

The current state of research on eighteenth-century Latin-language scholarly literature in Hungary

(A partial overview, raising some issues and recommendations for research)

Gergely TÓTH

Senior Research Fellow, HUN REN Institute of History

ORCID: 0009-0009-3164-0514

Abstract | In my study, I tried to review the progress of research in the areas of 18th-century Neo-Latin scholarly literature in Hungary – primarily with regard to works and authors with Hungarian relevance. I did not cover all disciplines in the same depth. I put more emphasis on historiography and its auxiliary sciences, and on *historia litteraria* (which was a kind of literary or rather cultural history in the period), while other disciplines were examined in less detail. In general, I have found that many scientific works or even entire oeuvres from this period are still unexplored and unprocessed, but there are also authors and works that are known but have been neglected in recent times. I have also pointed out that books in the field of natural sciences cannot be ignored by the researcher of Neolatin literature of this period, since these works were still largely written in Latin in the 18th century and in many ways represent an old humanist tradition of knowledge, thus showing great respect for ancient authorities.

In my paper I also introduced the Matthias Bél Neo-Latin Research Group founded in 2023, and its members. The aim of the research group is to cultivate this large field of research, namely the 18th century Neolatin literature – not excluding the 17th century, which is not sharply divorced from it in terms of Latin literature. The members of the workshop have been working together for a long time on various projects. The research group is happy to offer assistance to those who wish to study an 18th-century author or subject, whether in the form of tutoring, advising, proof-reading or collaborative work.

Keywords | 18th century, Neo-Latin historiography, *historia litteraria*, Matthias Bél Neo-Latin Research Group

* This study has been prepared with the support of the Bolyai János Research Scholarship Program and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (K 137752).

The harvest truly is plentiful, but the laborers are few¹ – this well-known verse describes the present state of research on eighteenth-century Latin-language scholarly literature in Hungary. There are namely large fields of wheat that go virtually untouched in these parts, and there is nobody to harvest the crop. It probably needs no justification that this kind of neglect is harmful in the medium and long term, as it could impact our idea of an entire era or even lead us astray if the land is not cultivated continuously, i.e. if there are no researchers who can give an up-to-date account of an author, work, or the development of a given branch of science.

Counterexamples abound in Hungarian literary history. For example, our nineteenth-century literature is subject to continuous discussion, and medieval chronicles also attracted significant attention as well. Understandably, humanist authors also seem to be more attractive topics than eighteenth-century writers, since researchers of Neo-Latin literature usually spent the best years of their youth in Virgil's and Livy's company, i.e. they are classical philologists, and so humanists, as explorers and admirers of antiquity, typically have a great impact on them. The mature Neo-Latin literature of the eighteenth century may seem less interesting and attractive in comparison.

Negative opinions have also long plagued eighteenth-century Hungarian history and culture. Historians have often considered this era uneventful and uninteresting, while literary historians thought it was bleak and anti-national.² Researchers of contemporary Protestant history of the church (who obviously also came from a Protestant background themselves) also had quite a negative opinion of this period, since they saw it as a time of ruthless Catholic restoration, a decades-long attempt to systematically starve out the Protestant churches, and not without reason.³ On the other hand,

¹ Mt 9,37.

² The Hungarian literature of this century was also long considered a low point in literary history. Ferenc Toldy's illustrious work sees the period between 1711 and 1772 as a "period of decline". See TOLDY Ferenc, *A magyar nemzeti irodalom története a legrégibb időktől a jelenkorig rövid előadásban* [The history of Hungarian national literature from the earliest times to the present, in brief lectures], volumes 1–2 (Pest: Athenaeum, 1872), 1, 99. Jenő Pintér later even calls this period of time an "anti-national era." See on this ALSZEGHY Zsolt: "Nemzetietlen-e irodalmunk »nemzetietlen« kora?" [Is the anti-national era of our literature anti-national?], *Irodalomtörténet* 31, no. 1 (1942): 1–13; more recently on periodization and the issue of delineating periods, see Tüskés Gábor, "A 18. századi irodalom korszakolásának kérdéséhez" [On the periodization of eighteenth-century literature], *Irodalomtörténet* 100, no. 4. (2019): 369–392. Although Toldy's and Pintér's negative evaluations clearly referred to Hungarian-language literature in a narrower sense, such comments and denouncements also had an impact in a wider sense. It is important to note that contemporary Latin-language scholarly literature often had a negative connotation among literary scholars, as a kind of clerical, outdated product that squeezed the life out of national literature and the use of the national language. See also Alszeghy's above-mentioned study on this.

³ ZSILINSZKY Mihály ed., *A magyarhoni protestáns egyház története* [The history of the Hungarian Protestant church] (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1907), 331–512; ZOVÁNYI Jenő, *A magyarországi protestantizmus története* [The history of Protestantism in Hungary], volumes 1–2 (Máriabesnyő–Gödöllő: Attraktor, 2004), 2, 5–180. Elemér Mályusz's heavily Protestant-leaning study is of particular importance in this area: MÁLYUSZ Elemér, *A türelmi rendelet. II. József és a magyar protestantizmus* [The patent of toleration:

Marxist historiography described this period as a “colonisation of Hungary” (interpreting it as a kind of colonisation by the Habsburgs), which also cast a dark shadow on the perceptions of this century.⁴

In the following, I present an overview of current research in the various areas of eighteenth-century Neo-Latin scholarly literature. I obviously cannot provide a full picture in such a brief study; I therefore examined those areas more closely that I consider to be of more importance; other areas I only discuss in passing. Through my brief overview, I only wish to signal where I detect a bigger backlog or gap in exploring the material, and I discuss the individual areas and their significance in general terms.⁵

In my paper, I also want to introduce the Matthias Bel Neo-Latin Research Group (BMNM) founded in 2023, as well as its members. The aim of this research group is to pursue this large area of research, i.e. eighteenth-century Neo-Latin literature. We do not discount the seventeenth century either, since there is no sharp separation between the two periods in terms of Latin literature. The members of the research group have long worked together on various projects, including the publication of the unpublished parts of **Matthias Bel's** *Notitia* since 2011, as well as the publication of Péter Révay's *De monarchia*.⁶

Joseph II and Hungarian Protestantism], (Budapest: Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság, 1939, new edition: Máriabesnyő–Gödöllő: Attraktor, 2006). Mályusz had already voiced strong criticism about the parts Szekfű wrote in Bálint Hómann and Gyula Szekfű's renowned “Magyar történet” [Hungarian history], particularly the part about the eighteenth century, which his colleague considered a “flourishing” period. On this, see Erős Vilmos, “Szekfű és Mályusz vitája a „Magyar Történet-ről” [The debate about ‘Magyar Történet’ between Szekfű and Mályusz], *Századok* 131, no. 2. (1997): 453–476.

4 MÓD Aladár, *400 év küzdelem az önálló Magyarorszáért* [400 years of struggle for an independent Hungary], 2nd, extended edition (Budapest: Szikra, 1945), 46; KOSÁRY Domokos, *Bevezetés a magyar történelem forrásaiba és irodalmába* [Introduction to the sources and secondary literature on Hungarian history], vol. 2. (1711–1825) (Budapest: Művelt Nép, 1954), 13.

5 My work has been aided greatly by the monograph of KOSÁRY DOMOKOS: *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1996). In English translation: KOSÁRY Domokos, *Culture and Society in Eighteenth-century Hungary* (Budapest: Corvina Kiadó, 1987). Another foundational text about this period is: SZELESTEI N. László, *Irodalom- és tudományszervezési törekvések a 18. századi Magyarországon 1690–1790* [Ambitions of organizing literature and science in eighteenth-century Hungary 1690–1790], *Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár kiadványai. Új sorozat 4* (Budapest: OSzK, 1989). See also Gábor TÜSKÉS–Éva KNAPP, “History of the Neo-Latin Studies in 18th-Century Hungary,” in *Prismes irisés. Textes recueillis sur les littératures classiques et modernes pour Olga Penke qui fête ses soixante années*, 185–200 (Szeged: Klebelsberg Kuno Egyetemi Kiadó, 2006). The following was also useful with the more recent literature: KÖSZEGHY Péter and TAMÁS Zsuzsanna eds., *Magyar Művelődéstörténeti Lexikon. Középkor és kora újkor* [Lexicon of Hungarian Cultural History. Middle Ages and Early Modernity], vol. 1–14 (Budapest: Balassi, 2003–2014). (Hereinafter: MAMÜL). The two recently published bulky volumes of the *Magyar remekírók* [Hungarian Classic Authors] anthology series are particularly important points of reference for the scientific literature of the time: TÜSKÉS Gábor ed., *Magyarországi gondolkodók. 18. század. Bölcsészettudományok* [Hungarian thinkers. 18th century. Humanities], vol. 1–2, (Budapest: Kortárs, 2011–2020). An important collection focusing on eighteenth-century Hungarian proposals for the foundation of learned societies, and documents related to freemasonry: *Learned Societies, Freemasonry, Sciences and Literature in 18th-century Hungary*, eds., Réka LENGYEL and Gábor TÜSKÉS (Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2007).

6 Members of the Matthias Bel Neo-Latin Research Group (*Officina Neolatina ex Matthia Belio nominata*) include: Bernadett Benei, Zoltán Gözsy, Rezső Jarmalov, Iván Kis, Sára Sánta, Gergely Tóth, and Péter

korább
an:
volume
s volt,
melyik?

Historiography, and church history-writing in particular, was of “strategic” importance in this period, as both sides needed it.⁷ For Catholics, it was essential to lay the foundations of a country-wide restoration, to recover their positions, benefices, estates and people’s souls.⁸ Protestants, on the other hand, had a fundamental interest in looking back because of the big cataclysms of the seventeenth century, the “decade of morning” (1671–1681, period of the violent counter-reformation), and a worsening state repression: on the one hand, they had to prove their right to exist; on the other hand, they were forced to document their damages, i.e. what they had lost, what they had suffered, and what was still left.⁹

Tóth. On the publication of *Notitia*, see below. The publication of Péter Révay’s work: RÉVAY Péter, *De monarchia et Sacra Corona Regni Hungariae centuriae septem – A magyar királyság birodalmáról és szent koronájáról szóló hét század*, ed. TÓTH Gergely, Latin text ed. and transl. TÓTH Gergely et al., vol. 1–2 (Budapest: BTK TTI, 2021). I will refer to particular members’ research projects below.

- 7 Another overview of historiography of that time, with its international context: ERŐS Vilmos, *Modern historiográfia. Az újkori történetírás egy története* [Modern historiography. A story of modern historiography], 69–82, (Budapest: Ráció, 2015); see also Vilmos ERŐS, “Über den Begriff der Historiographie. Paradigmen in der europäischen Geschichtsschreibung,” *Arbeiten zur Deutschen Philologie* XXXII. (2021) 101–122, especially: 104–106.; Soós István, “Felzárkózás vagy lemaradás? Történetírás a 18. századi Magyarországon” [Catching up or falling behind? Historiography in eighteenth-century Hungary], In *Clio inter arma. Tanulmányok a 16–18. századi magyarországi történetírásról*, [Clio inter arma. Essays on the 16–18th century Hungarian historiography] ed. Tóth Gergely, Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Értekezések, 227–251 (Budapest: MTA BTK TTI, 2014).
- 8 More recently, see Antal MOLNÁR, “Rudolf Bzensky SJ (1651–1715): ein tschechischer Missionar und Geschichteschreiber in Siebenbürgen,” in *Lesestoffe und kulturelles Niveau des niederen Klerus*, eds. István MONOK and Péter ÖRVÖS, Aufsätze zur Lesegeschichte. Sonderband 3, 67–77, (Szeged: Scriptorum RT., 2001); SZABADOS György, “»Jezsuita „sikertörténet“« (1644–1811). A magyar történettudomány konzervatív megteremtőiről” [»A Jesuit „success story“« (1644–1811). On the conservative founders of Hungarian historiography], in Tóth, *Clio inter arma...*, 203–226.; see also György SZABADOS, “The annals as a genre of Hungarian Jesuit historiography in the 17th–18th centuries. From the state history to the history of the state,” in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Upsaliensis. Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, ed. Astrid STEINER-WEBER, 1067–1075 (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2012).
- 9 See RITOÓK Zsigmondné [Szalay Ágnes], “Debreceni Ember Pál egyháztörténetének kéziratái” [The manuscripts of Pál Debreceni Ember’s history of the church], *Magyar Könyvszemle* 89, nos. 2, 3–4 (1973): 175–185 and 364–376, 180–182, 185; Tóth Gergely, “A mellőzéstől a hitvitákra át a nagy egyháztörténetekig: a magyarországi reformáció a 16–18. századi történetírásban” [From being sidelined through religious polemics to the great histories of the church. Hungarian reformation in sixteenth-eighteenth-century historiography], in *Egyházi társadalom a Magyar Királyságban a 16. században*, [Religious society in 16th century Hungarian Kingdom] eds. VARGA Szabolcs and VÉRTESI Lázár, *Seria Historiae Dioecesis Quinqueecclesiensis* 1, 409–422 (Pécs: Pécsi Hittudományi Főiskola Pécsi Egyháztörténeti Intézet, 2017), 417–419; Tóth Gergely, “Historia Querelarum. Sérelmekből összeálló egyháztörténet Okolicsányi Pál *Historia diplomatica* című munkájában” [Historia Querelarum. Church history consisting of grievances in Pál Okolicsányi’s *Historia diplomatica*], in *A reformáció emlékezete. Protestáns és katolikus értelmezések a 16–18. században*, [The memory of Reformation. Protestant and Catholic approaches from the 16th to the 18th century] eds. SZÁRAZ Orsolya, FAZAKAS Gergely Tamás, and IMRE Mihály, *Loci Memoriae Hungariae* 7, 217–227 (Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, 2018); Zoltán CSEPREGI, “Von der historischen Erinnerung bis zum kanonisierten Gedenken. Reformationsmemoria in Ungarn in der

These scientific areas have been researched quite thoroughly, also on the Catholic side. The role Gábor Hevenes (1656–1715) played, his plan to collect sources and its implementation are well-known from the works of László Szelestei N. and István Soós.¹⁰ Rezső Jarmalov, member of the Mátyás Bél Neo-Latin Working Group, focuses on Ferenc Otrokocsi Főris, a Calvinist priest who converted to Catholicism, and his manuscript history of the church,¹¹ while Bernadett Benei, another member of the research group, focuses on the multifaceted and talented Sámuel Timon (1675–1736).¹² The Jesuit Károly Péterffy (1700–1746) is also part of the story. His *Sacra Concilia* is a sort of Catholic history of the church, and although it is quite polemical from a denominational point of view, it already reflects on the Protestant and Catholic authors, and so it is also of interest in terms of the contemporary discourse among historians.¹³ However, nobody is doing in-depth research on him. An equally little-researched person is the Jesuit Miklós Schmitth (1707–1767) and his enormous oeuvre, for instance his work on the Eger diocese.¹⁴ What shall we do with it, who will read it? We also cannot ignore Gábor Kolinovics (1698–1770), who led a unique life: his meticulous chronicle of the first two

Frühen Neuzeit,” in *Rezeption und Memoria der Reformation im östlichen Europa*, eds. Ulrich A. WIEN and Henning P. JÜRGENS, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz 142, 9–22 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2024).

- 10 SZELESTEI N. László, “A jezsuiták történeti forrásgyűjtésének kezdetei Magyarországon” [The beginnings of the Jesuits’ historical source collecting in Hungary], *Magyar Könyvszemle* 103, no. 3. (1987): 161–172; Soós István, “Kishevesi Hevenes Gábor (1656–1715),” *Vasi honismereti és helytörténeti közlemények* 33, no. 1 (2006): 5–23.
- 11 JARMALOV Rezső, “Otrokocsi Főris Ferenc műve a magyar egyháztörténetről” [Ferenc Otrokocsi Főris’ work on the history of the church in Hungary], *Fons* 29, no. 4. (2022) 461–480; JARMALOV Rezső, “Otrokocsi Főris Ferenc *Historia Ecclesiastica Hungarorum* című művének kéziratai és szövegproblémái” [The manuscripts and textual problems of Ferenc Otrokocsi Főris’ *Historia Ecclesiastica Hungarorum*], in *A latin nyelv a kora újkori Magyarország és Erdély kultúrájában és művelődésében* [Latin language in the culture of Hungary and Transylvania], eds. BÉKÉS Enikő, KASZA Péter, and MOLNÁR Dávid, *Convivia Neolatina Hungarica* 5, 185–196 (Szeged: Lazi, 2023).
- 12 BENEI Bernadett, “»Non tam stylo, quam veritati studuit«: Timon Sámuel új szemléletű forráskritikája az *Epitome Chronologica Rerum Hungaricarum* c. munkájában” [»Non tam stylo, quam veritati studuit«: Sámuel Timon’s new approach to source criticism in his *Epitome Chronologica Rerum Hungaricarum*], in *Scientiarum miscellanea. Latin nyelvű tudományos irodalom Magyarországon a 15–18. században* [Scientiarum miscellanea. Scientific literature in Latin in 15–18th century Hungary], eds. KASZA Péter, KISS Farkas Gábor, and MOLNÁR Dávid, *Convivia Neolatina Hungarica* 2, 53–59 (Szeged: Lazi, 2017); BENEI Bernadett: “Chronologia nova Hungariae nascitur. Timon Sámuel *Epitoméjének* előzményei és főbb tulajdonságai” [“Chronologia nova Hungariae nascitur.” The precursors and main characteristics of Sámuel Timon’s *Epitome*], (forthcoming).
- 13 CAROLUS PÉTERFFY, *Sacra concilia ecclesiae Romano-Catholicae in regno Hungariae celebrata...* Tomus I–II, (Viennae Austriae–Posonii: Kaliwoda–Royer, 1742); a summary about his person, with (much) earlier literature: SZABADOS György, “Péterffy Károly, br.,” in MAMŰ IX. 162.
- 14 The above-mentioned work: Nicolaus SCHMITTH, *Episcopi Agrienses, fide diplomatum concinnati*, I–II, (Iaurini: Streibig, 1763); on his person more recently, see SZILAS László, “Schmitth Miklós,” in MAMŰL X. 258.

Szilasi



decades of the eighteenth century, his autobiography, and the document archives he collated should be mentioned from his enormous, mostly manuscript oeuvre.¹⁵

As for the great Jesuit historians of the second part of the eighteenth century, although there has indeed been some research on György Pray, István Katona, or even Károly Wagner, we are not aware of any ongoing research on them at the moment.¹⁶ The oeuvre of these authors is so large that they could easily yield doctoral dissertations or even DSc dissertations at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.¹⁷ The same is true for Ádám Ferenc Kollár (1718–1783): he has not really been forgotten, especially his political pieces, and thanks to Ján Tibenský, a biography is also available about him, although it is quite outdated by now.¹⁸ That being said, his correspondence has also

- 15 His manuscript chronicle on the years 1701–1720: Gabriel KOLINOVICS, *Commentariorum de rebus Ungaricis Libri XIII. Ubi Gesta Ab Anno, MDCCI. ad annum MDCCXX. ... accuratione summa recensentur, Senquicizii MDCCXLII.* (Manuscript.) Egyetemi Könyvtár (=EK) Ms. G. 86.; his unusual “minor monograph” about the diet of 1741: Gabriel KOLINOVICS, *Nova Hungariae periodus... sive Comitiorum generalium, quibus... Maria Theresia in reginam Ungariae Posonii anno 1741 inaugurabatur ... libris novem absolutissima narratio*, ed. Martinus Georgius KOVACHICH (Budae: typis Regiae Universitatis, 1790); about the author, see Ján Milán DUBOVSKÝ, *Gabriel Kolinovič Šenkvičský 1698–1770* (Šenkvice: Obec Šenkvice, 1998); TÓTH Gergely, “Felekezeti és történelmi emlékezet. A Rákóczi-szabadságharc a 18. századi honi történetírásban” [Confessionalism and historical memory. Rákóczi’s war of independence in the Hungarian historiography of the 18th century], *Történelmi Szemle* 52, no. 1 (2010): 13–36, 26–27; with additional data: KOLTAI András, “Kolinovics Gábor, senkviçi,” in MAMÜL V. 470.
- 16 About Katona’s life and oeuvre, see THOROCZKAY Gábor, “Előszó,” in KATONA István, *A kalocsai érseki egyház története* [The history of the archdiocese of Kalocsa], vol. I, transl. TAKÁCS József, ed. THOROCZKAY Gábor and ROMSICS Imre (Kalocsa: Kalocsai Múzeumbarátok Köre, 2001), I–VIII; an important paper on his methods of writing history: SZABADOS György, “Katona István történetírói időszerűségéről” [On István Katona’s relevance as a historian], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 112, no. 5–6 (2008): 686–688; more recently: DÓBÉK Ágnes, “Katona István történetíró levelei Eszterházy Károly egri püspökhöz. Adalékok Katona munkamódszeréhez és a *Historia Critica Regum Hungariae* kiadástörténetéhez” [Historian István Katona’s letters to Károly Eszterházy, bishop of Eger. Contributions to Katona’s working methods and the publication history of *Historia Critica Regum Hungariae*], *Lymbus. Magyarságtudományi forrásközlemények* 21 (2023): 355–372. György Pray has a rich literature. Some of the more recent works include: SZABADOS György, *A magyar történelem kezdeteiről. Az előidő-szemlélet hangsúlyváltásai a XV–XVIII. században* [On the beginnings of Hungarian history. Changes of emphasis in the approach to earlier times in the 15th–18th centuries], (Budapest: Balassi, 2006), 184–201; BÁTHORY Orsolya, *Pray György Epitome Rerum sub Josepho II. Leopoldo II. et Francisco I. regibus Hungariae gestarum című műve (bevezető tanulmány és szövegközlés)* [György Pray’s *Epitome Rerum sub Josepho II. Leopoldo II. et Francisco I. regibus Hungariae gestarum* (introductory study and text edition)], Doctoral (PhD) dissertation, (Debrecen: DE BTK, 2009); Soós István, “Felzárkózás vagy lemaradás?...,” 238–247. A more recent study on Károly Wagner: SZŐKE Kornélia, “Wagner Károly, a modern genealógus” [Károly Wagner, the modern genealogist], in *Stephanus noster. Tanulmányok Bartók István 60. születésnapjára*, eds. JANKOVICS József et al., 409–421 (Budapest: Reciti, 2015).
- 17 About Pray, see Orsolya Báthory’s dissertation in the previous note.
- 18 JÁN TIBENSKÝ, *A királynő könyvtárosa. Adam František Kollár élete és művei* [The queen’s librarian: Adam František Kollár’s life and works] (Bratislava: Madách, 1985). Also see more recently Paul SHORE, “Ex-Jesuit Librarian-Scholars Adam František Kollár and György Pray. Baroque Tradition, National Identity, and the Enlightenment among Jesuits in the Eastern Habsburg Lands,” *Journal of Jesuit Studies*, 6, no. 3 (2019), 467–485.

been published, thanks to István Soós,¹⁹ and a new correspondence edition always warrants a new synthesis, since it can enrich and nuance our perception of the author in a unique way. Ferenc Károly Palma's (1735–1787) popular Hungarian history should also be re-read and re-interpreted, as should Károly Wagner's (1732–1790) excellent works, *Analecta* and *Collectanea*, as well as his manuscript legacy.²⁰ The latter is of particular importance, since most of these authors have left a large amount of manuscript material behind, which provides further tasks and opportunities for researchers.

The greats also include István Kaprinai (1714–1785), an illustrious member of the Jesuit school of historians that copied, collected, and processed charters. Although his unfinished oeuvre had almost completely disappeared from research for a long time, during the last few years one study was written about his ecclesiastic rhetoric and one on his manuscript estate, and his correspondence with Sámuel Dobai Székely (1704–1779) was also published.²¹ The latest member of our group, Iván Kis, has started to explore his scientific oeuvre.²² I would finally like to highlight József Koller's (1703–1766)

19 See KOLLÁR Ádám Ferenc, *Levelezése* [Correspondence], ed. Soós István, Magyarországi tudósok levelezése 4 (Budapest: Universitas, 2000).

20 Franciscus Carolus PALMA, *Notitia rerum Hungaricarum...* I–III (Tyrnaviae: Typis Collegii Academici Soc. Jesu, 1770); Carolus WAGNER, *Analecta Scepusii sacri et profani*, I–II, 1774; Carolus WAGNER, *Collectanea genealogico-historica illustrium Hungariae familiarum...* I–IV (Posonii, Pestini et Lipsiae: Landerer, 1802). More recently about Palma: TÓTH Gergely, “Ex-jezsuiták: Önkép, önreprezentáció és a rend 1773. évi megszüntetésének emléke Palma Károly Ferenc, Pray György és Katona István történeti munkáiban” [Ex-Jesuits. Self-image, self-representation and the memory of the termination of the Order in 1773 in the works of Palma, Pray and Katona], in *Egyházi társadalom a 18. században* [Religious society in the 18th century] eds. FORGÓ András and GÓZSY Zoltán, Pécsi Egyháztörténeti Műhely 11, 411–425 (Pécs: META Egyesület, 2019), 411–419. About Wagner, see note 16.

21 SZÁRAZ Orsolya, “Itáliai hitszónokok Kaprinai István egyházi szónoklattanában” [Italian preachers in István Kaprinai's ecclesiastical rhetoric], in *Olasz-magyar irodalmi és művelődési kapcsolatok a 18–19. században* [Literary and cultural connections between Italy and Hungary in the 18–19th century], ed. DÓBÉK Ágnes, Reciti konferenciakötetek 14, 17–31 (Budapest: Reciti Kiadó, 2022); MÁTYÁS Melinda, “A Hevenesi, Kaprinai, Pray-kéziratgyűjtemény feldolgozásának kérdései” [Issues of examining the Hevenesi, Kaprinai, and Pray manuscript collections], in *Hagyományok és kihívások V. Múlt és jövő. Országos Könyvtár-szakmai Nap, 2016* [Traditions and challenges V. Past and present. National Library Science Day 2016], eds. SZABÓ Panna and SZÉKELYNÉ TÖRÖK Tünde, 111–119 (Budapest: ELTE Egyetemi Könyvtár és Levéltár, 2017); M. HORVÁTH Mária ed., *Dobai Székely Sámuel és Kaprinai István levelezése* [The correspondence of Sámuel Dobai Székely and István Kaprinai], Pázmány Irodalmi Műhely. Források (Piliscsaba: PPKÉ BTK, 2008).

22 Kis Iván, *Kaprinai István Hungaria diplomatica temporibus Mathiae de Hunyad... című műve (1767–1771). A szerző forráshasználata és történetírói módszerei* [István Kaprinai's *Hungaria diplomatica temporibus Mathiae de Hunyad...* (1767–1771). The author's source use and methods of historiography], Thesis, (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 2024); Kis Iván, “A Cillei-gyilkosság Kaprinai István *Hungaria diplomatica...* című munkájában. Források, munkamódszer, kortársak [The Cillei murder of Ulrich II, Count of Celje in István Kaprinai's *Hungaria diplomatica*: Sources, working method, and contemporaries]”, *Fons* 31, no. 3 (2024): 357–384. See also Kis Iván, “Kaprinai István *Hungaria diplomatica temporibus Mathiae de Hunyad regis Hungariae* című műve. A szerző forráshasználata és történetírói módszerei” [István Kaprinai's *Hungaria diplomatica temporibus Mathiae de Hunyad regis Hungariae*. The author's source use and methods of historiography], (forthcoming).

outstanding history of the Pécs diocese, about which there is also not much to hear or read these days.²³

On the Protestant side, the Burius' oeuvre on the history of the church is well-researched, nor have the works of Pál Debreceni Ember or Péter Bod on this topic been neglected.²⁴ János Ribini could publish his Lutheran history of the church during the reign of Joseph II, and it still awaits exploration.²⁵ It also makes sense to discuss the historiographies written by Protestant authors, since they had a different approach and field of interest; most importantly, they also had very different kinds of opportunities (or lack thereof). Some of the works they wrote were published abroad (e.g. the ones by Okolicsányi or Kristóf Parschitius, and later Gottfried Schwarz's *Initia*, which caused a great deal of controversy), while others were published in Hungary, although with significant compromises, e.g. the works of Mátyás Bél, and later János Tomka Szászky; many of

23 Josephus KOLLER, *Historia episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum*, I–VII (Posonii et Pestini: Landerer, 1782–1812). Although a conference was held in 2002 to commemorate the author (*A Koller József emlékkonferencia [2002. október 24–25.] válogatott előadásai*, eds. FONT Márta and VARGHA Dezső, Tanulmányok Pécs történetéből 13 [Pécs: Pécs Története Alapítvány, 2003]), I am not aware of any researcher currently conducting a more in-depth analysis of Koller's oeuvre. Ágnes DÓBÉK in her recent paper („circulation of Books, Manuscripts, and Ideas between Hungary and Italy. Cultural Transfers in the Environment of György Klimó, Bishop of Pécs (1751–1777),” *Cornova. Revue České společnosti pro vyzkum 18. Století*, 14, no. 1 (2024): 7–34, discusses his oeuvre in passing, mostly his studies in Italy and his influence on György Klimó, bishop of Pécs.

24 On these authors, see TÜSKÉS and KNAPP, “History of the Neo-Latin,” 190–194. The most recent significant research findings on Burius were published by Andor Tarnai, see TARNAI Andor, *Tanulmányok a magyarországi historia litteraria köréből* [Studies on the history of Hungarian historia litteraria], ed. KECSKEMÉTI Gábor, *Historia Litteraria* 16, 64–87 (Budapest: Universitas Kiadó, 2004). Dávid Csorba has explored Pál Debreceni Ember more in depth; the most recent of his many studies are: CSORBA Dávid, “Debreceni Ember Pál kéziratos prédikációinak tanulságai” [The lessons learned from Pál Debreceni Ember's manuscript sermons], *Sárospataki Füzetek* 20, no. 3 (2016): 63–93; CSORBA Dávid, “Debreceni Ember Pál fordítási és értelmezési technikái (1702)” [Pál Debreceni Ember's translation and interpretation techniques (1702)], in *Nunquam autores, semper interpretes. A magyarországi fordítási irodalom a 18. században* [Nunquam autores, semper interpretes. Translation in 18th century Hungary], ed. LENGYEL Réka, 15–38 (Budapest: MTA BTK ITI, 2016). Péter Bod also has a researcher, even a monographer, in Kund Botond Gudur's person. See GUDOR Kund Botond, *Bod Péter (1712–1769), a történetíró*, [Péter Bod (1712–1769), the historian] (Barót: Tortoma, 2018); GUDOR Kund Botond and GRÓF László, *Bod Péter, a kartográfus* [Péter Bod, the cartographer], (Sepsiszentgyörgy: Háromszék Vármegye, 2019). Some recent publications are also available on *Magyar Athénas*. See several studies in this volume: CSÖRSZ RUMEN István, HEGEDÜS Béla, and TÜSKÉS Gábor, eds., *Historia litteraria a XVIII. században* [Historia Litteraria in the 18th Century], Irodalomtudomány és kritika. Tanulmányok (Budapest: Universitas, 2006). More recently on Péter Bod's history of the church in Hungary, see TÓTH Gergely, *Szent István, Szent Korona, államalapítás a protestáns történetírásban (16–18. század)* [Saint Stephen, the Holy Crown, and the foundation of the Hungarian state in Protestant historiography (16th–18th centuries)], (Budapest: MTA BTK TTI, 2016), 137–142. More recently about Pál Debreceni Ember and Péter Bod, see also TÓTH Zsombor, *A hosszú reformáció jegyében: vallási perzekúció és tanúságtétel a református irodalmi hagyományban a gyászévtizedtől 1800-ig* [Under the sign of Long Reformation: religious persecution and testimony in Calvinist literary tradition from the decade of mourning until 1800], *Humanizmus és reformáció* 41 (Budapest: BTK Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2023), passim.

25 Ioannes RIBINI, *Memorabilia Augustanae Confessionis in Regno Hungariae...*, I–II, (Posonii, 1787–1789).

their works remained in manuscript form.²⁶ The exploration of these authors' works has made good progress in recent times.²⁷ Denominational issues were less significant in the second half of the century, what mattered more was how the individual authors viewed the reign of Maria Theresa and Joseph II. Several illustrious historiographers came from Protestant circles, including József Benczur or Dániel Cornides, who joined the debates on history and public law.²⁸ However, their oeuvre has not been explored to this day.

26 A summary of the above: KOSÁRY, *Művelődés...*, 145, 148–149, 150–153.

27 On Okolicsányi, see TÓTH, “Historia querelarum...”; on Parschitius: ZOMBORI István, “Bél Mátyás és a *Notitia Hungariae*” [*Mátyás Bél* and *Notitia Hungariae*], in BÉL Mátyás, *Csongrád és Csanád megye leírása* [Description of Csongrád and Csanád counties], transl. LAKATOS Pál and TÉGLÁSSY Imre, ed. ZOMBORI István, A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve 1980–81/2, 116–118, 128–133 (Szeged: Móra Ferenc Múzeum, 1984); On Schwarz, see TÓTH: *Szent István...*, 103–136. Slovak and Hungarian researchers have both examined *Mátyás Bél* quite intensively in recent decades. To only name some of the more important recent works: BÉL Mátyás, *Levelezése* [Correspondence], ed. SZELESTEI N. László, Magyarországi tudósok levelezése 3 (Budapest: Balassi, 1993); TÓTH Gergely, *Bél Mátyás „Notitia Hungariae novae...” c. művének keletkezéstörténete és kéziratának ismertetése* [The evolution of *Mátyás Bél*'s “*Notitia Hungariae Novae...*” and the description of its Manuscripts], PhD dissertation, Manuscript, Egyetemi Könyvtár, I–II (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 2007); KOMLÓSSY Gyöngyi, *Bél Mátyás irodalom- és nyelvtörténeti munkái, különös tekintettel Héber–magyar etimológiai szótárára és annak az életműben elfoglalt helyére* [*Mátyás Bél*'s works in the history of literature and language, with special emphasis on his Hebrew-Hungarian etymological dictionary and its importance within his oeuvre], PhD dissertation, (Szeged: SZTE BTK, 2008); KOMLÓSSY Gyöngyi, *A különös magyar nyelv. Adalékok Bél Mátyás nyelvtudományi munkásságához* [The unique Hungarian language. Additional insights into *Mátyás Bél*'s oeuvre in linguistics], *Historia Litteraria* 27 (Budapest: Universitas, 2010); IVONA KOLLÁROVÁ and IMRICH NAGY, *Matej Bel. Osobnosť, médium a transfer ideí na prahu osvietenstva* (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2021); MILOŠ JESENSKÝ, ed., *Belianum. Zo života a diela Mateja Bela*, (Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, 2021); TÓTH Gergely, “Egy hungarus értelmiségi pályafutásának tipikus és egyedi vonásai. Bél Mátyás elfeledett (ön)életrajza” [Typical and Idiosyncratic Features in the Career of a “Hungarus” Intellectual. The Forgotten [Auto]biography of Matthias Bel], *Történelmi Szemle* 64, no. 3. (2022): 417–445. Our research group is in the process of publishing the county descriptions in Bel's *Notitia*, which have survived in manuscript form: we are currently on volume eighth in our ten-volume series. See Matthias BEL, *Notitia Hungariae novae historico geographica... Comitatum ineditorum tomi I–VIII*, ed. Gregorius TÓTH et al. (Budapestini: MTA BTK TTI, 2011–2024). Bernadett Benei, Zoltán Gózszy, Rezső Jarmalov, Péter Tóth, and myself participate in this work from our research group. One unmistakable author who continued *Bél*'s work, i.e. providing a complex country description from a geographical and historical perspective, was Ladislaus Bartholomaeides (1754–1825). About him more recently, see RESTÁS Attila, “Ladislaus Bartholomaeides kisebb latin nyelvű munkái (Ladislaus Bartholomaeides' smaller Latin-language works)” in *Humanista történetírás és neolatin irodalom a 15–18. századi Magyarországon* [Humanist historiography and Neo-Latin literature in fifteenth–eighteenth century Hungary], eds. BÉKÉS Enikő, KASZA Péter, and LENGYEL Réka, 178–186 (Budapest: MTA BTK ITI, 2015).

28 About Benczur more recently: STIPTA István, *A magyar jogtörténet-tudomány kétszáz éve* [Two Hundred Years of Hungarian Legal Historiography], A Pólay Elemér Alapítvány könyvtára 57 (Budapest: A Pólay Elemér Alapítvány Iurisperitus Betéti Társasága, 2015), 19–20. About Cornides and his study on ancient Hungarians' religion, see VOIGT Vilmos, “*Commentatiunculus de religione veterum Hungarorum* D. Cornidis,” in KASZA, KISS and MOLNÁR, *Scientiarum miscellanea...*, 243–248.

We also have to take a separate look at the auxiliary sciences of history in this period. These studies got off to a slow start in the first half of the century, getting a boost with the university reforms later.²⁹ This area did not have a theoretical researcher in diplomacy for a long time. The appearance of *bellum diplomaticum*, i.e. “charter wars” was a welcome phenomenon in the second part of the century, including those concerning the Sylvester bull and Saint Stephen’s charter for the Pannonhalma Abbey, or around the foundation of the bishopric of Várad.³⁰ Although these are well-known debates, I believe they would also benefit from a monograph because Hungarian historiography as a profession was virtually born from these fights, with real-time discussions, comments on each other’s works, and critical comments. In the meantime, institutional support was also created through the establishment of university departments; first Pray, then Márton Schwartner wrote a university textbook on diplomacy. That is why it would be important to write the history of diplomacy research in this period. István Sinkovics has already written about this topic, as have others, including Albert Gárdonyi, but these are only brief summaries.³¹

A similar overview of the other auxiliary sciences would also be quite helpful, including an examination of the contemporary development of heraldry, sigillography, and numismatics. A thorough analysis of the development of family history research would also be enlightening, i.e. the process that led from the self-righteous, representative family trees of limited scientific value to critical genealogies, i.e. from *Trophaeum*, which teems with fictitious members of the Esterházy family, to Károly Wagner’s *Collectanea*.³² Let us also mention research on the Roman antiquity, which also started up

29 About this topic in general, see GÁRDONYI Albert, *A történelmi segédtudományok története Magyarországon* [The history of the auxiliary sciences of historiography in Hungary], (Budapest, 1926), in BARTONIEK Emma, GÁRDONYI Albert, and DÉZSI Lajos, *A magyar történettudomány kézikönyve*, 231–268 (Budapest: Könyvtértekészítő Vállalat, 1987); more recent summaries: BERTÉNYI Iván, ed., *A történelem segédtudományai* (The auxiliary sciences of history), *A történettudomány kézikönyve* (Budapest: Osiris, 2006).

30 More recently on the debate concerning the Sylvester bull: TÓTH, *Szent István...*, 19–26, 72–76, 121–126. On the letter of foundation of Pannonhalma: THOROCZKAY Gábor, “Szent István pannonhalmi oklevelének historiográfiája” [The historiography of Saint Stephen’s charter of Pannonhalma], in *Mons Sacer 996–1996. Pannonhalma 1000 éve* [The 1000 years of Pannonhalma], ed. TAKÁCS Imre, vol. 1–3, 90–109 (Pannonhalma: Pannonhalmi Főapátság, 1996), vol. 1. More recently on the polemic regarding the foundation of the bishopric of Várad, see a forthcoming study by a member of our research group: JARMALOV Rezső: “Egy elmérgesedő történetész-disputa. Pray György és Gánóczy Antal vitája a váradi püspökség alapításáról” [An escalating dispute between historians. The debate between György Pray and Antal Gánóczy on the foundation of the bishopric of Várad], (forthcoming).

31 GÁRDONYI, “A történelmi segédtudományok...,” 234–239; SINKOVICS István, “Pray György diplomatikája” [György Pray’s diplomacy], *Levéltári Közlemények* 44–45 (1974): 525–548.

32 A review of the development of genealogy: PANDULA Attila, “Genealógia” [Genealogy], in BERTÉNYI, *A történelem...*, 11–26; about the less scientifically rigorous “Baroque” family trees, with additional extensive literature: BENE Sándor, “A Zrínyiek: egy családtörténet története” [The Zrínyis: the story of a family history], in *A Zrínyiek a magyar és horvát históriában* [The Zrínyis in the Hungarian and the Croatian historiography], eds. BENE Sándor and HAUSNER Gábor, 271–319 (Budapest: Zrínyi, 2007),; on family his-

again in Hungary in this period, following humanist precedents. Foreign authors, such as Marsigli, have examined many monuments, as have Hungarian authors, e.g. Mátyás Bél, the Saxon Johann Seivert, and the greatest of all, István Schönvisner. This field already has a researcher in Sára Sánta's person, who is a colleague at BMNM.³³



Historia litteraria

Historia litteraria was an important genre of contemporary scholarship was *historia litteraria*, which involved the histories of culture, science, and literature. Hungarian literary scholars have long examined this area in earnest, since it is of primary importance to them.³⁴ If we take a look at the particular authors writing in Latin, Czvittinger's *Specimen* and Ince József Desericzky's *Vindicatio* have been studied quite extensively,³⁵ while Mihály Rotarides's *Lineamenta* has received less attention, although it is also true that his oeuvre is quite modest, and much of it has remained in manu-

tory research, which gradually became scientifically rigorous, see TÓTH Gergely, "»Theatrum nobilitatis Hungaricae«. Bél Mátyás családtörténeti kutatásai" [»Theatrum nobilitatis Hungaricae«. Mátyás Bél's family history research], *Fons* 17, no. 3. (2010): 321–337; TÓTH Gergely, "Egy koholmány hosszú árnyéka. Esterházy Pál genealógiai fikciójának utóélete a 18–19. században" [The long shadow of a forgery. The afterlife of Pál Esterházy's genealogical fiction in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries], in *Esterházy Pál, a műkedvelő mecénás. Egy 17. századi arisztokrata életpálya a politika és a művészet határvidékén* [Pál Esterházy, the Amateur Patron of Arts. The Life of a 17th Century Hungarian Aristocrat at the Frontier of Politics and Arts], ed. Ács Pál, 357–372 (Budapest: reciti, 2015). Also on how genealogy became scientifically rigorous: SZÖKE Kornélia, *Genealogia variabilis. Tanulmány a genealógia műfajairól a Thurzó-család példáján* [Genealogia variabilis: A study of the genres of genealogy through the example of the Thurzó family], Doctoral thesis (Miskolc: ME BTK, Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola, 2017).

33 See SÁNTA Sára, "Schönvisner István és az *Antiquitates*. Az első magyar városmonográfia mintái és forrása" [István Schönvisner and the *Antiquitates*. The models and source of the first city monograph], in KASZA, KISS, and MOLNÁR, *Scientiarum miscellanea...*, 69–74; SÁNTA Sára, "Chronicle of The First Planned Excavation in Hungary. István Schönvisner and *De Ruderibus*," *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 55 (2019): 233–245.; SÁNTA Sára, *A magyar ókortudat atyja, Schönvisner István* [The father of classical studies in Hungary, István Schönvisner], Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Értekezések (Budapest: HUN-REN BTK TTI, 2024). We should also mention Sámuel Köleséri here, about whose work as an antiquarian see more recently SÁNTA Sára, "Köleséri Sámuel, az erdélyi polihisztor régiségbúvár" [Sámuel Köleséri, the Transylvanian polyhistor and antiquarian], in BÉKÉS, KASZA, and MOLNÁR, *A latin nyelv...*, 371–377.

34 A substantial volume on *historia litteraria* in Hungary, with a thematic bibliography: Csörsz RUMEN, HEGEDÜS, and TÜSKÉS, *Historia litteraria...*; see also TÜSKÉS and KNAPP, "History of Neo-Latin Studies..." 191–194.

35 More recently on the latter: TÓTH Sándor Attila, Társadalmi-művelődési körkép Desericzky Ince *Vindicatiójában* [A social and cultural overview in Ince Desericzky's *Vindicatio*], in *Il ruolo delle religioni e delle chiese nella formazione delle società in Europa e nel Nuovo Mondo*, ed. EÖRDÖGH István, 234–246 (Szeged: Gradus ad Parnassum, 2005); SZÖRÉNYI László, "Desericzky Ince védirata a magyar műveltségről" [Ince Desericzky's defence of Hungarian culture], in BÉKÉS, KASZA, and LENGYEL, *Humanista történetírás...*, 168–177.

Rumen
törlendő

script form.³⁶ Pál Wallaszky has recently found his researcher in Anna Bátori.³⁷ At the same time, little is said lately about the Piarist Elek Horányi, the author of *Memoria Hungarorum*.³⁸ His controversial personality, his conflict with the Jesuits, his extensive encyclopedia of literary history, and network of connections await a new researcher, particularly since his correspondence has also been published, although unfortunately without much fanfare.³⁹

Linguistics, jurisprudence, and political literature

Regarding linguistics, I think that linguists and literary scholars are conducting a sufficient amount of research on the greats of the time, as well as their partially Latin-language works (this is also true for Mátyás Bél's work in this area, as well as Fóris Otrokocsi, György Kalmár, János Sajnovics, and Sámuel Gyarmathi).⁴⁰ However, it seems that the works on jurisprudence and public law in this period, including the works created during the Josephinist era, and later the literature of the debates on public law and history surrounding the upheaval that broke out in 1790, do not receive much attention these days, and so they could do with some new scrutiny.⁴¹ The various disputes were mostly conducted in Latin, so a Latin expert would have ample to do.

36 For his works and older (partly Slovak-language) literature on him, see Csörsz RUMEN, HEGEDÜS, and Tüskés, *Historia litteraria...*, 645–646. Mentioned more recently by: BÁTORI Anna, “A tudás hálózatai. Rotarides Mihály és Wallaszky Pál: egy kapcsolat olvasatai” [Networks of knowledge: Mihály Rotarides and Pál Wallaszky: readings of a relationship], in BÉKÉS, KASZA, and LENGYEL, *Humanista történetírás...*, 259–266.

37 On Wallaszky's works and older literature on him: Csörsz RUMEN, HEGEDÜS, and Tüskés, *Historia litteraria...*, 670–671; more recently, see BÁTORI Anna, “A tudás hálózatai. Wallaszky Pál historia litterariája és a 18. századi tudástranszfer (Módszertani kísérlet)” [Networks of knowledge. Pál Wallaszky's historia litteraria and eighteenth-century knowledge transfer (A methodological experiment)], *Irodalomismeret* 27, no. 3. (2016): 35–63.

38 A recent study about him that raises important issues: SZELESTEI N. László, “Horányi Elek, a lexikon-szerző” [Elek Horányi, the lexicographer], *Vigilia* 80, no. 1 (2015): 20–25. A shorter study about a treatise attributed to him: ZSOLDOS Endre, “Weiss Ferenc, Horányi Elek és Akai Kristóf” [Ferenc Weiss, Elek Horányi, and Kristóf Akai], *Magyar könyvszemle* 137, no. 2 (2021): 232–242.

39 HORÁNYI Elek, *Levelezése* [Correspondence], ed. SZELESTEI N. László (Budapest: MTA-PPKE Barokk Irodalom és Lelkiség Kutatócsoport, 2016).

40 For a summary, see KOSÁRY, *Művelődés...*, 157–158; 589–593. Zsuzsa C. VLADÁR's name deserves particular mention from the latest literature, who has been translating and researching seventeenth and eighteenth-century Latin-language Hungarian grammars, as well as other works on grammar and linguistics for a long time.

41 A survey of eighteenth-century works on jurisprudence: KOSÁRY, *Művelődés...*, 158–159, 593–599, and more recently STIPTA, *A magyar jogtörténet-tudomány...*, 19–62. An overview of the texts written on politics and public law around this time (quite outdated, but still of use): BALLAGI Géza, *A politikai irodalom Magyarországon 1825-ig* [Political literature in Hungary before 1825], ed., NAGY Ágoston (Budapest: Dialóg Campus, [1888] reprint: 2015). Many issues were debated at the beginning of the 1790s: one of these was the origin, history, and significance of the Holy Crown. Previous analyses on this topic: BODNÁR-KIRÁLY Tibor, “Koronaeszmé és történelem. Vita a Szent Koronáról a 18. század végi Magyarorszá-

I would like to draw attention to two fundamental issues in connection with the natural science literature of this time period. On the one hand, the works created on this subject are in even more “danger”, i.e. they are threatened by oblivion and neglect even more. This is due to the law of “small numbers”: since the number of Latin researchers is decreasing, it is increasingly less likely that a researcher will be available who has the requisite education or at least an interest in natural sciences in addition to having a solid grasp of Latin.

The other “problem” is that regardless of this, we cannot in good conscience discount these works by saying that they should be analyzed by natural scientists, if they can. These works are namely rooted in the culture of this period, similarly to the works in other disciplines, i.e. they are not products of some kind of closed-off, sanitized branch of science that developed separately. We only need to leaf through these works to immediately see that they are full of quotations from ancient authors, and not because these writers wanted to seem educated but because the knowledge of ancient authors was still a living source of inspiration and an important point of reference for the scholars of this time, including natural scientists.⁴² A prime example is Dániel Fischer (1695–1746), the versatile natural scientist and physician, who wrote about the folk remedy for smallpox. He begins with Pliny and continues with Herodotus, quoting the great Roman medical authority Celsus not much later. He keeps going in this manner in the entire work.⁴³ It is needless to say that he does so in excellent Latin, thanks to his

gon” [The idea of the Holy Crown and history. A debate about the Holy Crown in Hungary at the end of the eighteenth century], in *Politikai elit és politikai kultúra a 18. század végi Magyarországon*, [Political elite and political culture at late 18th century Hungary] ed. SZIJÁRTÓ M. István and SZÜCS Zoltán Gábor, Tántalom Sorozat 8, 170–191 (Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2012); BODNÁR-KIRÁLY Tibor, “Szent Korona és nemzeti karakter a 18. század végének magyar esztétikájában” [The Holy Crown and the national character in the late Eighteenth Century Hungarian intellectual history], in „*Politica philosophiai okoskodás.*” *Politikai nyelvek és történeti kontextusok a középkortól a 20. századig* [“Political philosophical reasoning.” Political languages and historical contexts from the Medieval times to the 20th century], eds. FAZAKAS Gergely Tamás, MIRU György, and VELKEY Ferenc, 209–219 (Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Történeti Intézet, 2013). See also TÓTH, *Szent István...*, 149–172; TÓTH Gergely, “Az Aranybulla recepciója a 18. századi politikai irodalomban, történetírásban és jogtudományban” [The reception of the Golden Bull in eighteenth-century political literature, historiography, and jurisprudence], *Századok* 156, no. 6 (2022): 1087–1118. An important paper on contemporary Latin-language journalism is also loosely connected: BALOGH Piroška, “A nyelvkérdés és a latin újságírás paradoxonai a 18. század végén” [The problem of language and the paradoxes of latin journalism in 18th century Hungary], in BÉKÉS, KASZA, and LENGYEL, *Humanista történetírás...*, 207–219.

42 Quite a memorable discussion of this phenomenon, although as it applies to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Gerhard OESTREICH, *Neostoicism and the early modern state*, eds. Brigitta OESTREICH and H. G. KOENIGSBERGER, transl. David McLINTOCK, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History (Cambridge: University Press, 1982), 1–9.

43 Daniel FISCHERUS, *De remedio rusticano, variolas per balneum primo aquae dulcis post vero seri lactis feliciter curandi... commentatio* (Erfordia: Weber, 1742). About Fischer more recently: SZELESTEI, *Irodalom- és tudományszervezési törekvések...*, 76–82, et passim; BOGÁR Judit, “Fischer Dániel,” in MAMÚL, III, 128.

humanism-based education. Can we really say about such a work that it has nothing to do with Neolatin literature? I do not think so.

After all this, I can only provide a long list of the scholars who have left behind a great oeuvre and are awaiting research – physicians include János Ádám Raymann, Károly Ottó Moller, János Kristóf Deccard, the above-mentioned Fischer, János Dániel Perliczy, Justus János Torkos, József Plenck, and the polyhistor István Hatvani; scholars interested in physics and chemistry research: István Csiba, Mihály Lipsicz, Mihály Szathmári Paksi, from later times the highly versatile János K. Horváth, Gábor Pázmándy, Pál Makó; from the scholars of astronomy and mathematics: Ferenc Kéri Borgia, who was also known as a historian, Miklós Jánossi, Antal Reviczky, and of course Miksa Hell; from the scholars who wrote about agriculture: Bél's colleague János Matolai, Sámuel Domby, and Lajos Mitterpacher.⁴⁴ The latter author already held lectures on agriculture at the Theresianum as a Jesuit and the son of the steward of the Savoyai estate in Bélye. He later became head of the agriculture department at the university of Buda. Finally, we should take a look at Mitterpacher's main work, *Elementa rei rusticae*. The knowledge and claims of the great agricultural authors of the antiquity, Columella, Varro, and Cato are embedded in this very pragmatic work with natural ease; which, similarly to Fischer's treatise, signals to us that Mitterpacher is also *our* author, not only that of the researchers of the history of agriculture.⁴⁵ The same is true for the rest of the above-mentioned scholars who wrote in Latin.

44 An overview: KOSÁRY, *Művelődés...*, 159–186, 602–647. Of course, there are also authors about whom more recent research findings are available. The Speculum Research Group led by István Monok (University of Tokaj) has already published several works on natural science from the 16th–18th centuries (accompanied by thorough studies about the authors), for example, a treatise on Tokaj wine by the above-mentioned Sámuel Domby (1758), or Antal Szirmay's description of the vineyards of Tokaj (1798). See DOMBY Sámuel, *De vino Tokaiensi. A tokaji borról, 1758*, transl. PETŐ Gábor, ed. N. Kis Timea, *Europica varietas Tokajensis. Acta Universitatis Tokajensis Sárospatakini. Patrimonium culturale. Fontes 3* (Budapest–Sárospatak: L'Harmattan Kiadó, Tokaj-Hegyalja Egyetem, 2022); SZIRMAY Antal, *Notitia montium et locorum viniferorum Zempleniensis, 1798. A tokaji, vagy is hegyalljai szőlőknek ültetéséről, 1810* [Growing Grapes in Tokaj, namely Hegyalja, 1810], transl. PETŐ Gábor, ed. ORBÁN Áron, *Europica varietas Tokajensis. Acta Universitatis Tokajensis Sárospatakini. Patrimonium culturale. Fontes 4* (Budapest–Sárospatak: L'Harmattan Kiadó, Tokaj-Hegyalja Egyetem, 2022). Réka Lengyel has recently written a study on István Hatvani. See LENGYEL Réka, "A polihisztor tudományosság utolsó nagy korszaka. Hatvani István munkássága és az *Introductio ad principia philosophiae*" [The last great era of polyhistor scholarship: István Hatvani's oeuvre and *Introductio ad principia philosophiae*], in KASZA, KISS, and MOLNÁR, *Scientiarum miscellanea...*, 125–132. More recently about Deccard, see KINCSES Katalin Mária, "Johann Christoph Deccard (1686–1764) botanikus, soproni evangélikus líceumigazgató" [Johann Christoph Deccard (1686–1764) botanist and head of the Lutheran lyceum in Sopron], *Orpheus Noster* 13, no. 2 (2021): 96–104. A recent English-language monograph is available about Miksa Hell and his oeuvre: Per Pippin ASPAAS and László KONTLER, *Maximilian Hell (1720–92) and the ends of Jesuit science in enlightenment Europe*, *Jesuit Studies* 27 (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019). A member of our research group demonstrates the exchange of information among contemporary researchers of natural science: TÓTH Péter, "Természettudósok kapcsolatai a 18. században" [Connections between natural scientists in the eighteenth century], *Publicationes Universitatis Miskolcensis. Sectio Philosophica* 24, no. 1. (2020): 417–424.

45 See the ancient quotations in Ludovicus MITTERPACHER, *Elementa rei rusticae* (Budae: typis Regiae Universitatis, 1779), 199, 200, 223, 239, 267, 321, etc. On more recent literature on his person, see JUHA

Conclusion

In my brief summary, I set out to provide a short overview of eighteenth-century Latin-language scholarly literature and the research on it. This synthesis can and should no doubt be amended in many places, especially in terms of the list of gaps, i.e. the authors, works, or other topics that are awaiting research. At the same time, I hope that the above has also shown that Latin specialists looking for their first research topic or searching for new areas of research can easily find some in this period, possibly even from the ones I listed above. The members of the Matthias Bel Neo-Latin Research Group have also set out to examine such less-researched topics, as I described in my summary. One thing is certain: the research topics listed above are primarily waiting for us, Latin specialists and “Neo-Latinists”. Others will hardly do the work for us.



Mariann, “Mitterpacher Lajos, mitternburgi” [Lajos Mitterpacher, from Mitternburg], in MAMŰL, VII, 447.