historiography of philosophy see: Béla Mester: »Toward a Central-European Comparative History of Philosophy. After Chamaerae of National Philosophies – the Hungarian Case.« In: *Synthesis Philosophica* 27 (2012), 2, 269–283.

24 Friedrich Carl Forberg: *Dissertatio philosophica de aesthetica transcendentali [...] publice defendet M. Fridericus Carolus Forberg Altenburgo-Saxo, respondente Samuele Toperczer Hungaro*. Jena 1792. For the details see János Rathmann: »Zur Rezeption der Deutschen Aufklärung in Oberungarn.« In: *Epochen, Richtungen, Lebenswerke. Studien über mittel- und osteuropäische Aufklärung*. Ed. Endre Kiss. Budapest 2010, 103–117.

25 N.N.: »Dubia de initiis transcendentalis idealismi Kantiani.« In: *Novi ecclesiastico – scholastici Annales Evangelicorum August. et Helvet. Confessionis in Austriaca Monarchia* 1 (1793), 2, 60–89.

Joannes Baptista Horváth, who was an emeritus professor of philosophy and physics. His œuvre and his *Declaratio* within it focused on the questions of natural philosophy. It represented a critique of the Kantian notions of the space and time.<sup>26</sup> This first period of the Hungarian debate on Kant, written in Latin and with a target audience of European scholars, was followed by a few years of silence during the wars. The new period of the debate was characterised by publications in Hungarian and by a large, mostly laic inland target audience. It focused on the questions of moral philosophy and its connection with religion in the atmosphere of the Holy Alliance in the last years. Aesthetics did not have a significant role in this second period either, despite the significant role it had in the philosophical thought of the protagonists of the debate. It is symptomatic that aesthetical questions were not in the focus of the defensive volume of Kantianism, organised by Kazinczy, a writer and author of the theory of belles-lettres, as well.<sup>27</sup>

### The Position of Aesthetics in the Manuscript and in the Printed Version of Rozgonyi's Late Work

Rozgonyi published syntheses of his philosophy at the end of the debate on Kant and at the end of his career, within four years, in Latin in a period when the language of public philosophy and that of the lectures of philosophy in a significant part of the Calvinist Colleges was Hungarian. Rozgonyi himself published several important works of the Kantian debate in Hungarian in the previous years, as well, as mentioned above. His aim was clear; he sought to continue the international discourse on Kantian philosophy within the framework of the new circumstances of the post-war period. At first, he sent his late answer to the critique of his *Dubia* and his *Dubia* itself with his former disciples throughout the European network of the *peregrinatio academica* of his college. In the person of Gottlob Ernst Schulze in Göttingen, based on his *Aenesidaemus*<sup>28</sup>, he hoped to find an anti-Kantian ally, and he sent him a

26 Horváth: *Declaratio infirmitatis* (= note 11)

27 Ferenc Kazinczy: *Prof. Tiszt. Márton István úrnak Ker. Morális Kathekhismus nevű munkájára írt Recenziók az azokra tett feleletekkel egybekötve* [Reviews on the *Christian moral catechism* by István Márton, together with the responds]. Vienna 1818. (Preface)

28 Gottlob Ernst Schulze: *Aenesidemos, oder über die Fundamente der von Herrn Professor Reinhold in Jena gelieferten Elementarphilosophie. Nebst einer Vertheidigung des Skepticismus gegen die Anmaassungen der Vernunftkritik*. Helmstedt 1792.

more detailed letter. After Schulze's positive answer, the next work, Rozgonyi's epistemology, was dedicated to Schulze<sup>29</sup>; this book was later positively reviewed in *Gelehrte Anzeigen* in Göttingen, as mentioned above. His last Latin work contains his legal philosophy<sup>30</sup>; all three syntheses are available in a significant number of the great university libraries of the Continental Europe. In his history of philosophy, there are rare references to aesthetics, only.<sup>31</sup> He mentioned in the description of the recent period of his lifetime that it was the first time in the history of philosophy when aesthetics was cultivated as a systematically developed philosophical discipline, and its important authors, he felt, should be discussed separately; but there was no separate chapter on aesthetics in this volume.<sup>32</sup> The structure of his large volume clearly mirrors the patterns of Thomas Reid's masterpieces, entitled *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* and *Essays on the Active Powers of the Human Mind*.<sup>33</sup> His legal philosophy can be regarded as an appendix and an application of the previous volume to the economy, politics, and social philosophy.

However, almost all Reid's topics are found in Rozgonyi's book, and their relationships are similar. The cultural examples and references used by Rozgonyi are often based on Reid's essays. Rozgonyi's work was not a simple translation or paraphrase; we should regard it as an original monograph *highly inspired* by Reid, with reflections on the previous philosophical debates of its author. Rozgonyi clearly hesitated to define the extent of the main topic of his greatest work. On the left side of the twin-frontispiece, he signed the subject as part A.) *on the Truth*; later, he divided it into two halves, A) and B), the later one representing his moral philosophy, but the declared topic of the last part of half A) *on the human will*

- 29 The text of the author's (printed) dedication on the title page: »Viro magnifico, Consul-tissimo Celeberrimo G. Ernesto Schulze, Potentissimi regis M. Britanniae a consuliis, Verae Philosophiae apud Germanos Restitutori, Ejusdemque Scienciae in nobilissima universae Eruditionis Palaestra Göttingensi Professori P. O. Leve hoc Opusculum Prae-sidio tanti Nominis tutanduni, perpetuaque venerationis monumentum pia mente of-fert, inscribitque Auctor.« Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi psychologiae* (= note 6), title page.
- 30 József Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi juris naturae, perpetua juris Romani, Hungarici, juris naturae Kantiani ratione habita*. Sárospatak 1822.
- 31 József Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi historiae philosophiae*. Sárospatak 1821.
- 32 »De Scriptoribus Æstheticae. Haec aetas Philosophiae, primos tulit Æstheticae System-aticae Auctores. Hic locus esset de his agendi proprius. Sed nos ne eadem his dicatur, Lectores ad Æstheticae nostrae Prolegomena relegamus.« Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi historiae philosophiae* (= note 31), 153.
- 33 The first series of his essays was published in 1785, the second one in 1788. The poste-rior editions regard them as one unified work, see: Thomas Reid: *Essays on the Powers of the Human Mind*, London–Edinburgh–Glasgow 1822, vol. 1–3.

is *the Good*. Three years later, he declared the topic of his legal philosophy as *the Good* with a twin-frontispiece of the same form, as the *B.*) part of philosophy. From this perspective, his philosophy is divided into two parts, epistemology for the study of the *Truth* and applied social philosophy in the form of legal philosophy for the study of the *Good*. Both have their foundations in the history of philosophy, but epistemology is a genuinely philosophical discipline in the strict sense. Where is aesthetics in this system, or where is the study of *Beauty*, between that of *Truth* and *Good*? At first glance, it is surprisingly insignificant in Rozgonyi's thought. The *aesthetical sense* is the sixth and last form of sense, after the physical sense, the sense of phantasy, the intellectual, the moral senses, and the sense of sympathy. According to its definition, »the aesthetical sense comes from the aspects of the things, or from the Beauty; we can learn about it from the special works on aesthetics.«<sup>34</sup> The message is also found in his lectures on the history of philosophy; there is a new, systematically developed field of research on modern aesthetics, but its place lies outside of philosophy in its strict sense. There are several hidden, additional loci of aesthetical qualities as the features of sensation, for example humour (with the example of Swift's Gulliver), but they emphasise more the subjection of aesthetics to epistemology rather than its importance or independence. Other published sources, such as Kazinczy's diary and correspondence, mentioned Rozgonyi's aesthetical opinions. Kazinczy's problem with Rozgonyi was not the lack of aesthetics in his philosophical thought, but his different opinions on the details of belles-lettres and on the concept of artwork, mirrored in his aesthetical lectures.

There is a well-known manuscript of his lectures in 1812–1813 penned by his student Pál Almási Balogh, who later became a distinguished figure in Hungarian intellectual life.<sup>35</sup> It is an uncensored version of the lectures, before the author's revisions in the course of the preparation of the text for an imagined international scholarly audience. Almási Balogh's manuscript does not contain Rozgonyi's legal philosophy, because it was not a part of the curriculum at the college, but a course held for the local *legal academy*. Its other parts can be regarded as the original forms of Rozgonyi's printed lectures, discussed above. The lectures on the history of philosophy do not differ significantly from the printed version; its function was seemingly to offer an introduction to philosophy. The other course

34 »Sensus Æstheticus oritur ex intuitu formae rei, vel ex Pulchro. De quo, loco proprio, in singulari opera de Æsthetica, pluribus agemus.« Rozgonyi: *Aphorismi psychologiae* (= note 6), 256.

35 Rozgonyi: *Philosophia universalis* (= note 5)

on *psychologia*, actually on epistemology or the philosophy of the mind, here has been divided into *three equal parts* after a short introduction, instead of the *dual system of the printed version*. The first part, *de repraesentatione tranquilla*, is devoted to the study of the *Truth*, the third one, *de repraesentatione vividiore sive Thelematologia* (a study on the human will), is a study of the *Good*, and the second one, *de repraesentatione vivida seu aethetica*, is a study of *Beauty*. The part on aesthetics is more than a third of the whole manuscript. It consists of about 250 pages. Rozgonyi offers an overview of the Antique and Modern opinions on Beauty till Fichte and Schelling, but he expresses his sympathies with Reid and Bettie, as well as his critique of Kant, in the details of his thoughts on aesthetics. His course contains a complete poetics, with a short history of the Italian, English, French, and German literatures. It is mainly the aesthetics of the Scottish common-sense philosophy, with a critique of the recent (mainly German) authors. English cultural examples are overrepresented; caricature is exemplified by Hogarth, humour by Swift, and natural beauty by Pope. It is the single part of the manuscript when Hungarian texts and several modern words from other languages are found within the Latin text (e.g. »burlesque«, short passages from novels in Hungarian translation, e.g. from Don Quixote, jokes, and anecdotes as examples of the genres of humour, and, rarely, several theoretical sentences in Hungarian).<sup>36</sup> The presence and distinguished place of aesthetics in Rozgonyi's lectures and the almost total absence of it from the printed work mirror a clearly opposite system of ideas. In the present phase of research, we can offer little more than hypotheses concerning the causes of this discrepancy.

### Instead of a Conclusion. Why Rozgonyi Omitted the Aesthetical Chapters of His Synthetic Work

In this paper, I discussed first the intellectual context of József Rozgonyi's critique of Kant as a framework for his aesthetical thinking; its main elements were the structural turn of the public sphere of scholars and the distinguished place of the Scottish *common sense*-tradition on Rozgonyi's philosophical horizon. I described the marginal position of aesthetics both in Rozgonyi's critique of

36 See, for example, his note in Hungarian on the poetry of Pope: »Gyakran a természetbe rettenetes zavarodások vagynak, de abból végtére edj gyönyörűség valami lesz.« [In nature, terrible confusions have often appeared, but in the end a beautiful entity has come of it]. Rozgonyi, *Philosophia universalis* (= note 5), 318.

Kant and in the Hungarian debate on Kant in general. The problem of the historiography of philosophy is that it was an epoch of the rise of aesthetics as an academic discipline of philosophy at the same time; and seemingly there was no interaction between these phenomena. In the analysis of the manuscript and the printed version of his late synthetic works, I showed Rozgonyi's ambiguous relationship with aesthetics, and a new problem emerged from the disharmony of the two versions concerning the role of aesthetics. One could well hypothesize that one of the causes of this lies in Rozgonyi's notion of philosophy in its strict sense, and the – perhaps misguided – perceptions of the international target audience. As his intellectual last will and testament, he wanted to formulate an epistemological opinion as a *hard core* of his philosophy, without any *soft* appendices. Another, possible cause was the connection between his aesthetical lectures and the national cultures and national languages, especially Hungarian. When he was purifying his manuscript of the Hungarian particularities while preparing it for an international audience, he dropped the aesthetical chapters, which contained a relatively large number of Hungarian references. In the chapters concerning epistemology and moral philosophy, he did not face this problem.