

Angewandte anthropologische Ästhetik
Konzepte und Praktiken 1700–1900

Applied Anthropological Aesthetics
Concepts and Practices 1700–1900



Bochumer Quellen und Forschungen zum 18. Jahrhundert

Herausgegeben von Carsten Zelle

Band 11

Angewandte anthropologische Ästhetik
Konzepte und Praktiken 1700–1900

Applied Anthropological Aesthetics
Concepts and Practices 1700–1900

Herausgegeben von Piroska Balogh und Gergely Fórizs

Wehrhahn Verlag

Die Herausgabe des Bandes wurde durch die finanzielle Unterstützung des Forschungszentrums für Humanwissenschaften der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften ermöglicht.



HAS

**Research Centre for
the Humanities**

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

1. Auflage 2020

Wehrhahn Verlag

www.wehrhahn-verlag.de

Satz und Gestaltung: Wehrhahn Verlag

Umschlagbild: Sokrates zieht Alkibiades aus der Umarmung der Wollust, Teilansicht. Öl auf Leinwand, 1791, Jean-Baptiste Regnault. Louvre, Paris. Quelle: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Jean-Baptiste_Regnault_-_Socrate_arrachant_Alcibiade_des_bras_de_la_volupté,_1791.jpg

Druck und Bindung: Sowa, Piaseczno

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Printed in Europe

© by Wehrhahn Verlag, Hannover

ISBN 978-3-86525-822-9

Inhalt

Piroska Balogh, Gergely Fórizs (Budapest) Zur Einleitung. Angewandte anthropologische Ästhetik – die Perspektive des Sowohl-als-auch	7
--	---

I. Angewandte Ästhetik

Marie Louise Herzfeld-Schild (Luzern) Die Musikalisierung des Menschen. Gedanken-Führung durch Anthropologie, Ästhetik und Musik im 18. Jahrhundert	15
---	----

Slávka Kopčáková (Prešov) The Aesthetics of Music in Upper Hungary between 1796 and 1842. Genesis, Sources and Initiators	47
---	----

Márton Szilágyi (Budapest) Latente Anwesenheit. Die ungarische Rezeption der literarischen Arbeiten von August Gottlieb Meißner um 1800	67
---	----

Gergely Fórizs (Budapest) Bildung und Vormundschaft Christian Oesers Frauenästhetik (1838/1899)	79
---	----

Borbála D. Mohay (Budapest) Ferenc Széchényi's Taste on Gardens and Landscapes	113
---	-----

II. Grenzfälle der Ästhetik

Botond Csuka (Budapest) From the Sympathetic Principle to the Nerve Fibres and Back Revisiting Edmund Burke's Solutions to the 'Paradox of Negative Emotions'	139
--	-----

Katalin Bartha-Kovács (Szeged) Ästhetik und Geschmackskritik Eine französische Variante der Kunstreflexion im 18. Jahrhundert	175
---	-----

Piroska Balogh (Budapest)	
Toward an Evolutionary Aesthetics	
August Greguss and the Hungarian Reception of Darwin	193

III. Rhetorik und Ästhetik an Gymnasien bzw. Universitäten

Carsten Zelle (Bochum)	
Eschenburgs Rhetorik – zur Theorie und Literatur	
der schönen Wissenschaften bzw. Redekünste (1783/1836)	
im Transformationsprozeß der rhetorischen Schriftkultur der Sattelzeit ...	209

Tomáš Hlobil (Prag)	
Das Erhabene in Franz Fickers Olmützer	
Vorlesungen über Ästhetik (1821/22)	
Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rolle Immanuel Kants	233

Antonín Polícar (Prague)	
Karl Heinrich Heydenreich on the a priori Sources of Pleasure and Taste ...	249

Piroska Balogh, Gergely Fórizs (Budapest)	
Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Appointment and Activity as	
Professor of Aesthetics at the Royal Hungarian University (1784–1791) ...	267

Appendix

1. Denkkzettel [Memorandum Concerning	
Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Biography and Bibliography, 1784]	294
2. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Plan for	
Teaching Aesthetics at Universities [1784]	295
3. Institutiones Aesthetices. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes'	
Lectures on Aesthetics (1791)	297

Namenregister	313
---------------------	-----

Über die Autorinnen und Autoren	323
---------------------------------------	-----

Piroska Balogh, Gergely Fórizs (Budapest)

Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Appointment and Activity as Professor of Aesthetics at the Royal Hungarian University (1784–1791)

1. Introduction

The German poet, author and translator Friedrich August Clemens Werthes (1748–1817) was born in the town of Buttenhausen in Württemberg. Here are his main biographical data we know from existing scholarship:¹ Werthes was born into the family of a Lutheran minister and was sent to the Lutheran foundation school of Tübingen (Tübinger Stift) for his advanced studies. He then continued his studies at the University of Erfurt, where he made a lifelong friendship with his philosophy professor, famous poet and editor Christoph Martin Wieland. He also became acquainted with the poets of the Göttinger Haindbund; his first volume, *Hirtenlieder* (pastoral songs), came out in 1772.²

- 1 For the most thorough critical survey of his life, see Theodor Herold: *Friedrich August Clemens Werthes und die deutschen Zriny-Dramen. Biographische und Quellenkritische Forschungen*. Münster 1898. For the most recent attempt, see Rita Unfer Lukoschik: »Rezeption italienischer Literatur im Deutschland der Spätaufklärung. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes (1748–1817)«. In: *Gelehrsamkeit in Deutschland und Italien im 18. Jahrhundert. Letterati, erudizione e società scientifiche negli spazi italiani e tedeschi del 700*. Ed. Giorgio Cusatelli, Maria Lieber, Heinz Thoma, Edoardo Tortarolo. Tübingen 1999, 111–126. The more recent scholarship focuses on Werthes as a playwright. See Markus Bernauer: »Clemens August Werthes' habsburgisches Theater«. In: *Wechselwirkungen I. Deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur im regionalen und internationalen Kontext*. Ed. Zoltán Szendi. Wien 2012, 95–104; Kálmán Kovács: »Niklas Zrini oder die Belagerung von Sigeth.« Gedächtniskämpfe und historische Narrative im zentraleuropäischen Kulturraum um 1800«. In: *Zentren und Peripherien. Deutsch und seine interkulturellen Beziehungen in Mitteleuropa*. Ed. Csaba Földes. Tübingen 2017, 181–195. For the bilingual (Hungarian-German) edition of Werthes' 1790 play about Miklós Zrínyi, with commentaries, see »Zrínyi, Zriny, Zrinski«. *Szigetvár német–magyar emlékezete 1790–1826 [German and Hungarian Memory of the Siege of Szigetvár 1790– 1826]*. Ed. Kálmán Kovács. Debrecen 2017, 7–62, 499–514.
- 2 Friedrich August Clemens Werthes, [and Christoph Martin Wieland]: *Hirtenlieder, von F. A. C. W. und der verklagte Amor. Ein Fragment von dem Verfasser der Musarion*. Leipzig 1772. On this book's influence on Goethe, see: Christopher Meid: »Mayfest: als bukolisches Gedicht. Zum Traditionsverhalten des jungen Goethe«. In: *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 136 (2019). Hg. Petra Oberhauser. Göttingen 2020, 127–141.

From this point on, he frequently published both original works of poetry and prose, as well as translations from Italian; from the 1780s, he also presented himself as a playwright. Nevertheless, it was his translations that brought him success. He translated the first eight cantos of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* into German, as well as Carlo Gozzi's plays.³ Meanwhile, he earned a living mainly by working as a private tutor to young aristocrats, which gave him the opportunity to travel throughout Germany and Switzerland. Between the years 1774 and 1780 he lived in Italy, but we know little of this period of his life. At the end of 1781, he was appointed professor of Italian literature at the Hohe Karlschule, an institution elevated to the rank of university by Joseph II in the same year. He stepped down from this position as early as the beginning of 1783. There seem to be two different explanations: either Prince Karl Eugen disapproved of his conduct⁴, or it was Werthes himself who was displeased with his working conditions, especially his salary.⁵ The next known fact from Werthes' life is that, following the proposal of the Viennese Studienhofkommission (Imperial Commission on Education) on 29 September 1784, Joseph II appointed him to be Professor of Aesthetics at the University of Pest on 13 October of the same year. This was Werthes' first long-term post, which he only resigned from six and a half years later, for reasons unknown, at the beginning of 1791, after the death of the emperor.⁶ He travelled to St. Petersburg, where he became a tutor once again. In 1797, we find him again in Württemberg, where he was appointed court counsellor and where he edited the official government journal.

- 3 This was first published in the 1774 volume of *Der Teutsche Merkur* and then, anonymously, as a distinct publication: *L. Ariosts rasender Roland, aus dem Italienischen Übersetzt*. Bern 1778. For Werthes' translations of Gozzi's works, see Hedwig Hoffmann Rusack: *Gozzi in Germany. A Survey of the Rise and Decline of the Gozzi Vogue in Germany and Austria, with Especial Reference to the German Romanticists*. New York 1930, especially the 3rd chapter: »The Spread of the Gozzi Vogue«, 56–71. By this time, Werthes' works and translations were already well-known in Hungary as well. This claim is supported by the fact that in his aesthetic treatise of 1784, published just before Werthes' appointment as professor of aesthetics, György Alajos Szerdahely referred to Werthes' merits in pastoral poetry as well as his Ariosto translations. Georg Aloys Szerdahely: *Poesis narrativa ad aestheticam seu Doctrinam boni gustus conformata*. Buda 1784, 146, 169.
- 4 Robert Uhlend: *Geschichte der Hohen Karlschule in Stuttgart*. Stuttgart 1953, 162.
- 5 Herold: *F. A. C. Werthes* (= note 1), 44 f. See also: *Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münsters. Wander- und Lehrjahre eines dänischen Gelehrten. Bd. 1. 1772–85*. Ed. Øjvind Andreasen. Kopenhagen / Leipzig 1937, 96.
- 6 For Werthes' time in Pest, see Gustav Heinrich: »Friedrich August Clemens Werthes in Ungarn«. In: *Ungarische Revue* 13 (1893) Heft 8–9, 508–513.

There has been no satisfying inquiry into the reasons why in 1784 the Austrian state gave such a privileged position to Werthes, a man who always lived an adventurous life without being able to or wanting to strike root anywhere. The details of his activities as a professor of aesthetics also lay hidden. In this paper, we will endeavour to explore these two topics by drawing on manuscripts that have as yet remained unpublished. We will examine two official documents in German that can be dated to 1784, and a set of lecture notes in Latin from 1791, both of which made public in the Appendix.

2. The circumstances of Werthes' appointment as professor of aesthetics

First, we will focus on the two documents connected to Werthes and kept among the official documents of Gottfried van Swieten in the manuscript repository of the Austrian National Library. Both unpublished materials are directly connected to the professorial appointment of the German author: one of them is a memorandum (»Denkzeddel«) by an anonymous author containing Werthes' main biographical data and bibliography; the other is an untitled proposal – written and signed by Werthes himself – about the principles of teaching aesthetics at universities. The documents are undated, but it is quite certain that they were written and sent to van Swieten directly before the 1784 appointment. As the president of the Studienhofkommission, the plenum responsible for the imperial education policy, van Swieten had considerable influence on the list of names that were submitted for professorial offices. Let us see, then, what new details we can learn from these documents about Werthes' life and his approach to aesthetics.

2. 1. The memorandum

As for the memorandum, it is noteworthy that it was probably this document that served as the basis of the Latin proposal of the Studienhofkommission on 29 September 1784.⁷ This is supported by the fact that both documents con-

7 Cf. Heinrich: »F. A. C. Werthes in Ungarn« (= note 6), 509. Heinrich gives a description of Werthes' professorial proposal based on the »files of the university of Budapest«. The documents in the university archives concerning the faculty of humanities, together with these files, were destroyed in 1956.

tain the same biographical data about Werthes. The only difference is that the proposal also includes some laudatory commentaries. (E.g.: »in amoenioribus literis artibusque liberalibus praeprimis excultus«). To mention another similarity: like the memorandum, the proposal also claims Werthes to be »34 years old«, which suggests that the memorandum might have been the source of the false data. In reality, Werthes, the applicant for the professorship, was 36 years old in 1784 – a fact already pointed out by Heinrich.⁸

The memorandum enriches our knowledge of Werthes' life with several important details. For example, there is mention of his university studies in Jena, which were previously unknown to scholars. For our present purposes, the most important detail is that after resigning his position at the university of Stuttgart he »undertook a learned journey to St. Petersburg and to the northern German provinces«. (»[M]achte er seitdem eine gelehrte Reise nach Petersburg und durch die nördlichen Provinzen von Deutschland«). This detail is of special importance because until this time we did not know what Werthes did between leaving Stuttgart in May 1783 and (re)appearing in Vienna in the summer of 1784. In his letter written to his mentor, Wieland, dated 4 May 1783, he mentions two scenarios for his future: he refers to a possible »Grand Tour«, i.e. an educational trip with a Russian count named Sievers, and with England being its main destination. But until then, he writes, he is going to Vienna, because »there« a position as professor of aesthetics has been offered to him »in the meantime«. Thus he decided to stay in Vienna, see how things would turn out, and gather some information as to whether »there is something to be gained there« for him, especially because »it is at this very time that the new institutions are coming into being«.⁹ This latter remark refers to the developments of the educational reforms then taking place in Austria, which, for instance, led to the appointment of Werthes' old poet friend, Johann Georg Jacobi¹⁰, to be Head of the Department of Aesthetics at the University of Freiburg in 1784.¹¹ Nevertheless, instead of Vienna, Werthes appeared in Weimar at the

8 Ibid.

9 F. A. C. Werthes to Christoph Martin Wieland, Stuttgart, 4 May 1783. In: *Wielands Briefwechsel. Bd. 8. Juli 1782 – Juni 1785. Teil 1*. Ed. Annerose Schneider. Berlin 1992, 96.

10 For the relationship of Werthes and Jacobi, see Herold: *F. A. C. Werthes* (= note 1), 14, 157.

11 For Joseph II's university reform concerning the faculty of humanities and aesthetics education, see Tomáš Hlobil: *Geschmacksbildung im Nationalinteresse. Die Anfänge der Prager Universitätsästhetik im mitteleuropäischen Kulturraum 1763–1805*. Hannover 2012, 39–51. For the circumstances of Jacobi's appointment, see *Ibid.*, 47 f.

end of June, where he asked for and received a letter of recommendation from Wieland.¹² The letter of recommendation was addressed to Tobias Philipp von Gebler in Vienna¹³, who was not only a significant playwright of his day but also held high office (at this time as the vice chancellor of the Bohemian-Austrian chancellery). It is debated by scholars whether Wieland's recommendation actually helped Werthes, who had just arrived in Vienna, because he remained unemployed for more than a year.¹⁴ The information in the memorandum, however, suggests that, even if Werthes went to Vienna in the summer of 1783, he did not stay there for long. Instead, he moved on – probably in the company of and with the financial support of the Russian count Sievers mentioned in his letter to Wieland – just not to England, as originally planned, but to St. Petersburg. This Russian sojourn can explain why we lack any information about Werthes' following year and why he travelled from Pest to St. Petersburg in 1791 to become the tutor to one of his former Stuttgart students there (not identical to the aforementioned count), who became a highly-ranking military officer.¹⁵ We know from the correspondence of Johann Georg Hamann that Werthes only returned from St. Petersburg in June 1784. While travelling to Vienna, Werthes visited the famous philosopher living in Königsberg, who mentioned this visitation to his friend with moderate enthusiasm.¹⁶

- 12 Cf. Thomas C. Starnes: *Christoph Martin Wieland. Leben und Werk. Aus zeitgenössischen Quellen chronologisch dargestellt. Band 1. »Vom Seraph zum Sittenverderber«. 1733–1783.* Sigmaringen 1987, 740.
- 13 Christoph Martin Wieland to Tobias Philipp von Gebler, Weimar, 29 June 1783. In: *Wielands Briefwechsel. Bd. 8.* (= note 9), 106–107.
- 14 The document (dated 29 September 1784) proposing Werthes for a professorship writes that he »currently devotes himself to literary activity in Vienna«, which suggests that he was officially unemployed at that time. Heinrich: »F. A. C. Werthes in Ungarn« (= note 6), 509. Herold points out the long interval between the recommendation addressed to Gebler and the actual professorial appointment. Herold: *F. A. C. Werthes* (= note 1), 59.
- 15 Cf. Friedrich Clemens August Werthes to Christoph Martin Wieland, Pest, 21 February 1791. In: *Wielands Briefwechsel. Bd. 11. Januar 1791 – Juni 1793. Erster Teil. Text.* Ed. Uta Motschmann. Berlin 2001, 41–42, here: 42. Also see: F. A. C. Werthes to Chr. M. Wieland, Pest, 3 April 1791. In: *Ibid.* 67–68, here: 68.
- 16 »Vorige Woche besuchte mich ein Prof. Werther oder Werthes in Gesellschaft unsers Mangelsdorf und Mohr. – Er kam von Petersburg und geht nach Wien. [...] Seine Begleitung und andere Umstände machten mich in Ansehung seiner verlegen und misstrauisch. Gegen Kant soll er gesagt haben bey Wieland im Hause gelebt zu haben – und mir versicherte er Herder noch zu Bückeburg gut gekannt zu haben. Nunmehr sagt man, daß es[sic!] der Uebersetzer des Ariost p[sic!] seyn soll.« Johann Georg Hamann to Johann George Scheffner, Königsberg, 8 June 1784. In: Johann Georg Hamann: *Briefwechsel. Bd. 5. 1783–1785.* Ed. Arthur Henkel. Frankfurt/M. 1965, 158–160, here: 158 f.

The next important detail is nowhere to be found in the content of the memorandum. It is the name of the person who wrote it. It can be stated with certainty that the memorandum was written by the same hand that wrote a draft of a letter, dated 17 August 1785, that can also be found among the Swieten documents.¹⁷ This draft is addressed to Johann Georg Jacobi, »professor of beautiful sciences« at Freiburg, and discusses the practical problems of teaching aesthetics. Usually, it is attributed to Gottfried van Swieten¹⁸, but, according to Ingrid Solly's dissertation, the handwriting on the draft belongs to Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen¹⁹, a claim also supported by Helmut Seel's recent monograph, with the slight difference that Seel attributes the authorship to Gemmingen, as well.²⁰ If the scholars who processed the history of Gemmingen's journal and wrote a monograph on his oeuvre identified the handwriting correctly (which is also the handwriting on the memorandum), then there are several – albeit indirect – conclusions to be drawn concerning the motivation for Werthes' appointment. There is also a direct connection between Gemmingen and Werthes: both of them were Freemasons and members of the Illuminati.

Earlier scholarship did not pay much attention to the fact that Werthes was a member of the secret societies of the Freemasons and the Illuminati²¹, and thus it was not commonly believed that there was an immediate link between

17 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Handschriftensammlung, Cod. 9717, fol. 538 r/v. For more on this letter, see Ernst Wangermann: »By and By We Shall Have an Enlightened Populace«. Moral Optimism and the Fine Arts«. In: *The Great Tradition and Its Legacy. The Evolution of Dramatic and Musical Theater in Austria and Central Europe*. Eds. Michael Cherlin, Halina Filipowicz, Richard L. Rudolph. New York / Oxford 2003, 12–32, here: 25. Also see Ernst Wangermann: *Aufklärung und staatsbürgerliche Erziehung. Gottfried van Swieten als Reformator des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens 1781–1791*, Wien 1978, 70.

18 One can find his name in the register of Jacobi's correspondence that erroneously dates the letter to 15 August 1785. Achim Aurnhammer, C.J. Andreas Klein: *Johann Georg Jacobi (1740–1814). Bibliographie und Briefverzeichnis*. Berlin / Boston 2012, 368.

19 Ingrid Solly: »Der Weltmann«. *Eine moralische Wochenschrift des Josephinismus* [Dissertation]. Wien 1981, 16.

20 Helmut Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen. Biographie*. Bayreuth 2000, 185.

21 Theodor Herold's Werthes-biography, for example, does not discuss this issue. The fact that Werthes was a member of the Illuminati society, a branch of Freemasonry, has been known ever since the memoir of his Stuttgart professor colleague, Jacob Friedrich von Abel. For this and on the Illuminati in general, see Richard van Dülmen: *Der Geheimbund der Illuminaten* [2nd Edition]. Stuttgart /Bad Cannstatt 1977. (On Werthes: *Ibid.*, 78.), also see *Der Illuminatenorden (1776–1785/87). Ein politischer Geheimbund der Aufklärungszeit*. Ed. Helmut Reinalter. Frankfurt/M. 1997.

his connections with other members and his suddenly ascending career in Vienna. Hans-Jürgen Schings' monograph resolved this oversight by examining the Stuttgart Illuminati, positioning Werthes in that circle, and exploring the years of his career spent in Stuttgart from this perspective. According to Schings, Werthes (or »Phyrro«, as he was called within the society) »clearly« took the initiative in founding the Stuttgart Illuminati Society in 1781. Schings also mentions that von Gebler, to whom Wieland's recommendation was addressed, was most probably also a member of the Illuminati.²² Following Schings, Rita Unfer Lukoschik has recently explicitly written that Werthes' professorial appointment »might have been partly the result of the efforts of Illuminati society members«.²³

Direct proof justifying this hypothesis has not yet been found, but there are several items of indirect evidence for it in contemporary documents. For example, we have the diary notes of two Freemason-Illuminati members, Georg Forster and Friedrich Münter, who travelled through Vienna at that time. Both of them mention Werthes, who was living in Vienna in the summer and autumn of 1784. Forster, staying in Vienna from 30 July 1784, accurately recorded in his diary the names of those he met, and Werthes' name appears several times on these lists – always mentioned together with the name of Gemmingen.²⁴ At this time, Baron Gemmingen was the president of the »Zur Wohlthätigkeit« Freemason Lodge and he was also part of the Illuminati. Forster himself – who was ceremonially initiated into the »Zur wahren Eintracht« Lodge in the August of 1784, then became an honorary member of Gemmingen's lodge in September – was part of the Illuminati from May that same year.²⁵ After 30th August 1784, Münter repeatedly mentions in his diary his discussions with »brother Werthes« about, among other things, the affairs of the society. Münter's diary is of interest for our present purposes because, according to the author, he met Werthes at Gemmingen's residence several times.²⁶

22 Hans-Jürgen Schings: *Die Brüder des Marquis Posa. Schiller und der Geheimbund der Illuminaten*. Tübingen 1996, 32.

23 Lukoschik (= note 1), 122.

24 Georg Forster: *Tagebücher* [2., berichtigte Auflage]. Ed. Brigitte Leuschner. Berlin 1993 (= *Georg Forsters Werke. Sämtliche Schriften, Tagebücher, Briefe*, 12), 108, 114, 117, 123, 124, 132, 137, 141.

25 For the note of Hans-Josef Irmen, see *Die Protokolle der Wiener Freimaurerloge »Zur wahren Eintracht« (1781–1785)*. Ed. Hans-Josef Irmen. Frankfurt/M. 1994, 325.

26 *Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münters* (= note 5), 59, 71, 86.

Our third relevant contemporary source specifically attests to the circumstances of Werthes' appointment. The documents in question are the letters of Johann Heinrich Gottfried von Bretschneider (1739–1810)²⁷, former director of the University Library of Pest, that he wrote to his friend, the Berlin-based publisher and editor Friedrich Nicolai.²⁸ At the end of October 1784, Bretschneider travelled from Vienna to Pest-Buda in the company of Werthes, whence he continued his travels to Lemberg (now Lviv, Ukraine) to take up his new position as librarian. He mentions Werthes' appointment in two of his letters. In the first, sent from Vienna, he describes Werthes in the following way: »Ich werde übermorgen über Ofen [i.e. Buda] nach Lemberg abreisen. Prof. Werthes der den Ariost übersetzt hat, ein Wielandianer den van Swieten auf Empfehlung des Bar[on]. Gemmingen zum Prof. der schönen Wissenschaften in Pest gemacht hat, wird mit mir bis Pest reisen.«²⁹ After returning to Buda, Bretschneider writes again to Nicolai, bringing up the topic for the second time. He notes that there are only three Protestant professors at the University of Pest, among them the freshly appointed Werthes: »ein Zögling Wielands der auf Empfehlung der Gräfin Thun, des Bar[on]. Gemmingen, und des B[aron]. v. Swieten hieher kommen[sic!] ist.«³⁰

Baron Otto Heinrich von Gemmingen-Hornberg (1755–1836), who seems to play a key role in our story, was, according to Münter's description, »a splendid, fine young man, filled with wit and fire, who spent his days mostly in his garden, dedicated to his friends«.³¹ He arrived at Vienna in 1782 from

27 Cf. János Bruckner: »H. G. Bretschneider an der Universitätsbibliothek Ofen-Pest (1780–1784). Zur Lebensgeschichte eines Bibliothekars der josephinischen Epoche«. In: *Biblos* 7 (1958) 2. Heft, 62–68. For Bretschneider's autobiography, see *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben des k.k. Hofrathes Heinrich Gottfried von Bretschneider. 1739 bis 1810*. Ed. Karl Friedrich Linger. Wien / Leipzig 1892.

28 For Nicolai's significance, see *Friedrich Nicolai (1733–1811)*. Ed. Stefanie Stockhorst, Knut Kiesant, Hans-Gert Roloff, Berlin 2011. In 1773, Werthes offered Nicolai his services as translator or writer, but Nicolai advised him to choose the state office instead. See Pamela E. Selwyn: *Everyday Life in the German Book Trade. Friedrich Nicolai as Bookseller and Publisher in the Age of Enlightenment 1750–1810*. Pennsylvania 2000, 300.

29 Johann Heinrich Gottfried von Bretschneider to Friedrich Nicolai, Vienna, 20 October 1784. In: Margit Szabó: *H. G. v. Bretschneider budai tartózkodása 1782–1784-ig. Fejezet a magyar felvilágosodás történetéből [H. G. v. Bretschneider in Buda 1782–1784. A Chapter from the History of Hungarian Enlightenment]*. Budapest 1942, 80–81, here: 81.

30 Johann Heinrich Gottfried von Bretschneider to Friedrich Nicolai, Buda [Ofen], 6 November 1784. In: *Ibid.*, 82.

31 *Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münters* (= note 5), 59.

Mannheim, where he had worked as a dramaturge for the national theatre.³² In Vienna, he moved with confidence in the highest circles, and published journals that supported the reform politics of Joseph II. His cooperation with van Swieten is known, though not documented in detail. According to Helmut Seel, after his arrival at Vienna, Gemmingen might have met van Swieten in the salon of Marie Wilhelmine von Thun-Hohenstein, a countess whose name also appears in Bretschneider's letter quoted earlier, and whose salon was one of the centres of Viennese cultural life.³³ It is a general assumption among scholars that Gemmingen edited his *Der Weltmann* (1782–1783) – his weekly journal addressed to higher aristocrats, propagating tolerance and striking a critical tone against the Catholic Church – together with van Swieten, and that van Swieten himself also published articles in the journal anonymously.³⁴ It is also assumed that Gemmingen had influence on issues of educational reform.³⁵ Officially, Gemmingen held no government position in Vienna, but his contemporaries believed he held significant informal power. Forster mentions Gemmingen as van Swieten's »closest friend« (»intimester Freund«)³⁶, while Münter writes about him that »[Gemmingen] hat im stillen vielen Einfluss durch seine Verbindungen mit dem Fürsten Kauniz[sic!], mit Baron van Swieten[sic!] und der Gräfin Thun«.³⁷ One of Georg Forster's letters also confirms³⁸ that Gem-

32 On Gemmingen as a playwright, see Cäsar Fleischlen: *Otto Heinrich von Gemmingen. Mit einer Vorstudie über Diderot als Dramatiker. »Le père de famille« – »Der deutsche Hausvater«.* Beitrag zu einer Geschichte des bürgerlichen Schauspiels. Stuttgart 1890.

33 Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen* (= note 20), 184.

34 Cf. Reinhold Bernhardt: »Aus der Umwelt der Wiener Klassiker. Freiherr Gottfried von Swieten (1734–1803)«. In: *Der Bär. Jahrbuch von Breikopf & Härtel* 7 (1930), 74–166, here: 78; Solly: »Der Weltmann« (= note 19), 18; Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen* (= note 20), 184; Wangermann: »By and By We Shall Have an Enlightened Populace.« (= note 17), 25 f. For the journal, see Wolfgang Martens: »Der Weltmann (Wien 1782–1783). Eine Wochenschrift für den Adel«. In: *Beiträge zu Komparatistik und Sozialgeschichte der Literatur*. Ed. Norbert Bachleitner, Alfred Noe und Hans-Gert Roloff, Amsterdam / Atlanta 1997, 645–655.

35 Solly: »Der Weltmann« (= note 19), 16, 189.

36 Georg Forster to Christian Gottlob Heyne, Vienna, 1 September 1784. In: Georg Forster: *Briefe 1784 – Juni 1787*. Ed. Brigitte Leuschner. Berlin 1978 (= *Georg Forsters Werke*, 14), 176–179, here: 177.

37 *Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münters* (= note 5), 111 f.

38 »Ich habe einen Freund hier, den Baron von Gemmingen, einen ganz vortrefflichen Kopf, der viel bei Fürst Kaunitz und bei van Swieten gilt«. Georg Forster to Samuel Thomas Sömmerring, Vienna, 14–16 August 1784. In: Forster: *Briefe 1784 – Juni 1787* (= note 36), 153–167, here: 161.

mingen's connections extended even to the highest ranks of the Austrian state apparatus, to State Chancellor Wenzel Anton Graf Kaunitz-Rietberg.

Gemmingen's acquaintance with Werthes predates their arrival at Vienna, for both of them were members of the ›Johannes zur brüderlichen Liebe‹ Freemason's Lodge, founded in 1781 in Worms.³⁹ Yet there seems to be only one visible sign of their cooperation: one of Werthes' lyrical poems was published in Gemmingen's *Magazin für Wissenschaften und Litteratur*, a journal launched in 1784.⁴⁰ Furthermore, we also know that Werthes helped in the distribution of the journal, utilising, for example, his connections in Königsberg. It is due to this that the first issue reached Johann Georg Hamann.⁴¹

As we have mentioned, both Werthes and Gemmingen were prominent Freemasons and Illuminati. Members of these secret orders used to help one another get ahead in society, which can be also documented based on their now publicly accessible secret correspondence, in which Werthes' name also makes an appearance. According to these documents, during a 1782 exchange of letters, Adolph Franz Friedrich Ludwig Freiherr von Knigge (alias Philo) and Johann Adam Weishaupt (alias Spartacus) discussed the possibility of a position for Werthes as a tutor. Werthes, however, could not accept the position, since it was reserved only for Catholics with a noble background.⁴² Certain details of this correspondence were already revealed by Leopold Alois Hoffmann (Gemmingen's and Werthes' fellow Freemason, and professor of German language and literature at the University of Pest between 1784 and 1790), who was deemed a traitor to the Freemasons. In his volume of 1796, he published a letter from Knigge with the clear intent of smearing him, in which the German

39 Cf. Wilhelm Kreutz: *Aufklärung in der Kurpfalz. Beiträge zu Institutionen, Sozietäten und Personen*. Heidelberg 2008, 150. Cf. Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen* (= note 20), 178 f.

40 F. A. C. Werthes: »Bey einer Thränenweide«. In: *Magazin für Wissenschaften und Litteratur* 1784 (1), 123–124.

41 See Johann Georg Hamann's letter to Johann George Scheffner, Königsberg, 19–20 September 1784. In: Johann Georg Hamann: *Briefwechsel. Bd. 5.* (= note 16), 221–223. here: 221. »Vorige Woche ist hier das erste Stück eines neuen *Magazins für Litteratur und Wissenschaften* angekommen, welches Otto von Gemmingen zu Wien [...] herausgibt. Pr.[ofessor] Werthes hat es seinem Freunde Mangelsdorf hier in Commiſſion gegeben. Das letzte u[nd] vielleicht schlechteste Stück ist von ihm; eine Ode unter der Aufschrift: *Thränenweide*. [...] Der Anfang verspricht viel Gutes.«

42 Adolph Franz Friedrich Ludwig Freiherr von Knigge to Johann Adam Weishaupt, Frankfurt, 24 September 1782. In: *Die Korrespondenz des Illuminatenordens. Band II. Januar 1782 – Juni 1783*. Ed. Reinhard Markner, Monika Neugebauer-Wölk, Hermann Schüttler. Berlin/Boston 2013, 196.

author presses for Werthes' Viennese appointment.⁴³ The picture becomes more complex if one considers that Hoffmann became head of the Department of German Language and Literature at the University of Pest in 1784 – allegedly due to Gemmingen's effective involvement.⁴⁴

Having considered all the above, the thesis that Werthes' good fortune in the year 1784 resulted from support from Freemason and Illuminati circles can be confirmed. One might also add that Baron Gemmingen played a crucial role in this.

Beyond that, however, one should also keep in mind that Werthes was also a perfect fit for the current governmental approach to cultural politics, as embodied by the name of van Swieten. In his monograph, Tomáš Hlobil points out the deliberate agenda during the reign of Joseph II to appoint well-known German poets and authors from Protestant regions to be heads of departments of aesthetics.⁴⁵ (As further examples, one might mention the 1784 appointment of Johann Georg Jacobi in Freiburg and the 1785 appointment of August Gottlieb Meißner in Prague.) There seem to be two interlocking motives behind this phenomenon. On the one hand, there is Joseph II's plan of centralization, employing persons from abroad who were independent from local elites and acted in accordance with central government, and, being Protestants, were independent from the Catholic clergy. For instance, in an official letter dated 9 August 1784, van Swieten explained the removal of the former professor of aesthetics in Pest, erstwhile Jesuit friar György Alajos Szerdahely, saying that since »the emperor wishes to reduce the number of ex-Jesuits in the university of Buda« there needs to be a Protestant appointed to be head of department.⁴⁶ On the other hand, one might discern in the background van Swieten's other agenda of prioritizing the actual improvement of taste that was expected from persons involved in practising art, especially in literary life.

43 Leopold Alois Hoffmann: *Aktenmäßige Darstellung der Deutschen Union, und ihrer Verbindung mit dem Illuminaten-Freimaurer- und Rosenkreutzer-Orden. Ein nöthiger Anhang zu den höchst wichtigen Erinnerungen zur rechten Zeit.* Wien 1796, 156.

44 Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen* (= note 20), 131.

45 Hlobil: *Geschmacksbildung im Nationalinteresse* (= note 11), 49 f.

46 Benedek Csaplár: »Révai sikertelen törekvése az egyetemi tanszékre« [»Révai's failed attempt to gain a professorship at the university«]. In: *Figyelő* 21 (1886), 118–133, 205–223, here: 212.

2. 2. Werthes' Plan for Teaching Aesthetics

The educational plan submitted by Werthes emphasises the social utility of an aesthetic curriculum designed to improve taste, and is clearly related to van Swieten's conception of education and aesthetics. Its theoretical background was first explored by Ernst Wangermann, who believed that it was during his years as ambassador in Berlin (1770–1777) that van Swieten became an »important convert to Shaftesburian moral aesthetics as formulated by Moses Mendelssohn and Johann Georg Sulzer.«⁴⁷ The intermingling of van Swieten's programme that elevated aesthetics to a »national issue«⁴⁸ with Sulzer's concept of taste can nevertheless be proved textually, as well: van Swieten, for example, made notes of the relevant definition proposed in the Berlin aesthete's lexicon: »Der Geschmack ist im Grunde nichts als das innere Gefühl, wodurch man die Reizung des Wahren und Guten empfindet.«⁴⁹ It was ideas like this that led Joseph II, inspired by van Swieten's initiative, to make aesthetics – a subject designed for the all-round improvement of taste – compulsory for third-year humanities students throughout the Empire in 1784.

To judge Werthes' ideas, however, we must also consider the general plan for scientific improvement developed by von Gemmingen in 1784 in his programmatic article published in his newly launched journal, the *Magazin für Wissenschaften und Litteratur*. The target audience of this periodical was the »enlightened bourgeoisie«; its central theme the cultivation of the sciences.⁵⁰ Drawing heavily and explicitly on Francis Bacon's conception of the sciences⁵¹, Gemmingen argues for an exoteric scientific culture; he considers social change to be a necessary precondition for this. The goal of »cultivating the sciences«, according to Gemmingen, is to undo the tendency of decay that followed the fall of the Roman Empire, when esoteric systems that had little to do with ex-

47 Wangermann: »By and By We Shall Have an Enlightened Populace« (= note 17), 24 f.

48 »Ferner die Bildung des Geschmacks, welche eben das Geschäft der Aesthetik ist, ist eine national-Angelegenheit, denn der Geschmack vervollkommet die Vernunft und Sittlichkeit, und verbreitet Anmut und Geselligkeit über das ganze Leben.« Gottfried van Swieten: »Über die Bildung der künftigen Volkslehrer. Vortrag der Studienhofkommission[.] Quotes from: Wangermann: *Aufklärung und staatsbürgerliche Erziehung* (= note 17), 38.

49 Cf. Wangermann: *Aufklärung und staatsbürgerliche Erziehung* (= note 17), 70.

50 Cf. Seel: *Otto Freiherr von Gemmingen* (note 20), 133 f.

51 Otto von Gemmingen: »Ueber Wissenschaftspflege«. In: *Magazin für Wissenschaften und Litteratur* 1 (1784), 1–9.

perience started to dominate the scientific world. In feudal systems, the sciences became the privilege of monks, who, detached from civil society, did not strive to serve mankind through their scientific work. Even though the sciences have since then made a partial return to society, one can still mostly find individual systems, especially in the fields of theology and law, which – even if »they, by their nature, are not real sciences« – have marginalised everything else. Instead of scholarship dedicated exclusively to an overtly specified field, Gemmingen argues for the model of classical antiquity, where »men of intellect«, who were always emphatically seen as statesmen, »tested their ideas on experience and put them into practice through their influence«. ⁵² The realization of this ideal is hindered, however, by the fact that those who are devoted to the improvement of the sciences have no means to influence social practice, nor to adjust their studies to it: »Noch immer ist bey uns das nicht vertilget, wogegen Baco so sehr eifert; groß ist der Schwarm der Systeme, und an Erfahrungen fehlt es noch immer. Man kümmert sich noch immer zu wenig um die unmittelbare Verbindung zwischen Grundsätzen und Anwendung. Daher die schiefe Unterscheidung zwischen Gelehrten und Geschäftsmännern, welche eigne Stände ausmachen.« ⁵³

It was through state interference that Gemmingen wished to resolve this problem. To regain the dignity of the sciences, to join theory with practice, he proposed to the emperor that excellent scholars be employed at the court, and that they be given »decent remuneration« and ability to »use their authority to promote the happiness of the people who they taught wisdom«. It is noteworthy that the state interference in the sciences proposed by Gemmingen did not merely consist of the utilitarian instrumentalization of science. Instead, and in accordance with Bacon's concept ⁵⁴, it proposed a model in which »practice is supported by theory, just as the latter is always to be accompanied by the former.« ⁵⁵

52 Ibid., 4 f.

53 Ibid., 5.

54 First and foremost, it is Bacon's »idola theatri« that are of special importance here, more specifically his argument against speculative philosophical systems. See, for instance, his argument that one should »consult experience [...], in order to frame his decisions and axioms«. Francis Bacon: *The New Organon*. In: Francis Bacon: *Selected Philosophical Works*. Ed. Rose-Mary Sargent. Indianapolis / Cambridge 1999, 86–206, here: 105 (*Book One*, 63).

55 »[M]an muß die Ausübung mit der Theorie unterstützen, so wie diese immer von jener begleitet seyn soll«. Gemmingen: »Ueber Wissenschaftspflege« (= note 51), 7.

It is plausible to interpret Werthes' educational plan in the context of this proposal. Introducing aesthetics in accord with the scientific ideal described by Gemmingen, Werthes writes that aesthetics is not to be taught in universities merely as an abstract science. Instead, aesthetics is to become a vehicle for actually improving taste. This implies moving away both from purely theoretical studies (from educating »metaphysicist know-it-all«), and from the merely practical education of poetics and rhetoric (educating »mere orators and poets«). Instead, the goal is to aim at the intersection of these two practices and to transcend them both: to promote the common good by making students capable of describing and understanding abstract truths. Thus, citizens would acquire capabilities necessary in all areas of life: »[D]er Geschmack ist das Leben jeder andern Wissenschaft, nur durch ihn können die größten und wichtigsten Wahrheiten so wie die besten und edelsten Gesinnungen allgemein und interessant gemacht werden.«

It would be in his inaugural lecture that Werthes expounded these ideas in detail, arguing that the effects of beauty extend to »the whole human being« (»der ganze Mensch«), and that it is intertwined with the ideal of *humanitas*.⁵⁶

3. Werthes' Professorial Activity at the University of Pest

Werthes held the title of ›Professor of Aesthetics‹ at the University of Pest between 1784 and 1791. His work as a professor of aesthetics has not yet been explored in detail in university histories and histories of criticism. Erzsébet Nyíry, who examined Werthes' years in Pest through a Germanist-comparatist lens, merely stated that he, in line with contemporary expectations, held his lectures in German.⁵⁷ University histories⁵⁸ have also observed this without giving any further details. Given that his inaugural lecture as well as his plays in this period were written in German, histories of aesthetics have also taken it for granted that his university lectures were held in the same language. It is quite interest-

56 Friedrich August Clemens Werthes: *Rede bey dem Antritt des öffentlichen Lehramts der schönen Wissenschaften auf der Universität von Pest*. Pest / Ofen 1784. On the lecture, see Hlobil: *Geschmacksbildung im Nationalinteresse* (= note 11), 209 ff.

57 Erzsébet Nyíry: *Werthes Frigyes Ágost Kelemen pesti évei 1784–1791. Adalékok első Zrínyi-dramáink történetéhez*. [Friedrich August Clemens Werthes's years in Pest between 1784–1791. *Supplements to the history of our first dramas on Zrínyi*.] Budapest 1939.

58 For a detailed account, see Imre Szentpétery: *A bölcsészettudományi kar története 1635–1935 [History of Faculty of Humanities 1635–1935]*. Budapest 1935, 280–286.

ing, however, that, according to the account of the *Wiener Zeitung*, he also gave a speech in Latin the day after his German inaugural lecture, though its text was not published.⁵⁹ The oldest university history from 1835, written by György Fejér, does not touch upon whether Werthes taught in German and whether this had something to do with him getting the job.⁶⁰

In the Manuscript Archive of the Hungarian National Széchényi Library there is a set of lecture notes taken by Adalbert Gerzon in the year 1791.⁶¹ These notes record two semesters of a course on the history of aesthetics. Interestingly, the instructor for the course was replaced after the first semester. The first semester was taught by Werthes, and the second by a professor temporarily substituting him, Julius Gabelhofer⁶², an Austrian Piarist and Illuminati Freemason, who later became notorious as an informer for the court. The notes for both semesters are in Latin. Even though Joseph II's university reform of 1784 prescribed the use of German textbooks to professors, contemporary textbooks and lecture notes⁶³ show that this did not necessarily mean that the language of education at the University of Pest was also changed. It was also in 1784, as part of van Swieten's reform, that Károly Koppi was appointed

- 59 »Ungarn. An der nunmehr von Ofen nach Pest versetzten Kön[iglichen]. Universität haben die Vorlesungen am 5. d[ieses]. M[onats]. ihren Anfang genommen. An diesem Tage hielt der neuernannte Professor der schönen Wissenschaften, Hr. Friderich[sic] Werthes, in seinem zahlreich besetzten Hörsaal, eine deutsche Antrittsrede in Bezug auf seinen Lehrgegenstand, die allgemeinen Beyfall fand, so wie seine Tages darauf in lateinischer Sprache abgehaltene, sehr wohlgesetzte Rede.« *Wiener Zeitung* 5 (1784), No. 93 [20 November], 2631.
- 60 György Fejér gives a detailed biography and bibliography of Werthes. György Fejér: *Historia Academiae Scientiarum Pazmaniae Archi- Episcopalis ac M. Theresianae Regiae Literaria*. Buda 1835, 170. Fejér himself was a student of Werthes: he mentions that »Doctrina ipsius usus sum in Aesthetica, Philologia et Auctoribus Classicis«. That is, Werthes »taught me aesthetics, philology, and antique authors«. (Ibid.)
- 61 *Augusti Werthes A[r]tium] L[iberalium] et Phylosophiae Doctoris tum Clarissimi Gabelhofer Theologiae Doctoris Valedicente Cl. Werthes, Institutiones Aesthetices, 1791, Adalberti Gerzon[is] III anni Phylos[ophiae] Pestini*. manuscript, National Széchényi Library, Manuscript collection, Quart. Lat. 2399. VII.
- 62 For his work as a professor of aesthetics, see Béla Kiss: »Julius Gabelhofer esztétikai előadásai a pesti egyetemen (1791)« [»Julius Gabelhofer's lectures on aesthetics at the University of Pest, 1791«]. In: *Lymbus* 9 (2011), 259–317.
- 63 E.g. Koppi Károly: *Caroli Koppi e Scholis Piis AA. LL. et Phil. Doctoris, atque in Regia Scientiarum Universitate Hung. Hist. Univ. Professoris P. O. Praelectionum Historicarum Tomus primus*. Pest 1788; *Historia Universalis A Clarissimo Domino Carolo Koppi. Auditoribus Philosophiae A[n]no Ilo proposita. Quam in Proprios Usus conscripsi Emericus Skublics A[n]no 1788/9*. National Széchényi Library, manuscript collection, Quart. Lat. 3902.

to the newly established department of *historia universalis* (before that only Hungarian history and clerical history were taught at the University of Pest). It is well documented that in the following decade Koppi taught *historia universalis* based on the Göttingen method (the methodology of August Ludwig von Schlözer and Johann Christoph Gatterer), but he consistently did so – as his notes and theses attest – in Latin.⁶⁴ Besides, he was a Piarist friar, who might have seemed to be an ideal candidate, given the rivalry of the two orders, to counterbalance the influence of ex-Jesuit professors at the university. It can be demonstrated that Károly Koppi's appointment was supported by the same circle that supported that of Werthes.⁶⁵ These facts also show that the main agenda of Swieten's reform was not Germanization, but rather the replacing of personnel in cultural politics, as well as reforming attitudes and introducing new disciplines that were regarded as timely and useful for the state. This assumption is also supported by Tomáš Hlobil's book on the history of Bohemian university aesthetics⁶⁶, and by the documents submitted by the professors who were appointed in 1784. In these documents, the freshly appointed professors – not just Werthes – wished to prove to van Swieten the social utility of their disciplines.⁶⁷ The key figure in Hungarian language reform, the author Ferenc Kazinczy, who, as van Swieten's officer, served as an educational inspector in one of the Hungarian school districts between 1786 and 1791, also felt that forceful Germanization was not the aim of the government's cultural policy.⁶⁸

64 For Koppi's role in university reform, see Piroška Balogh: »Koppi Károly. Kísérlet a göttingeni modern történettudomány metodikájának magyarországi meghonosítására [Károly Koppi. An Attempt to Naturalize the Modern Historiographical Methods of Göttingen in Hungary]«. In: *Századok* 151 (2017), 953–970. As the article shows, Koppi and Werthes were planning to publish a journal together entitled *Ungarische Historische Bibliothek*.

65 Károly Koppi, who was himself a Freemason, had connections to Bretschneider and Friedrich Nicolai through Márton Palásthy. See *Fejezetek egy leveleskönyvből. Palásthy Márton levelei Koppi Károlyhoz 1780–1783. [Chapters of a Correspondence. Márton Palásthy's Letters to Károly Koppi, 1780–1783.]* Ed. Piroška Balogh, Szeged 2008.

66 Hlobil: *Geschmacksbildung im Nationalinteresse* (= note 11).

67 These documents can be found in van Swieten's estate. Besides the text published here by Werthes, Károly Koppi's plan is also yet to be published (*Entwurf der Universalgeschichte an der hohen Schule zu Pest*, with Swieten's response, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Handschriftensammlung, Cod. 9717. fol. 490–491.)

68 »Doch haben Sie dabey denen Localvorstehern, Lehrern und Eltern zu erläutern, dass der die Absicht Sr. Mayestät verkennen würde, der glauben könnte, dass man die Verbreitung der deutschen Sprache zum Untergange der Innländischen, besonders aber der Ungarischen betreibt. Nie war dies der Wunsch der Regierung. Es ist zur Zierde des Thrones Sr. Majestät, dass unter ihm verschiedene Nationen ruhen; und ausser dem,

One might object that even though Joseph II's language decree that made German the official language of administration and law came into force in April 1784 and Werthes became professor in October, Joseph withdrew his decree at his death, so at the time of the 1791 lecture under scrutiny Latin was the official language. But, according to an account in the journal *Mindenes Gyűjtemény*, Werthes did not seem to share Joseph's Germanizing agenda even before his death: »It is a disgrace, indeed, that those with different mother tongues from ours feel a more fervent affection towards our Hungarian language than some of our fellow Hungarians. – Werthes, a professor of the fine sciences, did not know a single word in Hungarian two years ago. Since then, however, he made such progress in learning our language that he now understands every work written in Hungarian.«⁶⁹ The journal *Ephemerides Budenses*, published in Latin but also promoting the use of the Hungarian language⁷⁰, reported on Werthes' publications and professorial activity numerous times, if briefly, but made no mention of Werthes representing the Germanizing tendency, although it did emphasize details like this in most cases.⁷¹

dass die Ungarische Sprache in dem gemeinschaftlichen Leben unentbehrlich ist, so ist sie auch aus philosophischen Rücksichten werth fortgepflanzt zu werden. Sie liefert den Ungarischen Grossmuth und Stolz, die Quelle heroischer Thaten, womit Atila, Ludwig I, Andreas der 2te, Matthias Hunyadi und M. Theresia feindlichen Waffen trotzten und Europas Schrecken wurden, künftigen Generationen über; – sie ist unter allen lebenden (wenn Sie die üppig wollüstige Italienische ausnehmen) die schönste; reich, melodisch und original. Schenken Sie Ihr vielmehr (in so weit es andere Gegenstände erlauben) Ihr besonderes Augenmerk, und cultiviren Sie durch Ihre Cultivation den Geschmack und den Geist der *edlen Nation, der zur völligen Blüthe der Wissenschaften* (ich brauche hier den Ausdruck unseres grossen Praesidenten (ez B. Swieten Ö exc.) [that is his excellency Baron van Swieten] – *nichts anders fehlt als allumirt zu werden.*« Excerpt from the speech Kazinczy gave as educational inspector of the Kassa (today: Košice) school district to his employees on 20 December 1789. Ferenc Kazinczy to József Péczeli, Alsóregmec, 23 December 1789. In: *Kazinczy Ferenc levelezése. Vol 1. 1763–1789* [*The Correspondence of Ferenc Kazinczy*]. Ed. János Váczy. Budapest 1890, 522–524, here: 523 f.

69 Anonymous entry, untitled. In: *Mindenes Gyűjtemény* 2 (1790), IV, 87.

70 For the programme of the *Ephemerides Budenses*, see Piroška Balogh: »The Language Question and the Paradoxes of Latin Journalism in Eighteenth-century Hungary«. In: *Latin at the Crossroads of Identity. The Evolution of Linguistic Nationalism in the Kingdom of Hungary*. Eds. Gábor Almási, Lav Šubarić. Leiden 2015, 166–189.

71 The *Ephemerides Budenses* reported on Werthes' activity several times. See, for example, 2 (1791), 279–280; 3 (1792), 614.

Werthes' 1791 departure was reported by several journals;⁷² Georg Aloys Belnay wrote a farewell poem to him, complemented with an appreciatory biography.⁷³ Werthes also seems to have remained in contact with the professors at Pest.⁷⁴ Thus the possibility that Werthes taught aesthetics in German until 1790 at the University of Pest cannot be ruled out with absolute certainty, but there are several good reasons to believe that he taught in Latin and that his appointment was not primarily due to him being German, but rather to his approach to aesthetics and culture, and his web of personal connections. The concept of aesthetics in question has been aptly described in Hungarian scholarship by József Szauder. According to him, Werthes' lectures conveyed to his audience a traditional neo-classicist approach, while Gabelhofer talked about genius and taste, also referring to Baumgarten.⁷⁵ Gabelhofer's lectures – and their main foci – have been thoroughly examined by Béla Kiss.⁷⁶ It is time, then, that we do the same with Werthes' lectures on aesthetics.

3. 1. Werthes' Lectures on Aesthetics

In the Manuscript Archive of the Hungarian National Széchényi Library there is a collection of lecture notes, taken between 1789 and 1791 at the university of Pest, by a student named Adalbert Gerzon.⁷⁷ Unfortunately, we lack any data concerning Gerzon's biography. All we know about him is that he

72 See the previous note. See also *Magyar Kurir* 5 (1792) 221. According to the journal *Hadi és más nevezetes történetek*, Werthes went to St. Petersburg because of an illness: *Hadi és más nevezetes történetek* 4 (1791), 491. Werthes' embeddedness into the intelligentsia of Pest is reflected by one of his topical poems, mentioned in the report referred to in the previous note: *Kirchengesänge auf das am ersten May 1791. von den Protestanten in Ungarn zu feyernde Religionsfest für das evangelische Bethaus zu Pest verfertigt*. [Pest] 1791.

73 Georg Aloys Belnay: *Auf die Abreise des Herrn Friedr. Aug. Cl. Werthes*. Pest 1791.

74 This is suggested by an entry in László Festetics's, a young aristocrat's, *Album amicorum* (National Széchényi Library, manuscript collection, Oct. Lat. 1256. 63r.) about Werthes, dated 20 September 1803, Stuttgart. This is noteworthy, because during his travels in Germany, Festetics was accompanied by Johann Ludwig Schedius, Werthes' successor at the aesthetics department at Pest. It might have also been him who was responsible for choosing the designations of their travels.

75 József Szauder: »Az esztétikai tanszék betöltésére kiírt pályázat és kritikai irányzataink 1791-ben« [Application for the chair of aesthetics and our critical discourses in 1791]. In: *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75 (1971), 78–106, here: 81 f.

76 Kiss: »Julius Gabelhofer esztétikai előadásai« (= note 62).

77 National Széchényi Library (Budapest), Manuscript collection (OSZK Kézirattár), Quart. Lat. 2399.

listened to Anton Kreil's lectures on Kant's philosophy and psychology, Ludwig Mitterpacher's lectures on natural history, Martin Schwartzner's lectures on diplomatics, András Dugonics's lectures on mathematics, Károly Koppi's lectures on universal history, and (in his third year at the faculty of humanities) Werthes's lectures on aesthetics. Werthes gave these lectures on aesthetics in the first semester of 1790–91. Before the beginning of the second semester, he left the university of Pest, hence the lectures on aesthetics were continued by Gabrielhofer. Gerzon's notes on Werthes's lectures are 17 page long. The notes show that Werthes delineated the boundaries of the science of aesthetics, the various arts, and the links between aesthetics and rhetorics. Let us now turn to the main theses of Werthes' lectures published in Latin in the Appendix:

1.) On the science of aesthetics:

What does the science of the beautiful consist of? It is a theory of art. Art is a practice specific to man, an important aspect of human nature. Aesthetics is the analysis of the internal perception of sensory impressions. Both the conversative arts (poetry, rhetoric) and the representational arts (painting, architecture, sculpture) belong here. The necessary attributes of an artist are 1. a delicate sensibility to beauty; 2. a power of judgment and a power of expression. If he is in possession of each of these, then he is a »SCHENI«. (The term is most probably an erroneously recorded version of the German ›Genie).

2.) On the utility of the arts:

Their main utility is the improvement and perfection of man through 1. strengthening his virtues, 2. refining his mind, and 3. planting the desire towards perfection into his soul. The arts are *artes liberales*, since they make men *liberalis*, i.e. noble, and nations cultivated. It is not only inner moral improvement that bestows true significance on the arts. The artist is always a citizen as well, who, therefore, improves civic life through his works. Is it possible to abuse or misuse the arts? Indeed it is, when they are used as a means of bare pleasure, and while their proper use is forgotten. The science of the beautiful reveals to us how we can grasp the essence of the arts. To quote Quintilian: a man of culture understands the essence of the arts, while those without culture enjoy only their effect. One might ask whether the artist needs the laws of aesthetics or if his own genius is enough for him. We must remind ourselves that the rules of art are rooted in the practice of art, and, therefore, that our art education should also be practical and started in childhood, so it is able to refine our sens-

es. Art theory has a general branch as well as particular branches for the various arts. Conversative arts take priority, since 1. conversation is the most important of the skills we have; 2. conversation is the source of nationality, humanity and the arts; 3. it was language that elevated man from the realm of animals. Conversation consists of articulated sounds. It expresses forms, colours, and the thoughts of the human mind, moulding ideas into the confines of sounds. It forms a coherent system that conjugates the human senses, sensibility, perception, sociability, and humanity. It has the ability to express the character of a person or a nation.

3.) On the beauty of language:

The beauty of language depends on the degree it can agreeably move the sensory and imaginative powers of the human mind. The degree of its beauty depends on climate, eating habits, and other national characteristics: the most beautiful language is certainly the Greek language. Each language has its own beauty particular to it that needs improvement. Improvement or cultivation are analogous with the organic process of a child becoming an adult. Its last stage is luxury, feminization, and affectation. The state of language is indicative of the cultural state of a person as well as that of a nation. Where language is deprived, thinking suffers from deprivation, too. This can be aided by conversation, learning new tongues, and translating foreign works.

4.) On rhetoric:

Rhetoric is the skill of eloquence as well as its theory. It pervades our lives as the personal eloquence we use as parents, friends, or citizens. Its model is Socrates. The discovery of writing and then the development of printing were significant milestones in the history of rhetoric.

5.) On the author:

A person who expresses the sentiments of his soul to the public. Rhetoric is the art of speaking and writing beautifully. Only a good person will become a good orator, since a speech is good only when it is founded on proper ideas and follows the rules of language. We can violate these rules either grammatically (barbarism, soloecism, or spelling) or morally. The outer structure of speech consists of logical structure and periods. Its merit is clarity; its faults are obscurity and ambiguity. Structural correctness is not enough for a speech to be beautiful. It

also needs to have vivacity, that is 1. vivid sensual and expressive power, 2. an exciting subject, 3. a vivid apprehension of this subject. The means of vivacity are figures: 1. figures of emotions, 2. figures of fantasy: metonymy and gradation, 3. figures of understanding. One must avoid: 1. using figures pointlessly, 2. using them improperly, 3. using them to exaggerate despicable, vile, or worthless things, 4. connecting things too distant from one another, 5. using them immoderately. What is a beautiful image? It is a metaphor that moves our imagination vividly and delicately. What is a beautiful way of thinking? Its essence is Witz, i.e. unexpected association. The external beauties of an oration: 1. well-chosen words: natural, not vulgar, urbane, pure. Pure: with nothing extraneous (purism). Extraneity: archaism, provincialism, foreign words, neologisms. 2. The order of words, euphony.

Werthes' theses end here: even though his lectures on aesthetics continued in the spring semester of the academic year 1790/1791, they were delivered by Gabelhofer. We can state with certainty that Werthes' lectures were quite different from the assumptions and claims of his earlier scholarship – both in their language and content. Werthes' conception is clearly within the realm of anthropological aesthetics. As for the division of the arts, he follows Sulzer's system.⁷⁸ And although »genius« appears in the erroneous form of »SCHENI« in the lecture notes, it did occur – pace Szauder's assumptions – during the lectures. Furthermore, confuting another earlier assumption, Werthes uses the term in accordance with Baumgarten's notion of genius, since the definition proposed in the notes (as the harmony of powers of the mind and sensory perception) draws on the Baumgartenian definition of the term.⁷⁹ Another aspect is that Adalbert Gerzon, making these notes, became confused, and did not know how to spell this (for him) new term.

Werthes' definition of an author is also noteworthy: an author is defined as a person who expresses his sentiments publicly (»Qui publice animi sensa sua depromunt«). His decision to place the expression of emotions into the centre of poetics and rhetoric and his emphasis on the role of fantasy in a later chap-

78 Johann Georg Sulzer: *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*. Vol. 1–2. Leipzig 1771 / 1774.

79 For a detailed description of »Ingenio venustus et elegans connatum«, i.e. aesthetic ingenium in Latin and German, see Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten: *Aesthetica – Aesthetik*. Ed. Dagmar Mirbach, Hamburg 2007, 28–39. For some further aspects of Baumgarten's notion of ingenium, see Dagmar Mirbach: »Ingenium Venustum und Magnitudo Pectoris. Ethische Aspekte von Alexander Gottlieb Baumgartens Aesthetica«. In: *Aufklärung* 20 (2008), 199–218.

ter are clear allusions to contemporary theories of enthusiasm. Werthes took a strong interest in this particular subject. This is reflected by the fact that he translated the Italian Saverio Bettinelli's book on enthusiasm as early as 1778, which he then refined in 1794.⁸⁰ Bettinelli's concept of enthusiasm, in many respects like Baumgarten's concept of ingenium, builds on the Platonic notion of kalokagathia: »Wie der Enthusiasmus in seiner Erhebung das allgemeine, höchste, und idealische Schöne erreichen kann, so läßt sich glauben, daß in einem ähnlichen Zustand die Genien auch das Wahre und Gute auch[sic!] erreichen können.«⁸¹ A similar definition is offered in Werthes' inaugural lecture of 1784: »Enthusiasmus, dies lebhaftes Gefühl des Schönen, des Wahren und Guten.«⁸² It is plausible that Werthes' interest in enthusiasm is connected to his Freemason circle. Werthes' embeddedness in the Freemason circles of Pest is shown by his name appearing on the list of names of the Pester »Lese-gesellschaft«, a collective comprised mostly of Freemasons, in the company of Károly Koppi, Anton Kreil, and Martin Schwarner.⁸³ During his years spent in Pest, he probably became acquainted with members of the local *Magnanimitas* Lodge, who had several links to the specifically Hungarian Freemason organisation, the so-called Draskovics Observancy. The constitution of the Draskovics Observancy involves an anthropological programme concerning the ideal Freemason, and mentions the characteristic of »enthusiasmus« among his paramount virtues.⁸⁴ Thus, at this point, the aesthetic theory of enthusiasm seems

80 Original: Saverio Bettinelli: *Dell'Entusiasmo delle belle arti*. Milano 1769. and *Opere*. Vol. 2. *L'entusiasmo*. Venice 1780. Translations: Xaver Bettinelli: *Über den Enthusiasmus der schönen Künste*. Transl. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes. Bern 1778. and *Vom Werth des Enthusiasmus. Geschichte seiner Wirkung in der Philosophie, in der Wissenschaft und in der Regierungskunst*. Ed. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes. Leipzig 1794.

81 Xaver Bettinelli: *Über den Enthusiasmus der schönen Künste*. Transl. Friedrich August Clemens Werthes. Bern 1778, 239. Both the Jesuit Bettinelli's interpretation of enthusiasm and Werthes' translation are already alluded to by Werthes' predecessor György Alajos Szerdahelyi in his treatise on poetics. Georg Aloys Szerdahelyi: *Ars poetica generalis ad aestheticam seu Doctrinam boni gustus conformata*. Buda 1783, 149 f.

82 Werthes: *Rede bey dem Antritt* (= note 56), without pagination. Cf. Hlobil: *Geschmacksbildung im Nationalinteresse* (= note 11), 210 f.

83 See Etelka Doncsecz: »Ferenc Verseghy und die Freimaurerei«. In: *Aufgeklärte Sozietäten, Literatur und Wissenschaft in Mitteleuropa*, Ed. Breuer Dieter, Gábor Tüskés, Réka Lengyel, Berlin / Boston 2019, 439–448, here: 443.

84 On the constitution of Draskovics observance, and its anthropological programme, see: Piroska Balogh: »The Constitutional Principles of the Draskovics Observance and its Influence on Cultural Networks« In: Dieter, Tüskés, Lengyel (Eds.): *Aufgeklärte Sozietäten* (= note 83), 319–331.

to merge with the political discourse of enthusiasm (where it is often negatively evaluated) widespread in Freemason circles.⁸⁵ This merger is well demonstrated in the person and theoretical views of Werthes himself.

When treating the relation between art and civic education, the lectures clearly draw on the principles of van Swieten's idea of culture; in this regard, they are a direct continuation of Werthes' plan and inaugural lecture. And although earlier scholarship introduced Werthes as a follower of Kant, one might regard some of his arguments as even a challenge or criticism of Kant's thoughts on genius. For example, Werthes raises the question of whether poets need the laws of aesthetics or whether their genius suffices. He also asks whether these laws are external or internal to the author's own ingenium.

His argument concerning the relation of language and culture also contradicts the assumption that aesthetics education fully distanced itself from the project of cultivating national tongues. Werthes' organic conception of language cultivation, as an aesthetic imperative, would hardly come as a surprise coming from a Hungarian author, but it is truly surprising coming from an author whose mother tongue is German, and who was lecturing in Latin.

Werthes' lectures also prove noteworthy when read from the vantage point of the aesthetic system of his predecessor, György Alajos Szerdahely.⁸⁶ Both authors share the idea that the arts and aesthetics itself are crucial vehicles of moral improvement, and that the vivid representation of feelings and ideas is of crucial importance. Werthes, however, holds that language is the most significant source of the power art has over us. For him, unlike for Szerdahely, it is not poetics, founded on visual elements, that links general aesthetics with particular aesthetics, but rhetoric (understood as the theory of the use of language in general). Werthes' approach is fundamentally that of Herder's. Reading his lectures

85 Gabriele Dürbeck: *Einbildungskraft und Aufklärung. Perspektiven der Philosophie, Anthropologie und Ästhetik um 1750*. Berlin 1998, especially: 55–67.; and *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe 1650–1850*. Ed. Lawrence E. Klein, Anthony J. La Vopa. Huntington 1998, especially 29–50. For an interpretation that discusses Bettinelli's book on enthusiasm and Werthes' translation in the context of the Freemasonry of Italy, see Ruggiero Di Castiglione: *La Massoneria nelle Due Sicilie nel '700. Vol. III. Dal legittimismo alla cospirazione*. Rome 2009, 254.

86 For György Alajos Szerdahely's aesthetics, see Idem: *Aesthetica (1778)*. Ed., transl. Piroska Balogh. Debrecen 2012 (= *Szerdahely György Alajos esztétikai írásai, I* [Georg Aloys Szerdahely's Works on Aesthetics]); Botond Csuka: »Aesthetics in Motion. On György Szerdahely's Dynamic Aesthetics«. In: *Anthropologische Ästhetik in Mitteleuropa (1750–1850) / Anthropological Aesthetics in Central Europe (1750–1850)*. Ed. Piroska Balogh, Gergely Fórizs. Hannover 2018, 153–180.

on aesthetics, the influence of the following authors' theories of language can be discerned: Johann Gottfried Herder⁸⁷, Johann Georg Sulzer⁸⁸, and Christoph Martin Wieland.⁸⁹ Wieland's works are particularly important pretexts, since, as we have already noted, he had personal connections to Werthes, being one of his most influential and enthusiastic mentors and teachers.⁹⁰ That the classical author most often referred to during the lectures is Horace – especially his lyric epistles – is also due to Wieland: Werthes' take on Horace is indebted to Wieland's translation and interpretation.⁹¹ In his 1791 letter to Wieland, Werthes points out that he often quotes Horace during his lectures, thinking it important that his students be introduced to him.⁹² Theories of aesthetics that attributed a foundational role to language, like that of Werthes, were popular and state-of-the-art in the 1790s. As a contemporary parallel, one might think of Benedictine Benno Ortman's *Principia cum sacrae, tum civilis eloquentiae, in usum auditorum collegit, disposuit, illustravit* of 1797⁹³, written by the author for the gymnasium and lyceum students of Munich. His sources and terminology are very similar to those of Werthes; it was no coincidence that among the speech samples Ortman also examines the funeral oration of Gerhard van Swieten. Another parallel might be Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, published in 1783.⁹⁴ It is the relation between rhetoric and aesthetics that con-

87 Johann Gottfried Herder: *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*. Berlin 1772.

88 Johann Georg Sulzer: *Anmerkungen über den gegenseitigen Einfluß der Vernunft in die Sprache, und die Sprache in die Vernunft* [1767]. The edition used here is Johann Georg Sulzer: *Vermischte philosophische Schriften*. Leipzig 1773. 166–198.

89 [Christoph Martin Wieland:] *Beiträge zur geheimen Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes und Herzens. Aus den Archiven der Natur gezogen*. Reuttligen 1776.

90 Cf.: Herold: *F. C. A. Werthes* (= note 1), 12. For the relationship of Werthes and Wieland see also: *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen. In Schilderungen aus Karl August Böttiger's handschriftlichem Nachlasse. Erstes Bändchen*. Ed. Karl Wilhelm Böttiger. Leipzig 1838, 250 f.

91 For Wieland's image of Horace, see Jane Veronica Curran: *Horace's »Epistles«, Wieland and the Reader. A Three-Way Relationship*. London 1995.

92 »Unmöglich könnt' ich Z. B. mit Worten ausdrücken, mit welchem Vergnügen ich während meines hiesigen Aufenthalts Ihre Horazischen Episteln und Satyren gelesen und wieder gelesen habe. Ich habe mehrmals über diese Werke des Horaz öffentliche Vorlesungen gehalten, um wenn ich schon dem rohen Gaumen meiner Zuhörer von diesen herrlichen Gastmahlen, wie Sie von Ihnen aufgetischt worden, nicht viel zu kosten geben konnte, wenigstens für mich den wollüstigen Genuß davon so viel möglich zu erneuern.« F. A. C. Werthes to Christoph Martin Wieland, Pest, 21 February 1791. In: *Wielands Briefwechsel Bd. 11*. (= note 15), 41–42, here: 42.

93 Benedictine Benno Ortman: *Principia cum sacrae, tum civilis eloquentiae, in usum auditorum collegit, disposuit, illustravit*. München 1798.

94 Hugh Blair: *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. London 1783.

stitutes the central theme of the Edinburgh professor's work: according to Blair, rhetoric and aesthetic culture are the most significant vehicles for making one's way in society. Polished literature and effective speech and writing are among the necessary social skills. It is noteworthy that the term *litterae amoeniores* that often occurs in Werthes' lectures, is a verbatim translation of *Belles lettres*, the central term of Blair's theory. It is also fair to assume that Blair's considerable reception in Hungary⁹⁵ might be connected to Werthes' activity as a professor of aesthetics.

4. Conclusions

Why does all this matter? First of all, the history of Hungarian aesthetics and criticism can be revisited from the perspective of Werthes' aesthetic activity. More specifically, Lajos Csetri's lamentation that there was no aesthetically underpinned rhetoric in 18th-century Hungary can be rebutted.⁹⁶ According to Csetri, such theories were later imported by József Kármán's *Bildungstheorie*⁹⁷

- 95 On Blair's reception in Hungary, see Ferenc Hörcher, Kálmán Tóth: »The Scottish Discourse on Taste in Early 19th-Century Hungary. Two Translations of Hugh Blair's Introduction to Rhetoric«. In: Balogh, Fórizs (Eds.): *Anthropologische Ästhetik* (note 86), 253–292.
- 96 Csetri makes this claim several times in his work on the history of Hungarian literary criticism in the early 19th century. Cf. Lajos Csetri: *Egység vagy különbözőség? Nyelv- és irodalomszemlélet a magyar irodalmi nyelvújítás korszakában. [Unity or Dissimilarity? Attitudes to Language and Literature in the Era of Hungarian Language Reform.]* Budapest 1990.
- 97 »József Kármán [1769, Losonc (Slo. Lučenec, present-day Slovakia) – 1795, Losonc (?)]: writer, essayist, and editor. He came from a family of Protestant clergymen. In 1785 Kármán entered the University of Pest to study law. Three years later he moved to Vienna. He returned to Pest in the autumn of 1791 and started a career in the legal profession. In 1792 or 1793 he became a member of a Freemason lodge in Pest. Consequently, he formed connections with a number of Protestant noble families and gained support for establishing a literary association. Considering journalism a means of popularizing national literature, he was co-founder, with Gáspár Pajor, of the magazine *Uránia*, which reached three volumes in 1794–1795. His most important work, the epistolary novel *Fanni hagyományai* (*Fanni's Testaments*), was first published in *Uránia* in 1794. The story of a young girl's unhappy love affair introduced a tone of sentimentalism to Hungarian literature. Apart from publishing a number of translations, Kármán also wrote on the advancement of Hungarian literature and advocated the establishment of literary salons as a mean of developing the national culture. *Uránia* eventually collapsed due to financial difficulties. Kármán returned to Losonc in April 1795, threatened with detention because of his connections to people implicated in the Jacobin conspiracy.

and Ferenc Kazinczy's programme.⁹⁸ We should note that József Kármán was studying law in Pest during the years of Werthes' professorship, and he also had to complete the course on aesthetics due to the 1784 reform of higher education. Furthermore, the *Magnanimitas* lodge, where Werthes, a member of the Illuminati, was also present during his years in Pest, might have very well been a link to Kármán and Kazinczy, who were both Freemasons.⁹⁹ It is also possible that Werthes' play about Miklós Zrínyi, one of the greatest Hungarian heroes of the Turkish wars, which was extensively reviewed in the press of its time, roused Kármán's and Kazinczy's interest. Thus there are good reasons to believe that Werthes' activity as a professor influenced Kármán's thinking, just as it was no coincidence that the editor Gáspár Pajor, Kármán's colleague at the journal *Uránia*, translated Moses Mendelssohn's *Phädon* in 1793.¹⁰⁰ In this case, it was also a professor of aesthetics, Lajos János Schedius, the successor of Werthes at the department, whose considerable influence was at work in the background.¹⁰¹

Thus the investigation into and detailed philological examination of Werthes' educational plan and lecture notes have disproved the assumption, so widely held in the literature, that he taught in German, or that an agenda of Germanization can best explain his appointment to the University of Pest. The intention behind Werthes' appointment as professor was not to enforce German upon the universities but to promote the practical cultivation of taste, a new concept of cultural education. Those who fitted this concept were sought

He died the same year under unclear circumstances.« *Late Enlightenment. Emergence of the Modern ›National Idea.* Eds. Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček. Budapest 2006, 231. For the English translation of Kármán's main programme, »A' Nemzet Tsinosodása« (»The Refinement of the Nation«), see *ibid.* 231–236. For Kármán's cultural aims, see Márton Szilágyi: *Kármán József és Pajor Gáspár Urániája [József Kármán's and Gáspár Pajor's Uránia]*. Debrecen 1998, 404–423.

98 For Kazinczy's programme and his Freemason connections, see Márton Szilágyi: »Freimaurerei als Vehiculum des künstlerischen Schaffens? Ferenc Kazinczy und die Literatur der ungarischen Aufklärung« In: Dieter, Tüskés, Lengyel (Eds.): *Aufgeklärte Sozietäten* (= note 83), 406–412.

99 On the lodge, see Ludwig Abafi: *Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Oesterreich-Ungarn*. Budapest 1899, V, 189–199.

100 Moses Mendelssohn: *Fédon vagy a' lélek halhatatlanságáról. Három beszélgetésekre.* [Transl. Gáspár Pajor]. Pest 1793. The original work: *Phaedon oder über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, in drey Gesprächen*. Berlin / Stettin 1767.

101 For a detailed exploration of this, see Szilágyi: *Kármán József* (= note 98), 50 f.

out and found through the extensive informal network of connections of the elite of Habsburg cultural policy. Furthermore, the sources examined have also painted a different picture of the horizons of European intellectual history from that of earlier works on the history of Hungarian criticism. One of the crucial conclusions of our research is that in the case of Werthes, who in the cultural history of Central Europe (Austria, Germany, and Italy) is usually regarded as a translator and playwright, a detailed examination of his years in Pest, years that have until now been considered to be of marginal significance, can lead to very unexpected consequences. Years of his professorial activity reveal the only immediate sources for Werthes' theoretical thought on aesthetics. Instead of Kant, it was Baumgarten whose influence proved to be decisive for him; the tradition of rhetoric-based aesthetics, intertwined with the Hungarian reception of Blair, became the primary context; and the discourse on enthusiasm, linked to Bettinelli's thought and political context, came to the foreground. These conclusions can well attest to the broad perspectives of institutional history (university aesthetics) and of historical investigations that treat the Central European (more specifically the Habsburg) context as an integral unit.

Translated by Botond Csuka

Appendix

[1.] Memorandum Concerning Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Biography and Bibliography (1784)¹⁰²

Denkzeddel

Friedrich August Clemens Werthes in Schwaben gebürtig, 34 Jahre alt, besuchte, nachdem er zu Tübingen seine akademischen Studien geendigt hatte, noch die sächsischen Universitäten Jena und Erfurt; an welchem letztere[sic!] Ort er besonders die Vorlesungen und den Umgang des berühmten Wielands zu benutzen Gelegenheit hatte. Nachher lebte er theils in verschiedenen andern Städten von Deutschland, theils in Italien und in der Schweiz, wo er sich überall vorzüglich im Fache der schönen Wissenschaften, Kenntnisse erwarb und mit demjenigen[sic!] in Verbindung kam welche sich darinn hervorgethan haben. Im Jahr 1782 wurde er als Professor der schönen Wissenschaften und besonders italiänischen Litteratur auf die neue Universität von Stuttgart berufen, wo er nach anderthalb Jahren seine Entlassung begehrte und erhielt. Endlich machte er seitdem eine gelehrte Reise nach Petersburg und durch die nördlichen Provinzen von Deutschland. Seine Schriften welche größtentheils mit Beyfall aufgenommen wurden, sind:

1. Ueber den Atys des Catull.
2. Hirtenlieder von Wieland herausgegeben.
3. Ueber die Sitten der Morlaken aus dem Ital.
4. 5. 6. Orpheus – Deucalion – Pandora – Singspiele
7. Ariosts rasender Roland. die acht ersten Bücher in acht zeiligen Stanzen übersezt.
8. Vom Enthusiasmus der schönen Künste aus dem Ital.
9. Geschichte des Schicksals der Freymaurer zu Neapel
10. Theatralische Werke des Gozzi. aus dem Ital.
11. Ueber die vorzüglichsten Ital. Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts
12. Bomstons Begebenheiten in Italien. Ein Roman in Briefen.

[2.] Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Plan for Teaching Aesthetics at Universities (1784)¹⁰³

Die Anstalten, welche auf wohleingerichteten hohen Schulen zum¹⁰⁴ Unterricht in der Aesthetik getroffen werden, können im allgemeinen nicht zur Absicht haben, metaphysische Vernünftler über die schönen Künste und Wissenschaften, oder bloß Redner und Dichter hervorzubringen; sondern überhaupt soll der Geschmack junger Leute so dadurch gebildet werden, daß sie darnach in ihren künftigen Leben, bey welcher Wissenschaft oder Kunst es seyn mag, sowohl in ihren Urtheilen als bey eigenen Arbeiten sich davon geleitet werden können.

Indessen scheint die gewöhnliche Lehrart dieser Wissenschaft bey weitem dieser Absicht nicht zu entsprechen, sondern vielmehr zwey Hauptfehler sich zu Schulden kommen zu lassen, die derselben gerade entgegengesetzt sind.

Fürs erste, fangen die Lehrer der Aesthetik den Unterricht in dieser Wissenschaft meistens mit abgezogenen Begriffen und einer besonders für junge Leute ermüdenden Terminologie an. Der Jüngling, der für Verstand, Herz und Phantasie Vergnügen sucht, findet Überdruß, und kehrt in das Feld der Romanen zurück, von dem er hergekommen war.

Die umgekehrte Methode würde also einzuschlagen seyn. Erst Beyspiele und dann allgemeine Grundsätze, die, so gut sie auch davon abgezogen werden, doch niemahls so viel sagen, und so lebhaften Eindruck machen, als die Begriffe selbst. Man müßte damit anfangen, stufenweise von jeder Classe die größten Muster vorzulegen und, damit die Zuhörer überall nur an das Vollkommenste gewöhnt werden, anstatt einen einzelnen classischen Schriftsteller ganz durchzugehen, aus verschiedenen von jedem das Vortrefflichste in seiner Art heraus nehmen.

Der zweyte Fehler, welcher bey dem Unterricht in der Aesthetik gemacht zu werden pflegt, besteht darinn, daß die schöne Wissenschaft bloß auf die Künste und oft einzig und allein auf die Dichtkunst angewandt wird; da sie doch alles, was in den Werken des Geistes gefällt, zum Gegenstand hat, und nur die kleinste Anzahl in der Folge die Künste, am wenigsten die Dichtkunst zu treiben erkoren ist. Auch deßwegen sollte die letztere nicht zur Hauptsache gemacht werden, weil junge Leute nur gar zu leicht davon ange[stiftet] werden,

103 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Handschriftensammlung, Cod. 9719, f. 363–364 r/v.

104 Schulen <getroffen> zum

und sehr oft von der Natur ungerufen ihre beste Zeit damit verlieren und hernach unnütze Mitglieder der Gesellschaft abgeben.

Man müßte sich also, wie gesagt, zum Zweck machen, den Geschmack junger Leute so zu bilden, daß er in jedem Beruf ihres zukünftigen Lebens seinen Einfluß zeigen und behaupten könnte. Ein Endzweck, welcher der ernsthaftesten Vorsorge eines Staats werth ist; denn der Geschmack ist das Leben jeder andern Wissenschaft, nur durch ihn können die größten und wichtigsten Wahrheiten so wie die besten und edelsten Gesinnungen allgemein und interessant gemacht werden.

Man müßte von der simpelsten Prosa stufenweise bis zur erhabensten Beredsamkeit, und von dieser erst zur Dichtkunst übergehen, müßte überhaupt von dem philosophischen, von dem Brief-Styl, von dem Geschäftstyl, von dem historischen und rednerischen Styl, und insbesondere aus jeder Wissenschaft, die einer ästhetischen Vorstellung bedarf und fähig ist, so wie hernach von allen Classen der Dichtkunst, die vortrefflichsten aesthetischen Muster vorlegen, und Regeln und allgemeine Grundsätze daraus herleiten.

Weil es aber wichtiger ist, daß junge Leute selbst schreiben lernen als daß sie wissen, wie ander[e] zu schreiben haben so müßte die Selbstübung immer mit der Theorie fortlaufen, so daß in jeder Woche wenigstens eine Stunde für eigene Ausarbeitungen ausgesetzt würde.

Dieser ganze Unterricht könnte so eingerichtet werden, daß er mit Verlauf eines Jahres jedesmahl geendigt würde.

F. A. C. Werthes

[3.] Friedrich August Clemens Werthes' Lectures on Aesthetics (1791). Lecture notes written by Adalbert Gerzon¹⁰⁵

Augusti Verthes A[r]tium L[iberalium] et Phylosophiae Doctoris tum Cla-
rissimi Gabelhoffer Theologiae Doctoris

Valedicente Cl[arissimo] Verthes, Institutiones Aesthetices

1791

Adalberti Gerzon[is] III anni Phylos[ophiae] Pestini

Praelectiones Aestheticae

Quid intelligitur per litteras amoeniores?

Litterae Amoeniores continent Theoriam artium elegantior[um]. Per litteras Amoeniores hoc intelligit[ur]: ars saepe opponit[ur] scientiae, saepe naturae, earum intelligit[ur] facultas hominis opera propria ad exemplum naturae efficiendi. Inter opera naturae sunt aliqua praestantissima, per excellentiam pulchra adpellata, quib[us] natura, et omnib[us] n[atu]ris ea absolueret ultimam perfectionem pulchritudinis addidit, et modo facultatem largita est natura hominib[us] n[on] tantum efigendi bona, sed etiam pulchra.

Pulchrum est res, quae sentit[ur] potius, quam intelligit[ur]. Opponit[ur] deformi, vili, mediocri, ideo semper denotat aliquid rarius, aliquid p[rae]stantis, adeoque in suo genere rarius, quod in primis sensus Animi et phantasia voluptate afficit. Praedicat[ur] potius de reb[us] visibilib[us], dein translata haec denominatio in alios sensus. –

Quoad sensus externos de his reb[us] p[rae]dicat[ur], quae aut in visum, aut v[er]o auditum cadunt, quia similem motum in a[nim]o excitant. Reliquis sensib[us] n[on] attribuit[ur], quia illos potius cum a[nim]alib[us] com[m]unes habemus. Dein de objectis sensuum interior[um] quadrat, ita dicit[ur] pulchra cogitatio, actio. Illae artes, quae opera pulchra efficiunt, pulchrae vocant[ur], distinguunt[ur] artes mechanicae a scientiis, artes necessitati, scientiae intellectui suites faciunt. Distinguunt[ur] v[er]o artes in loquentes et fingentes, loquentes s[un]t, quae mediante phantasia sermone pulchrum efigunt, talis est eloquentia, poesis. Fingentes v[er]o s[un]t, quae im[m]ediate pulchrum efigunt ita Pictura, Architectura, Statuaria.

105 National Széchényi Library (Budapest), Manuscript collection (OSZK Kézirattár), Quart. Lat. 2399. VII. The [...] denotes solution of abbreviations.

Quae vigor artium elegantior[um]

Artes elegantiores originem h[abe]nt in naturali quodam hominum instinctu tam seipsos, quam reflexive se perficiendi, ad tales ergo artes efigendas pulchra mente opus h[abe]t artifex. Haec v[er]o proprietates requirunt[ur] in artifice

1o: sensus pulchri subtilior, qui magis latentes et reconditas pulchritudines in reb[us] distinguit.

2o: Imaginatio vividior, haec enim, quaecunq[ue] pulchra s[un]t in unum conglubare d[ebe]t.

3o: Requiritur facultas proprias ideas sibi pulchras efigendi, et haec facultas vocat[ur] scheni.

Ille, qui artes pulchras exercet, vocat[ur] artifex et hoc in artibus fingentib[us] locum h[abe]t, in loquentib[us] enim artem oratoriam, aut historicam, aut poeticam vocamus.

Quis usus literarum Amoerior[um]

Usus artium liberalium quam maxime in eo consistit, ut quam maxime serviant ad excellendos homines perficiendosq[ue], nam reliqua sua opera natura perficit, homo autem ipse se perficere d[ebe]t, quod est ejus privilegium et off[ici]um.

Quomodo haec artes hominem perficere possunt?

Triplici modo:

1o: easdem illas virtutes, quas artificium in se continet excitando in aliis atq[ue] fovendo.

2o: Pulchrum morum a[nim]i leniorem efficiat repetitis vicib[us].

3o: Cum artes pulchrae ubiq[ue] exempla perfectionis sensibilis dent, et hic sensus perfectionis hoc modo homini familiaris naturalisq[ue] reddi potest, ut dein spiritus perfectionis in omnibus vitae actionib[us] emineat. Inde artes hae ab antiquis humanitatis adpellabant[ur] ob ea dotem ob quam sensum humanitatis excitant, et alunt, quod ipse Ovidius testat[ur], dicens:

Didicisse fideliter artes emolit mores nec sinet esse ferus

Vocat[ur] autem artes liberales, quia sensus elationes animi, homini libere dignos inspirant, hinc nationes cultae distinguunt[ur] ab incultis, scilicet objecta utilia exempla imitatione digna exponunt.

Quis usus fortuitus seu contingens?

Est usus hic n[on] absolute sed t[ame]n moraliter necessarius, ita artifex n[on] solum artifex sed etiam homo civis, off[ici]is subjectus est. Artificii exempla in nobis eundem effectum ex experientia v[el] mediante imaginatione

faciunt: ita nos sacrum aliquod legemus, semet ipsos concitatos esse sentiemus, et quidem v[el] moerorem v[el] indignationem

Quis Abusus?

In eo consistit abusus, si operib[us] n[on] utamur, solummodo fruamur. Homines inscii ob hunc abusum tanquam ob sinceritatem curum effectum calumniant[ur]

Quae Remedia?

sunt litterae amoeniores, et scientia pulchri, cum ostendant, quid in qualibet arte pulchrum. Cum in rationes pulchri inquiram, regulas ejusdem tenere oportet. Hic sensus recti relate ad artes elegantiores bonus gustus dicit[ur]. – Quintilianus dicit »Docti rationem artis intelligunt, indocti voluptatem.« Cum jam sensus recti idem sit in definiendo bono quam pulchro, quando excitat[ur], tunc diuturnitate et frequentia in habitum et instinctum transire potest, qui ejus perfectionem constituit. Si usum hunc n[on] habeant, t[ame]n mererent[ur] coli, quia sum[m]unt[ur] pro nota characteristicam hominis culti.

Quoruplex usus?

Usus n[em]pe specialis pro iis, qui illas artes exercere volunt. Generalis v[er]o, o[mn]es peculiare exercitationes. Hic magna lis inter eruditos est, s[un]t, qui regulas artis superfluas esse existimant: Oratorem Poetam ingenio opus habere; alii defendant dicentes: quod o[mn]es etiam sum[m]i artifices certas leges securi sunt n[on] explicitas quidam, sed implicitas habuisse a[n]imo et hac Theoria implicita Homerus praestantissima Poemata conscripsit, quam Theoriam Aristoteles abstraxit, et scriptorem edidit. Tales Theoriae tanquam bona exempla omnib[us] hominib[us] utilia esse possunt, semper autem Theoria cum Praxi conjuncta esse d[ebe]t. Unde merito Horatius ait »Natura fieret laudabili carmen an arte quae situm est; ego nec studium sine divina vena, nec nude apud possit video ingeniu[m]. Alterius si altera poscit opem res, et conspirat amice.«

Ex illa duplici usus adparet necessitas illas Primae Juventuti tradendi, quia n[em]pe omnib[us] facultatib[us] inferiorib[us] s[un]t p[rae]diti, quae perfici d[ebe]nt, juvenis quoq[ue] arte dicendi opus h[abe]t. Tum necessitas earum adparet etiam ex neglectu earum utpote in morib[us] rudib[us]. Eruditus etiam sine sensu pulchri pedantia est, maxime observantur hi in modo docendi propter inhumanitatem, quam com[m]ittunt, cum t[ame]n o[mn]ia docte profer[re] volunt. Hinc poenam Juvenalis dicit »Hoc sermone pavent, hoc iram gaudia curas, hoc cuncta expendant animi secreta, quis ultra contumbunt docte.«

Ex hoc igit[ur] adparet, quomodo litterae amoeniores docendae sint; cum ergo bonus gustus ex sensu et iudicio recti compositus sit, hinc doctrina literar[um] amoenior[um] sive ore sive scriptorem tradita ad sensus animi

aeq[ue] ac ad intellectum dirigenda erit, inde proprie dicit[ur] Aestetica Graeca aesticos sensibilis seu scientia sensibilis. Pleriq[ue], qui hanc scientiam abstrahere ponant, peccant, quia n[on] tantum purae mentis, sed entis sensibilis cura habenda est. Sicut s[un]t docendae artes hae, ita etiam discendae, aeq[ue] igit[ur] necessarium sensum pulchri alere per talia artificia. Exempla hujusmodi perfectionis imitatione digna Graeci nobis reliquerunt, hae artes floruerunt quidem apud Aegyptios et Phaenicios sed n[on] in eo gradu. A Graecis ad Romanis, ab his post secula illa obscura ad Italos, hinc in reliquas partes Europae pervenerunt.

Dividit[ur] Theoria haec artium liberalium in specialem et generalem. Specialis ostendit sensus pulchri singulis artibus proprios ita Poesis, Pictura, Generalis seu per excellentiam Aestetica ostendit pulchritudinis omnib[us] artib[us] com[m]unes.

De artibus locutivis

Inter artes elegantiores Principem locum merent[ur] artes locutivae et quidem:

1o: quia sermo utilissimum atq[ue] absolutissimum vitae instrumentum est.

2o: quia nationis et humanitatis omniumq[ue] artium est nutrimentum.

3o: qui ipsa Lingua est prima et nobilissima artium: Ipsa enim inventio Linguae est primu[m] atq[ue] praestantissimum documentum excellentiae, ad quam natura nos formavit, sermo enim ex nulla re constat, quam ex sonis articulatis significatum habentib[us], itaq[ue] res n[on] tantum sonantes sed formas colores, ipsas etiam cogitationes animi subtilissimas in sonos transmutat, et quidam in angustissimos limites paucor[um] sonor[um] infinitatem idearum concluderat, et quidem haec facultas in cohaerens systema redactum est, ad hoc systema concin[n]ere signa debuerint, uti etiam ratio, sensatio, perceptio, opera, tum socialitas, humanitas, sensus ordinis, simetriae, analogiae, o[mn]i a haec conspiciant ad opus hoc consociandum. Hoc opus ostendit, quantum homo p[rae]stat omnib[us] a[nim]antib[us] sicut v[er]o facultate loquendi a[nim]antib[us] p[rae]stat, ita modo loquendi nationib[us] distinguit[ur], et quidem cum sermo nihil aliud sit, quam adumbratio mentis, a diversis nationib[us] diversam formam inducere debuit. O[mn]is enim natio suum characterem modo loquendi com[m]unicavit: hinc character romanorum gravitatem in lingua ostendit, inde mollities linguae Italicae, tum quidpiam off[ici]osu[m] sociale in Gallica, acre in Anglica, austerum quoq[ue] in Germanica, donec Germani in sylvis vixerunt, p[rae]fert.

Quomodo aliqua lingua pulchra evadit?

Pulcher sermo est talis, qui et sono et sensu sensus animi et imaginationem voluptate afficere potest, ergo a tali natione poterit sermo pulcher eformari, quae a natura subtiliorem exquisitionemque sensum pulchri habet, et talis natio erat Graeca, ad quod clima, alimentum et concurrerunt, haec igitur lingua pulchritudine omnēs reliquas superat, interea autem quaelibet lingua sine respectu aliam suam propriam venustatem habet, et etiam comparare cum aliis ulterioris perfectionis est capax, et quidem cultura sermonis pari passu ambulat cum cultura nationis et humanitatis, ideo sicut homo in infantia et juventute impeta sensuum et affectuum regitur, eodem modo sermo aptus est ad exprimendos sensus et affectus hunc illa periodo plurimi optimique poetae habent, mox dein ratione et bonis auribus temperatur et purgatur, ad ultimum autem, dum jam sermo summam perfectionem attigit, saepius in luxuriam et affectionem delabitur. Est igitur sermo mensura culturae tam apud integras gentes, quam singulos homines, ergo natio cujus lingua apta fuerit ad sensum exprimendum, illa inferiorem culturae gradum occupat, sic natio, quae pro re verbum habet, ergo nec rem videtur haberi, ad originem rei ex origine verbi concluditur. Hinc sequitur usus conversationis cum aliis cultioribus, quia in ipsa conversatione cum sermone tales res acquirit, hinc usus linguarum peregrinationum, translationum librorum. Ubi penuria idearum, ibi penuria sermonis.

De Oratione

Oratio est series connexa verborum ex apparatu linguae formata tantum considerata per se quatenus seriem idearum in dicente refert et exprimit, sed etiam quatenus respectu aliorum agit aut agere potest. Quoad secundum respectum potest oratio ad omnia illa, quae in aliis efficere volumus adcommodari ita Cicero dicit, »est oratio mollis et tenera, et ita flexibilis, ut sequatur quocumque torqueas«, ad nostrum arbitrium sicut mollissimam caeram formamus et fingimus. Prior facultas dicendi in se ars bene dicendi vocatur. Secunda autem Eloquentia, id est scientia oratoris homines dicendo in id quod vult ducendi. Utraque haec facultas diverso modo ab hominibus applicatur: sunt, qui illa tantum in vita privata utuntur quae patres, amici, civesque, hoc genus eloquentiae eloquentia privata dicitur. Inter illos, qui in historia celebres sunt praecipue Socrates notandus, qui auditoribus omnibus, quod voluit, persuadere potuit. Seneca dicit de eo »Socrates tamen in me-

dio erat, et lugentes patres consolabat, et desperantes de republica erigebat, et divitib[us] opes suas timentib[us] exprobrabat seram periculosae avaritiae poenitentiam, et imitari volentib[us] magnum circumferebat exemplar, cum intra 30. Dominos solus ille liber incederet.« Alii publica eloquentiae utuntq[ue], sic Pericles, qui dicebat[ur] ab Aristophane fulgere tonare, permiscere totam Graeciam, sic etiam Demosthenes. Hic ait Cicero »Hujus eloquentia est tractare animos, atq[ue] vi modo permovere, modo ir[r]epit in sensus, modo perfringit, novas opiniones inserit, evellit insitas.«

Hoc modo eloquentiam, majorem vim, quam o[mn]em violentiam habere dixit Socrates. Quamvis v[er]o haec facultas dicendi tam magna sit, t[ame]n mens hominis n[on] fuit ea contenta, cumq[ue] p[rae]sentib[us] et absentib[us] remotissimis voluit loqui, hinc scriptura inventa, quod est documentum manifestum impulsus naturalis hominem ad ulteriorem perfectionem propellens. Primiores signa verbor[um] ponabant[ue], et probabilissima signa hieroglyphica Aegyptior[um] ita Chineses, pro singulis verbis peculiariora signa h[abe]nt. Tandem signa singular[um] literarum inventa s[un]t: huc pertinet ratio scribendi. Apud Pervanos ope modorum animi sensa depromunt. Sed etiam ipsa scriptura primo materiis dixeris, tum mollionib[us], et hoc tempore ad hunc scribendi methodum deventum est, quam t[ame]n ars typographiae infinite perfecit.

Quid scriptores?

Qui publice animi sensa sua depromunt, auctores seu scriptores dicunt[ue]. Inter illos inveniunt brevi tempore in oblivionem abeunt, pauci autem superstites qui ad exemplum naturae pulchrum scriptis suis addendo supervivunt, et auctores classici dicunt[ur], ideo vocant[ur] classici quia quasi in illa classe altiori aliis supermanserunt, ergo n[on] tantum veteres auctores classici s[un]t, sed quaevis natio culta h[abe]t suos auctores cultos. Itaq[ue] dividit[ur] in oralem et scriptam, eodem modo eloquentia dividit[ur], ars bene pulchre scribendi saepe ars dicendi vocat[ur], si etiam Theoria hujus artis vocat[ur] Rhetorica vox Graeca a verbo Reo, seu loquor. Fuerint jam apud Graecos, qui viderent discrimen inter p[rae]stantes auctores et ciliores. Usus ergo hujus artis ex eo patet, quia n[on] (ut multis videt[ur]) in mero ornatu consistit, consistit quidem, ut mediante illo facilites ad finem suum propositum perveniat; hinc, quia orator h[abe]t facultatem animos hominum fascinandi, obtrectatio venit, quod nihil sit aliud, quam fraudulenta deceptuit[ur], per exemplo Zophystae vocant[ur], sed etiam hic abusus pro natura rei ponit[ur], cum omniu[m] rer[um] det[ur]

abusus, ad curandam hoc veteres statuerunt: neminem posse nisi virum bonum esse oratorem. Patet igit[ur] triplex ejus usus, in vita privata, eloquentia publica, v[el] v[er]o oratione scripta utilis est populis eam com[m]unicando. Hinc sequit[ur] dignitas auris hujus, quam v[el] ipsa Cicero secundo loco ponebat dicens: »Duae s[un]t artes, quae possunt locare homines in altissimo gradu dignitatis una Imperatoris, altera oratoris boni.« Alio quoq[ue] loco »Tantam vim h[abe]t illa, quae recte a bono poeta dicta est flexanima, atq[ue] omniu[m] regina? ... , ut n[on] modo inclinantem eripere, aut stantem inclinare, sed etiam adversantem et expugnantem, ut Imperator bonus ac fortis capere possit.« Hinc sequit[ur] necessitas studii hujus, quod rationem ab usu et exercitiis pendet. Quod ipse Cicero favet[ur] dicens »Usus frequens omniu[m] Magistor[um] praecepta superat, apud est quam plurimam scribere, stylus optimus et p[rae]stantissimus dicendi effector et magister est.« Consistit in rectitudine et perspicuitate orationis. Per rectitudinem intelligit[ur] 1o oratio recta, rectum v[er]o in genere tale est, quale esse d[ebe]t. Cum autem oratio constat in verbis sensisq[ue] animi, hinc utrumq[ue] rectum esse oportet. Cum v[er]o ideae sensus animi, ex animo proveniant, ergo recta erit oratio si ipsi sensus sani, ratioq[ue] recta fuerit, sine si cogitationes cum ipsis reb[us] convenient. Cum verba cum legib[us] linguae consentiant, recta erit oratio. Et quidem usus linguae leges orationis praescribit. Ita Horatius »Usus quem tenes arbitrium est, et jus et norma loquendi.« Non intelligit[ur] v[er]o usus linguae com[m]unis Provincia[m] analogia etc. sed per usum linguae intelligit[ur] consensus bene loquentium praecipuor[um] optimorumq[ue] scriptor[um], dicit Quintilianus »Consuetudinem sermonis vocabo consensum eruditorum, sicut vivendi consensu bonorum.«

Vitia contra has leges p[er] falsae notiones aut v[er]o sensationes. Er[r]ores s[un]t aut logici, aut morales aut gram[m]atici, gram[m]atici v[er]o s[un]t aut Barbarissimi, aut solecismi, Barbarismus in sequelis verbis solecismum v[er]o in syntaxi seu serie verbor[um] versat[ur]. Sunt autem rectitudo orationis se extendit usq[ue] ad externam scribendi rationem, et tum rectitudo haec orthographia vocat[ur]. Locutio praecipue normam scribendi dat quoad interpunctiones sicut ratio est imago idear[um], ita scriptura est imago locutionis. Minor pars orationis per com[m]uta notat[ur] hinc oriunt[ur] Periodi.

Externa structura orationis

Notanda est differentia inter propositiones logicas seu incisa, et periodos. Propositio logica est simplex animi expressio. Periodus autem est talis forma ora-

tionis, quando sensus primariae sententiae per interpositionem secundariam usq[ue] ad finem suspendit[ur]. Ita Cicero Periodum definit: »Periodus est oratio in quodam quasi orbe inclusa procur[r]ens.« Hinc igit[ur] saepius Periodus nomine Ambitus, Circuitus, Orbis, comraehensionis, circumscriptionis venit. »Ita sufectii sententia concordia parvae res crescunt, discordia maxima dilabunt[ur],« est sententia simplex sensum im[m]ediate determinans. Praejuncto v[er]o: Quemadmodum periodus erudit. Fusa seu dissoluta oratio est, si propositionib[us] logicis utamur, v[el] sensu animi naturali ratione exprimamus. Periodica v[er]o, quae in verbis ambi[...] disposcit[ur]. Periodus est simplex et composita, illa uno membro, haec plurib[us] constat. Membra periodi vocant[ur] tales propositiones, quae n[on] per se, sed conjunctim cum aliis sensum absoluunt. Hinc periodi uni, bi, tri, quadrimembres. Notari hic d[ebe]t, quod a plurib[us] periodus plurium membror[um] quam 4 vitiosu[m] dicat[ur] quod spiritus ei exprimendae n[on] sufficiens, sed voci adcom[m]odanda est, et talis Periodus Pneuma dicit[ur]: ea v[er]o, quae orationem eousq[ue] producit, ut spiritum n[on] ferat Fasis seu Extensio dicit[ur]. Contra hanc regulam obijci potest: cum oratio debeat esse imago animi, saepe certem sensus animi diutius vehementiusq[ue] provoluant[ur], structura orationis exterior d[ebe]t longior esse. Ita Cicero artifex maximus Periodor[um] in Ver[r]em ejusmodi orationib[us] utit[ur].

Perspicuitas

Altera proprietas orationis est perspicuitas, quae illa virtus est, vi cujus sensus facile et uno tantum modo intelligi potest. Vitia opposita s[un]t obscuritas et ambiguitas. Obscuritas orit[ur] ex obscuritate mentis, v[el] obscuritate lector[um]. Ambiguitas est, dum oratio plurib[us] modis intelligi potest, ut enim sol in oculos ita oratio in animu[m] si in eam non intendatur incurrat. Ambiguitas orit[ur] etiam, si scriptor n[on] recte rem suam perspiciat, saepe ex structura locationeq[ue] verborum. Huc pertinet Aequinotatio; si n[on] utor vocabulo pro re e.g. Amor deu[m]. Saepius obscuritas orit[ur] ex nimia brevitate, ut secundum Horatiu[m] »Brevius esse laboro obscurus fio« recte obtineat.

An in rectitudine et perspicuitate consistat pulchritudo orationis?

Si auctores classicos legamus, observamus quidem hos o[mn]es et recte et perspicue scripsisse, et t[ame]n observamus pulchritudinem n[on] in his consistere. sed quidpiam aliud orationi inesse debere ita e.g. si dicam »Excellentiam

in ante aliqua jucundiorē quidam esse, quam rudimenta illius artis, sed illam sine his esse n[on] posse«, hac ratione recte et perspicue dicta est oratio, nihil v[er]o pulchri continet, cum sit experientia construata et vulgaris. Jam v[er]o Cicero in hunc modum eandem expressit, »omnium magnarum artium sicut arbor[um] altitudo nos delectat, radius stirpesq[ue] n[on] item, sed esse illa sine his n[on] potest,« jam hic eadem oratio longe sub alia fine comparet, jam haec praeter illas dotes orationis etiam quidpiam aliud continet, n[on] enim jam videt[ur] sed servit[ur] ejus pulchritudo. Cicero rursus »Nemo unquam est oratorem, quod latine loqueret[ur], admiratus, si est aliter ir[r]ident, neq[ue] eum oratorem tantum[m]odo, sed hominum n[on] putant, nemo extulit cum verbis, qui ita dixisset, ut qui adessem, intelligerent; quid dicerant, sed contempsit cum, qui minus id facere potuisset.« Item Quintilianus »Parum est aegrum n[on] esse; fortem et laetum, et alacrem esse volo: parum abest ab infirmitate, in quo sola sanitas laudat[ur].« Hinc rectitudo et perspicuitas supponenda potius; sed illud, quod animum movet, accedat, et haec proprietas vocat[ur] vigor seu vivida vis orationis, per quam ea virtus intelligit[ur]; ope cujus sensus animi com[m]ovent[ur], unde haec proprietas Emphasis, splendor, seu lumen orationis dicit[ur]. Potest autem consistere partim in vividis animi sensis, partim in vivida elocutione. Ad hanc vividitatem requirit[ur]:

1o Vivida vis animi, quae in eo consistit, ut vivide sentiamus, et sensus vivide exprimere possimus. Sic Cicero dicit, »Neq[ue] unquam is, qui audieris, incederet[ur], nisi ardens ad eum perveniret oratio.« Sic etiam Horatius »si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi.«

2o Requirit[ur] vivida vis argumenti seu materiae. Unde Quintilianus »Magna eloquentia sicut flam[m]a materia alit[ur], et morib[us] excitat[ur], et urendo clarescit, crescit enim cum amplitudine rer[um] vis ingenii, nec quisquam claram et illustrem orationem efficere potest, nisi, qui causam parem invenit.« Hinc adparet; quod multum ab inventione argumenti pendeat.

3o Pertinet huc vivida perceptio argumenti.

De Figuris

Diversi loquendi modi, qui orationis formam im[m]utant, a Rhaetorib[us] Figurae dicent[ur], per quas diversae modificationes orationis, quae sensus animi vividiores exprimunt, intelligit[ur]. Quintilianus Figuram definit: »Figura est conformatio quaedam orationis remota a com[m]uni et primum se offerente ratione.« Graeci schem[m]ata (Gustus) vocabant. Dividunt[ur] figurae; in affectuum, phantasiae, et ingenii figuras.

Figurae Affectuum

Per figuras Affectuum nihil aliud intelligit[ur], quam signa externa affectuum. Observat[ur] enim quod unus motus animi sit lenior, altea vehementior, et quasi similis pungentib[us] ictib[us], et tum quod naturalius est, quam exclamare, per interjectiones Ah! Pro! Heu! O! etc. quae interjectiones cum Horatio »verae voces ab imo pectore« dicent[ur]. Observat[ur], quod vehemens affectus quasi in medio cursu et serie idear[um] inter[r]umpat[ur] Ut Virgilius de Neptuno dicente »Quos ego! – sed motos p[rae]stat component flutus« et haec figura vocat[ur] Aposiopoesis, suspensio, Praecisio. Si v[er]o gravis animi com[m]otio perturbet ideas, animus minus cogitat, quam sentio, objectum cum moveat[ur] in eo praedominat[ur], unde haec figura Ellipsis vocat[ur], ubi verba aliqua omittunt[ur]. Sic Cicero de Ver[r]e »Huncine hominem? hancine audaciam? hancine impudentiam??« Subintelligit[ur] impare relinquemus. Si v[er]o tale objectam primarium o[mn]es s[en]sos ideas alias praecur[r]at, et quasi totam seriem idear[um] perventat, vocat[ur] Inversio, ubi n[em]p[e] verbum aliquod corona consuetum ordinem syntaxeos eximit[ur] ex suo ordine, et in altiori loco collocat[ur]. Ita Nisus Eurialum salvans apud Virgilium loquit[ur] »Me me adsum, qui feci, in me convenite fer[r]um.« Tale objectum quasi homini solum praesens est, et illud vade saepius alloquit[ur], et hinc Apostrophe orit[ur], cum n[em]p[e] id ea recur[r]it, etiam idem sensus. Inde veniunt Repetitionis figurae utpote Epizeuxis ubi idem verbum repetit[ur]. Ita Cicero »Nos nos dico aperte nos Consules desumus.« Potest v[er]o saepius reperi aut ab initio, aut a fine, et quidem si ab initio repetat[ur] Anaphora, si in fine Epifora dicit[ur], cujus utriusq[ue] exemplum Cicero h[abe]t »Quis legem tulit? Rutulus. Quis majorem partem populi suffragiis privavit? Rutulus.« etc. Cum animus colligit[ur], infinita vis idear[um] de eodem objecto cumulat[ur], et figura talis cumulatio Est etiam proprium affectib[us], objecta supra modum cumulare et augere, ea talis figura vocat[ur] Hyperbola. – Figurae hae o[mn]es ex ipsa natura provenire d[ebe]nt et tum tantum his figuris uti possumus, si tale adsit objectam, quod vividitatem affectuum excitare potest.

Figurae Phantasmatum

Per quas imagines vividae verbis expressae intelligunt[ur]. Distinguendum v[er]o Phantasma a memoria haec enim ideas generales objector[um] abstractor[um] repraesentat. Phantasia v[er]o imagines rer[um] absentium ita animo repraesentat, ut eas cernere oculis ac p[rae]sentes habere videamur. Tales vividae imagina-

tiones Phantasiae v[el] visiones vocant[ur], verbis dein expraessae Energia, v[el] Hypotiposis, v[el] secundum Ciceronem sub oculos subjectio v[el] Illustratio, v[el] Evidentia Quintilianus pariter eam describit dicens »Illa tum fieri solet, cum res n[on] gesta indicat[ur], sed ut sit gesta ostendit[ur], nec universa, sed per partes; est ergo proposita quaedam forma redita expressa verbis, ut cerni potius videat[ur], quam audiri«, Cicero quoq[ue] in Ver[r]em »Ipse inflam[m]atus scelere et furore in forum venit, ardebant oculi, toto ex ore crudelitas emicabat.« Hac ratione scriptor quiscunq[ue] cum ipsa natura n[on] solum contendere, verum etiam superare potest.

h.e. n[on] tantum vivide exprimit, sed addit etiam sensus animo, quos obiectum in animo excitat. Phantasia n[on] semper objectum fixum tenet, sed saepius ab illo transit ad aliam rem, quae aliquam relationem cum primario h[abe]t. Talis conversio Tropus dicit[ur] v[el] Translationes. Im[m]utatio vocis a propria sua significatione ad aliam ob conjunctionem internam synecdocho vocat[ur]. Tunc id accidit, cum Totum pro parte Genus pro Species et vicissim sum[m]it[ur]; uti caput pro homine, mors pro mortali. Saepe imaginatio n[on] tantum in ipso objecto com[m]orat[ur], sed ad externa objecta evagat[ur] ob conjunctionem externam, et tunc Metonymia audit, quae nihil aliud est, quam im[m]utatio vocis a propria significatione in aliam, ob conjunctionem externam traducta: uti causa pro effecti, et vicissim e.g. Lacrimae pro dolore, lingua pro sermone, stylus pro scriptura, carnes pro frugib[us]. Evagatio ad alias res, quae praesenti objecto aut similes aut dissimiles s[un]t, Figura similitudinis aut An-thitheton nominat[ur]. Significationis propriae in alienam im[m]utatio, ob similitudinem, quae reb[us] intercedit, metaphora dicit[ur] v.g. sol vocat[ur] Rex coeli. Phantasia n[on] tantum vividiores sensus exprimit, sed vitam, colores, sensusq[ue] viventium addit e.g. Domus, sylvia surgit, herba sitit, morit[ur], res n[em]p[e] tales tanquam personas repraesentat. Saepe res tales Imaginatio tamquam loquentes inducit, hinc oriet[ur] sermocinatio. Phantasiae etiam est; ut a minori ad majus ascendat, inde orit[ur] Gradatio sive Climax. Cicero h[abe]t exemplum ejus »In urbe luxuries creat[ur], ex luxuria avaritia existat necesse est, ex avaritia erumpit audacia, inde o[mn]ia scelera et malesitia gignunt[ur].« In eo autem vividitas et vis imaginationis cernit[ur] »si novam et propriam imaginem sibi efigat, talis imago idealis vocat[ur].« Cicero ait »Illi artifices v[el] in simulacris v[el] in picturis cum facerent Jovis formam aut Minervae, n[on] contemplabant[ur] aliquem, a quo similitudinem ducerent, sed ipsor[um] in mente insidebat species pulchritudinis eximiae quaedam, quam intuentes in ea quae defixi ad illius similitudinem artem et manum dirigebant.« Sic Cicero de Ciropedia »Cyros ille a Xenophonte n[on] ad historiae fidem scripsit, sed ad

efigiem justi imperii.« Vividiores v[er]o impressiones faciunt Tropi, quia sensus animi duplicat[ur]. Inde etiam regulae pro usu tropor[um] fiunt;

1o Nunquam adhibeant[ur] sine ratione sufficiente, nisi recuta vividitas orationes augeat[ur].

2o Cavendum est, ne Tropi sint nimis longe periti, sive desumpti a reb[us] nimis dicursio sed sint naturales e.g. si montes Verucas Ter[r]ae adpellarem. Unde Cicero ait, verecunda d[ebe]t esse Translatis, ut deducta esse in alienum locum, n[on] ir[r]uisse, atq[ue] ut voluntatis n[on] vi venisse videat[ur].

3o Cavendum est ne ducant[ur] a reb[us] obscenis, sordidis, abjectis, incongruis, quia hoc modo vis orationis destruit[ur] v.g. Cicero repraehendit eum, qui dicebat morte Africani Rempublicam castratam esse. Sicq[ue] Horatius »Jupiter hybernas cana nive conspicet Alpes.«

4o Cavendum ne Attributa diversar[um] et discrepantium rerum conjungant[ur] v.g. Fortuna vitrea est, dum videt frangit[ur], hic attributa videre, et vitreum s[un]t diversa.

5o Ne nimis frequentent[ur], satietatem enim afferunt.

Num in vividitate consistat pulchritudo orationis?

Vividitas orationis jam per se animo grata est, quia animus hominis ut corpus vult moveri, sed t[ame]n inter diversas significationes orationis aliae videri possunt indifferentes, aliae juvendae. Indifferentes videbunt[ur] tales gestus quos indiferens animi motus protulit. Jucundiores erunt nobis figurae, si aliquam praestantiam animi, naturaeq[ue] humanae prodant sive, quae sensus, ad praestantiam naturae excitant, uti cogitatio, sermo, pictura etc. pulchra vocant[ur], quae nobiliorem sentiendi rationem expriment, ubi aliquis a benignitate humanitate generositate amicitia, n[on] modo com[m]odi, se exquisitioni laudet[ur] e.g. Martialis Ariae necem sibi inferentis verba ad maritum suum facit »si qua fides, vulnus, quod feci n[on] dolet inquit, sed quod tu facies hoc mihi Paete dolet.« Huc pertinet praecipue sublimitas orationis, est n[em]p[e] illa, quae magnas cogitationes et generosiores affectus exhibet v.g. Horatius de sapiente »si fractus illabat[ur] orbis, inpauidum ferient ruinae.« Aut responsis Augusti detecta conjunctione Cinnae »simul Amici Cinna.« Rursum Horatius »Reges in ipsos imperium est Jovis cuncta supercilio moventis.« Sacrae scripturae »Fiat lux, et facta est.«

Quid intelligit[ur] per pulchrum imaginem?

Pulchra imago ea dicit[ur], quae p[rae]stantiorem subtilioremq[ue] vim imaginationis prodit, n[on] igit[ur] imaginationis omnis imago seligenda est, veram exquisitor; sic n[on] par ratio est metaphoris quibuscunq[ue] uti, sed aptes sic v.g. Cicero loquit[ur] de Bruto »sed in te intuens Brute dolet, cujus in adulescentium per medias laudes quasi quadrigis vehementem transverso incur[r]it misera fortuna Reipublicae.« Hoc alius scriptor com[m]unius expressisset ita »In te intuens Brute doleo, quod ulterior profectus tuus in Repub[licae] intercipiat[ur].« Cicero v[er]o pulchriorem imaginem attulit sum[m]ens scilicet metaphoram a circensib[us] ludis. Ita o[mn]es figurae disjudicari d[e]bent, et quaerendum an pulchrae sint remq[ue] aptae. Sic v.g. Hanc sententia[m] »Dulce solum Patriae« diversi scriptores diverso modo exprimunt, et quidem Cicero »Patriae tanta est vis ac tanta natura, ut Graecam illam in asperrimis saxulis tanquam tridulunt affixum sapientissimus vir Ulisses im[m]ortalitati an-teposuit.« Haec imago merito pulchra dici potest.

Quid pulchra cogitatio?

Pulchra cogitatio ea dicit[ur], quae p[rae]stantem cum acumenq[ue] cogitandi prodit. Taciti dictum acutu[m] est, dum Imperatorem Galbam loquentem inducit, ad Pisonem »Imperaturus est hominib[us], qui nec totam servitutum pati possunt, nec totam libertatem.« Huc pertinent o[mn]es figurae ingenico Germanico Witz, quae facultas consistit in reb[us] reconditis, discrepantib[us] aut quae nullam vident[ur] habere inita se relationem, h[ab]ent t[ame]n. Huc pertinent figurae Epanodos seu Antimetastasis, quod idem est ac Transmutatio sive Conversio in contrariam partem, sive quando sententia acute per acutiorem vim ingenii convertit[ur] v.g. Com[m]unus sententia est »Homines omniu[m] rer[um] prius obliviscunt[ur], quam injuria[m].« Cicero v[er]o laudans Caesarem hanc ita convertit »Nihil solum oblivisci, quam injurias.« Sic Seneca dicit »Crede res severa est verum gaudium« per quam sententia[m] phylosophiam moralem exprimit, cum gaudium semper cu[m] laetitia conjunctum esse soleat. Sic etiam verba acute converti et nece possunt. Ita Quintilianus, »Qui stiltis eruditi videri volunt, stulti eruditus vident[ur].« Est etiam figura oximoron, cum contraria de eodem docunt[ur]. Sic opposita s[un]t esse et n[on] esse e.g. »Nihil scit, qui o[mn]ia scit.« Ita insaniens, sapientia, concordia, discordia. Illa figurae, quae res diversas conjungit vocat[ur] simichiosis, quod idem est ac copulatio seu domesticatio, huc pertinet figura Antanaclasis, dum idem verbum bis sed

duplici sensu ponit[ur]: Tale est Epitaphium de Foemina »Quiescit, quae nunquam quievit.« Ita Ovidius de Medea »Talis erat mater si modo mater erat.« Tum »Amici vivamus dum[m]odo vivimus.« Dein quoad expressionem ingenii, ubi ideas suas reconditas h[abe]t v.g. »Aedes illustres, seu quas ventus perflat.« Et hi lusus ingenii vocant[ur]. Huc pertinet figura Ironiae, ubi contrariu[m] intelligit[ur]; ita de studioso malo si dicam »Lumen universitatis.« Haec ideo referunt[ur] inter figuras orationis, quia amor proprio blandiunt. Ita Quintilianus de lectionib[us] dicit »Auditorib[us] grata haec s[un]t, quae cum intelligunt, acumina suo delectans, n[on] quasi audierint, sed quasi invenerint.« Ita etiam illi, qui auctorem n[on] intelligunt, ei vitio vertunt, quod signu[m] est minoris acuminis.

Figurae spuriae

Huc pertinent, figurae spuriae, seu abusus ingenii uti s[un]t Anagram[m]ata ex transpositione verborum ir[r]egulari orta, Chronogram[m]ata tempus literis indicantia, Achrostica ubi quidpiam literis majusculis indicat[ur], et Lippogram[m]ata ex omissione aliquor[um] literar[um] orta. Huc pertinet Enig[m]as, ubi significationi verbi ipsa substituit[ur] v[el] imago. Echo, ubi ex ultimis literis nova verba emergunt. Figurae hae est foetus monachor[um] aevi, praeter enim id, quod nullo ingenio opus habeant, offendunt sensum analogiae et simetriae.

De pulchritudine Orationis externa

Versat[ur] haec partim in formis et modo loquendi, partim in mechanismo verbor[um].

1. Pulchritudo in modis loquendi elegantia dicit[ur] (ab eligere) Regula est haec; quod expressiones debeant esse naturales n[on] v[er]o vulgares. Veteres hanc proprietatem orationis Atticismum sive Urbanitatem adpellabant. Atticismus ab Athenis, in quib[us] n[em]p[e] sedes hominu[m] cultior[um] totius Graeciae erat, sub atticismo complexus verbor[um], formar[um], legumq[ue] apud homines cultos usitator[um] intelligit[ur]. Hunc de Urbanitate in hunc modum Quintilianus »Qua urbanitate significari video sermonem p[rae]ferentem in verbis et sono, et usu, propriu[m] quemdam gustum urbis, et sumtam ex conversatione doctor[um] tacitam eruditionem, deniq[ue] cui contraria sit rusticitas.« Vitia opposita urbanitati est rusticitas ratio n[em]p[e] dicendi vulgaris, et apud homines incultos usitata, huc pertinent obscenitates adversat[ur]

etiam Calloplismus v[el] affectatio, qua[m] Petronius »melitos verbor[um] globulos, et o[mni]a dicta factaq[ue] quasi papavere et caesamo sparsa esse« ait.

Puritas orationis consistit in eo; si ea nullo alieno sermone cor[r]upta sit. Quatuor v[er]o sermonis alieni species dant[ur]:

a) Archaismus, si quis verbis v[el] formis obsoletis utat[ur].

b) Provincialismus, usus verbor[um] tantum in aliqua provincia usitator[um].

c) Peregrinitas, si quis verba peregrina orationi im[m]isceat, inde Graecismus, latinismus, Germanismus, Gallicismus etc.

d) Neologismus, dum aliquis novis fictis verbis utit[ur], uti t[ame]n illis licet, si pro denominatione rei nullum verbum serviat.

e) Denique huc pertinet purismus, seu nimia puritas.

2o Mechanismus verbor[um] duplex est, pulchritudo quatenus conjuncta est cum ipso sensu orationis, aut sine ejus respectu, dicit[ur]q[ue] aut Harmonia, aut numeros. Harmonia consistit in convenientia externi orationis habitum cum sensu ejus. Locum h[abe]t partim in verbis, partim in serie pluriu[m] verbor[um]. Exemplum p[rae]ebet Virgilius: »Illi intra se se magna vi brachia tollunt,« v[el] v[er]o Horatius »Parturiunt montes nascet[ur] ridiculus mus.« Reb[us] gravib[us], tristib[us], magnis magis verba longiora, quam e contra leniorib[us] breviora conveniunt, ut Cicero de Thucidide diceret »De bellicis reb[us] canit etiam quodam[m]odo bellium.« N[ume]rus in eo versat[ur], quatenus scilicet, n[on] ad ipsum objectum, sed externum orationis sonum respicit[ur], idq[ue] Euphonia (Benesonantia) vocat[ur]. Pariterq[ue] in singulis verbis, et serie eor[um] locum h[abe]t, hoc dependet ab apta permixtione vocalium consonantiumq[ue], longarum breviumq[ue] syllabar[um]. Opponit[ur] vocalitate durities, monotonia, si n[em]p[e] idem sonus saepius recur[r]at. Virtus haec locum h[abe]t in integris propositionib[us], praecipue in structura periodo[um], unde etiam n[ume]rosam audit, praecipue v[er]o ad fines eor[um] respicit[ur]. In genere id observandum esse, o[mn]es oportere aurib[us] se potius accomodare, cum superfluae hic regulae sint. Unde merito Quintilianus ait »curam verbor[um], rer[um] volo esse sollicitudinem,« si igt[ur] oratio penitus careat hujusmodi pulchritudinib[us] nihil h[abe]t, quod animu[m] lectoris auditorisve incitet, teneatq[ue], uti etiam superfluo nitore facile fastidium parit, hinc opus est umbra luceq[ue] in oratione. Ad plenam orationem reddendam requirit[ur] Praecisio, o[mn]e n[em]p[e] superfluum vitet[ur]. Pleonasmus vitet[ur], ubi n[em]p[e] plus dicit[ur] quam opus est. H[abe]t locum in singulis verbis et propositionib[us]. Tum Digressiones in alias materias, Tauthologia sui repetitio. Ultima tandem perfectio est cor[r]rectio id est vacatio omnib[us] vitiis.