

Jesuits, Transylvanian Baroque and the Middle Ages: Ignatius Batthyány and Saint Gerardus of Cenad

Claudiu Marius Mesaros¹

Recibido: 31/05/2019 / Aceptado: 18/11/2020

Abstract: Although considered as the end of the Late (baroque) Scholasticism, in Central Europe the 18th century still bore the substance of philosophical thinking and education of the Jesuit baroque philosophy, especially its ideal of building study societies and classical libraries accompanied by astronomical observatories and scientific collections. The Jesuit model of Eger was brought by the Transylvanian Bishop Ignatius Batthyány at Alba Iulia where he has established a learning place consisting in a classical and theological library and founded a literary society, trained a professional librarian and aimed at offering a study place for meritory scholars. He was himself a theologian, paleographer and historian, edited and commented on the treatise *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Isingrimum liberalem* by the 11th century Benedictine Bishop Gerardus of Cenad. Bishop Batthyány was for many reasons a baroque scholar although many times introduced as a man of Enlightenment by some historians.

Keywords: modern philosophy; baroque philosophy; Transylvanian philosophy; Batthyány; Gerard of Cenad; *Deliberatio*.

[es] Los jesuitas, el barroco transilvano y la Edad Media: Ignacio Batthyány y San Gerardo de Cenad

Resumen: Aunque se considera como el fin de la Escolástica Tardía (barroca), en Europa Central el siglo XVIII todavía llevaba la sustancia del pensamiento filosófico y la educación de la filosofía barroca jesuita, especialmente su ideal de construir sociedades de estudio y bibliotecas clásicas acompañadas de observatorios astronómicos y colecciones científicas. El modelo jesuita de Eger fue trasladado por el obispo transilvano Ignacio Batthyány a Alba Iulia, donde estableció un lugar de aprendizaje consistente en una biblioteca clásica y teológica y fundó una sociedad literaria, formó a un bibliotecario profesional y se propuso ofrecer un lugar de estudio para los eruditos meritorios. Él mismo fue teólogo, paleógrafo e historiador, y editó y comentó el tratado *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Isingrimum liberalem* del obispo benedictino del siglo XI Gerardus de Cenad. El obispo Batthyány fue por muchas razones un erudito barroco, aunque algunos historiadores lo presentan a menudo como un hombre de la Ilustración.

Palabras clave: filosofía moderna; filosofía barroca; filosofía transilvana; Batthyány; Gerardo de Cenad; *Deliberatio*.

Summary: The multiple identity of modern philosophy. Baroque Scholasticism. Baroque colleges and philosophy. The model of Eger and the Transylvanian library of Batthyány. 1794 - the first research institute of science in Transylvania: Institutum Batthyaneum. On the Batthyány's edition of *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Isingrimum liberalem*. Bibliography.

Cómo citar: Marius Mesaros, C. (2020). Jesuits, Transylvanian Baroque and the Middle Ages: Ignatius Batthyány and Saint Gerardus of Cenad, en *Ingenium. Revista Electrónica de Pensamiento Moderno y Metodología en Historia de la Ideas* 14, 17-24.

The multiple identity of modern philosophy

The interval known as «modern philosophy» eventually became the universal label for a very diverse array of philosophical schools and movements between late 15th and 19th centuries, sometimes with two strata known as early modern and late modern philosophy. Many contemporary histories of philosophy simply assign that the canonical Rationalist and Empiricist figures altogether can be considered baroque philosophers². In his *New History of West-*

ern Philosophy, Anthony Kenny³ envisages modern philosophy as comprising the great interval from 1513, the year of Machiavelli's *Prince*, up to 1831, the death of Hegel. For such a great interval of time to be conceptually covered requires not only sophisticated historiographic constructions but quite a lot of empathy from the readers as well. For instance, it is possible to accept that modern philosophy has main features such as confidence in philosophy's capacity to give full explanations of the world and of the human person in rational terms⁴, but such gener-

¹ Claudiu Marius Mesaros is Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Communication Science, Centre for Research in Historiography of Philosophy and Philosophy of Imaginary, West University of Timișoara.
ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-8940-7584
Email: claudiu.mesaros@e-uvt.ro

² A. Barnes, «Philosophy», in P. M. Soergel (ed.), *The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600–1800*, Thomson-Gale, 276-327.

³ A. Kenny, *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: A New History of Western Philosophy Volume 3*, Oxford University Press, 2006, see «Chronology», 332.

⁴ F. Mora, «Suárez and the modern philosophy» *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 14 (1953), 531, *apud* Novotný, 217.

al descriptions are common not only to Protestants, since Melancton, and to the Counter-Reformation philosophers, as Ferrater Mora admits, but as well to the Ancient philosophers. But an author like Anthony Kenny is fully aware of this and supports a newer kind of division. Apart from the term «modern philosophy» he creates a second label, the «philosophy in the modern world», the name of a different volume of his book, suggesting that modern philosophy of the pre-modern world is altogether different from what we might call philosophy in the world called modern. In other words, the modern world has a different philosophy from the modern philosophy. And that is, according to the fourth volume⁵, running from 1757 with the Burke's *Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, up to the Rawls's *Theory of Justice* in 1971!

And, still, what strikes the reader in the very introduction of Kenny's volume three is the observation that none of the modern philosophers have held an university position, in other words, they were all private or independent thinkers, and, above all, none was Aristotelian. We are alarmed by the fact that, after the Scholastic idea of a university and the status of the philosophers somehow related to it, with notable exceptions of course, now it is like time to accept that the universities are, for some reasons, outdated or maybe excepted from the general philosophical practice:

To someone approaching the early modern period of philosophy from an ancient and medieval background the most striking feature of the age is the absence of Aristotle from the philosophic scene. To be sure, in the period covered by this volume the study of Aristotle continued in the academic establishment, and at Oxford University there has never been a time since its foundation when Aristotle was not taught. But the other striking characteristic of our period, which marks it off from both the Middle Ages and the twentieth century, is that it was a time when philosophy was most energetically pursued not within universities but outside them. Of all the great thinkers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, none before Wolff and Kant held professorships of philosophy⁶.

Anti-Aristotelianism (or perhaps, in some cases, just different options from Aristotle, as there was a powerful Platonic tradition starting from the Renaissance) and activity located outside universities: these two characteristics seem to be the most important, and it is also a matter of fact that the institutional philosophy of the period remains less studied by the contemporary historians of philosophy. What happened

between say, the late 15th and the times of Wolff and Kant? We know that the humanists believed in the value of classics and opposed the study of ancient Greek and Latin texts (*humaniores*) recently rediscovered and published. They

despised the Latin that had been the lingua franca of medieval universities, far removed in style from the works of Cicero and Livy. Erasmus had been unhappy studying at the Sorbonne, and More mocked the logic he had been taught at Oxford. In philosophy, both of them looked back to Plato rather than to Aristotle and his many medieval admirers⁷.

But at the same time, in the next century, figures like Leibniz were aware of the fact that Aristotelianism was still in use by others and was being transformed and reformed. Leibniz was personally engaged in the struggle between the moderns and the Aristotelians, having firm opinions about the superiority of Descartes⁸ based on the authority of Joseph Glanvill.

The anti-modernists against whom Leibniz was engaged were on the other side of the philosophical spectrum. According to Mercer, there were two types of antimodernists: first, the traditional Scholastic philosophers who continued to teach Aristotle just as it had been done for centuries, in a Scholastic manner, and second, the philosophers who believed that Aristotle had to be taught in a new, anti-scholastic way, free from the Scholastic errors⁹. Both currents were represented in Germany and were familiar to Leibniz under the names of Johann Adam Scherzer and respectively Jacob Thomasius.

The first such current, the Aristotelians, were less homogeneous than one can imagine; as the oldest school in Europe, it is reasonable to expect it had multiple directions and agendas in its turn. M. W. F. Stone points out that both geographically and philosophically there were multiple lines of modern Aristotelianism or, should it be called, late Scholasticism, so that the early modern philosophy nourished many different «Aristotelianisms», that can be ordered under different labels, to mention only a few like «Scholastic Aristotelianism», a «Secular Aristotelianism», a «Lutheran Aristotelianism», a «Calvinist Aristotelianism», each focused on a different finality of philosophy and generating opinions often contradicting each other, although all «Aristotelian».

From the universities and Reformed Academies of England, Scotland, Germany, Scandinavia, Central Europe, and the Low Countries in the north, to the universities, salons and religious houses of France, Spain,

⁵ A. Kenny, *Philosophy in the Modern World: A New History of Western Philosophy, Volume 4*, 319-20.

⁶ Kenny, *The Rise of Modern Philosophy (Volume 3)*, xii.

⁷ Kenny, *The Rise of Modern Philosophy*, 2.

⁸ C. I. Mercer «The Seventeenth-Century Debate Between the Moderns and the Aristotelians: Leibniz and Philosophia Reformata», in I. Marchlewitz, A. Heinekamp, *Leibniz' Auseinandersetzung mit Vorgängern und Zeitgenossen Herausgegeben*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990, 19.

⁹ *ibid.*, 20.

Portugal and Italy in the south, one can find self-styled «Aristotelians» and committed «Scholastics» pursuing miscellaneous lines of inquiry, and arriving at radically different conclusions in logic, natural philosophy, metaphysics, ethics, and theology¹⁰.

The study of Aristotelianism was further encouraged by the development of translations from both Greek and Arab, so there is a long list of names of understudied Aristotelians such as Nicoletto Vernia (1420 –1499), Agostino Nifo (1473-1538), Bernardinus Tomitanus (1517 - 1576), Jacopo Zabarella (1533 –1589), Jacob Schegk (1511-87), Philip Melancthon (1497-1560), Bartholomeus Keckermann (1571-1609), Rudolph Goclenius (1547-1628), Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624), and others, up to the Jesuit thinkers like Franciscus Toletus (1536-96) and Francisco Suarez (1548-1617). Textbooks were produced as well, influential at their turn, some of them Thomistic, like the *Cursus philosophicus* and the *Cursus theologicus* of John of St Thomas or John Poinset (1589-1644), the *Summa* of Eustachius a Sancto Paulo (d. 1640), the Charles d'Abra Raconis (1590-1646) with his *Sum of all Philosophy* (1617), or the Coimbra Commentators. In France there was the *Corpus of Philosophy* (1623) by Scipion Dupleix (1569-1661), one of the best known, but as well the monumental *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* and *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* by Charles du Fresne, sieur du Cange (1610-1688), not a textbooks but encyclopedic manuals. This last-mentioned work is of importance for our paper, as we shall see later, because it is the only source referred to by the bishop Batthyany of Transylvania in 1790. What emerges is a complex image of modern philosophy containing several different, often contradictory schools of thought.

Baroque Scholasticism

The context briefly described is rather difficult to be properly understood as «modern», since it was rather the anti-modernist part of the philosophical thinking during the 15th to 17th centuries. And, since it was historically contemporary to the Baroque period the term «Baroque Scholasticism» (*Barockscholastik*) was coined by the German scholar Karl Eschweiler¹¹ as a name for the peculiarity of the thinking of scholars like Suarez and his followers, using the term after the model of naming cultural epochs the style of monumental art that prevails in each of them. Thus, the so-called baroque scholasticism is used as a derogatory

meaning for the alternative philosophical culture that continued to live apart from what is canonically known as the «modern culture» or «modern philosophy», introduced as the revolution of philosophical thought as it changed its agenda from metaphysical and teleological towards epistemological and method oriented thinking that found its way through by two fundamental distinct presuppositions, rationalism and empiricism¹². This remnant and alternative culture of the baroque scholasticism continued to cultivate its own methods and conceptual set, failing to assume the new vocabulary of rationalist and empiricist philosophies, all across Europe and Americas, remaining mainstream and reaching a peak around the middle of the 17th century (1630-1680) but surviving until the 18th century. Nevertheless, apart from «baroque scholasticism», there were as well other labels such as «late medieval», «Renaissance», «early modern Aristotelianism/scholasticism», «Second scholastic», «Counter-Reformation philosophy», «successor of the Renaissance scholasticism» or «Post-medieval scholasticism»¹³.

Novotný also mentions that baroque scholasticism cannot stand under the same name as «modern philosophy» for several reasons. First, Suárez and the 17th century scholastics do not belong to modern philosophy because they belong to a mainstream tradition which was mostly criticized by both empiricists and rationalists, so there were different tones of relating to the Aristotelian and scholastic traditions. Second, modern philosophy is epistemology-driven, whereas 17th and 18th century scholasticism is metaphysics-driven. Third, that modern philosophy is science-driven, whereas the 17th century scholasticism is theology-driven.

This form of late scholasticism is not to be understood in its narrow sense as simply thinking and methods rooted in Aristotle and Aquinas, but as a

professional institutionally-based philosophical culture, which is characterized, at least in times of health, by comprehensiveness, team-work, rigor, systematicity, and friendliness to an organized religion¹⁴.

which means first of all that scholasticism is differentiated from the modern philosophy by institutionalism and religion attachment, apart from methodology, systematicity and teamwork. According to this description, we can recognize scholastic traditions either when they manifest ahead of their time, as scholars unanimously consider Boethius, for example, as the founder of Scholastic thinking, or later than their chronological canonical limits, as it is the

¹⁰ M. W. F. Stone, «Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy», in Steven Nadler (ed.), *Blackwell Companions to Philosophy: A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, Blackwell Publishers, 2002, 7.

¹¹ K. Eschweiler, «Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts», in *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft I*, Aschendorff, Münster 1928, 251-325. Online-Ressource: <http://www.fgbueno.es/ger/ke1928a.htm>, 307.

¹² D. Novotný, «In Defense of Baroque Scholasticism», *Studia Neoaristotelica*, 6, 2 (2009), 209-233.

¹³ *ibid.*, 212.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, 216.

case of some 18th century intellectuals that bear similar characteristics.

Baroque scholasticism bears important philosophical features such as dense argumentation, strict delimitation between philosophical and theological intrusions, deep concern for methodology and defining the subjects, diversity of topics and loose specialization, interest in the intra-mental world, first-person perspectives («building the mystical self»), and systematization of thought; to this extent, they can be considered as system-builders par excellence. Nonetheless, and this may be of a more notable interest for contemporary readers, one of the characteristics we find essential is that they mainly discussed theories of their living colleagues not only historical sources, which turns them into a very living and dynamic tradition of thought. To the same extent, the baroque scholastic is considered to be a time of applied thinking, as they used philosophical debate primarily to the aim of applying it in theology. Still, they were driven also by mathematics, science, and technology (especially in Jesuit Colleges), and were more practical than speculative, always interested in astronomical observatories, experiments, national history and libraries.

Baroque colleges and philosophy

One of the cultural models assumed by the baroque scholastics was the college community of study, namely the Jesuit ideal of education built around a library and an astronomical observatory. Before the 16th century the number of astronomical observatories in Europe was limited, but in the 18th century their number increased, and the Jesuit colleges and monasteries aligned themselves with the older universities¹⁵. Since their very start in 1534, Jesuits have been engaged in education and founded colleges. The ideal type of such college included an observatory, a chair of mathematics, and considered themselves as Aristotelians. In the middle of the 18th century they were still teaching Aristotelian physics and the Tychoonian system of the world¹⁶. The Jesuit Observatories were established as early as 1549 (Ingolstadt), and continued to arise until 18th century in Central European cities like Nagyszombat (1753). There were even missionary observatories built as far as Beijing (1644–1773/1803) or India. After the suppression of the Jesuits (1750 to 1773) and then their final prohibition by Pope Clement XIV in 1773, their

model of an Aristotelian college was still alive and even the possibility that civil authorities could establish faculties after the Jesuit model, as it was the case for instance in the city of Timișoara, as late as 1841¹⁷, on the continuity of a former Jesuit Theological seminary established earlier in 1806.

In Hungary, observatories in monasteries became a tradition after 1785 when bishop Ferenc Barkóczy established in Eger the *Specula Observatory*, planned as a start of a future university (built in late baroque style) and supported by the aristocrat Károly Eszterházy, personally interested in the development of libraries¹⁸. The four planned faculties were Sciences, Medicine, Theology, and Law. As due to a Theresian law from 1777 only one university was allowed in Hungary, and that existed already in Buda, the building eventually became a Lyceum¹⁹. But its tower observatory financed by Eszterházy got to possess the most performant instruments at the time and inspired other bishops like Batthyány of Transylvania, another baroque intellectual animated by the ideal of the close relation between science and religion and an organic union of all branches of art in one uniform, complementary effect²⁰. As Wolfschmidt concludes, it would be only until the baroque time

that one could find a unity of science, arts, architecture and religion, which was lost in the time afterwards. In the 19th century observatories were purely scientific institutions²¹.

The model of Eger and the Transylvanian library of Batthyány

The ideal model of the Jesuit colleges included an essential distinctive feature, that of the unity of branches of science and Theology, under the patronage of the Church or monasteries. The model of Eger inspired Ignaz or Ignatius Batthyány (1741 – 1798), abbot of Ják, canonical of Eger and later, between 1780 and 1798 when he passed away, bishop of Transylvania. We was a descendant of an aristocratic family, studied in Pest, Nagyszombat, Graz and Rome, and obtained a doctoral degree at the *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum*, spending time in the learning places of Rome, study travels, and company of mentors, becoming a multi-faceted scholar in fields such as history, paleography, and astronomy, besides theology²².

¹⁵ G. Wolfschmidt, «Cultural Heritage and Architecture of Baroque Observatories», in *Proceedings of International ICOMOS Symposium in Hamburg, October 14-17, 2008*. Berlin, Hendrik Bäbeler-Verlag (International Council on Monuments and Sites, Monuments and Sites XVIII), 2009.

¹⁶ *ibid.*, 4.

¹⁷ S. Bugarski, *Lyceum Temesvariense*, Timișoara, Fundația Diaspora-Editura Tempus, 2008, 12-14.

¹⁸ R. A. Gates, «Aristocratic Libraries, Censorship, and Bookprinting in Late-Eighteenth-Century Hungary», *The Journal of Library History* (1974-1987), 22, 1 (Winter, 1987), 23-41.

¹⁹ Wolfschmidt, «Cultural Heritage and Architecture of Baroque Observatories», 5.

²⁰ G. Montanari, A. Wojtyła, M. Wyrzykowska (eds.), *Jesuits and Universities*, Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2015, 9.

²¹ Wolfschmidt, «Cultural Heritage and Architecture of Baroque Observatories», 8.

²² D. Hendre Biró, «Le décor de la bibliothèque et de l'observatoire astronomique fondés par le comte Ignác Batthyány, évêque de Transylvanie, à la

Shortly after he enrolled in the *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum* in 1763, he contacted the Jesuit writer György Pray, who determined Batthyány to pursue a systematic crystallized research plan. Batthyány came to Rome where he took over the research already begun by other former Jesuits, Inchoffer Menyhért (1584-1648) and Péterffy Károly (1700-1746), on the sources in the Vatican Archives regarding the Hungarian history and especially the Hungarian church history²³. Giuseppe Garampi was *Praefectus* of the Vatican Archives at the time, and this is how Batthyány was to be later summoned to translate the 11th century text called *Deliberatio* by Saint Gerard of Cenad.

According to the Hungarian historian Zsigmond, Jakó²⁴, Batthyány's historical career is part of the Jesuit Historical School and a result of its methodological achievements. He was a co-worker and a sincere friend of Jesuit historians of the time. His long lasting collaborator was György Pray. After the dissolution of the Jesuit order and in 1776, Pray offered Batthyány to move to Eger to work together. The period spent by Batthyány in Eger (1766-1781) was influential: the large buildings and plans of Bishop Esterházy could influence Batthyány in order to make Gyulafehérvár (today Alba Iulia), just like Eger, which was growing under his own eyes, a learning center²⁵. He had a powerful motivation for this: during this interval, in 1779, he published a study on the sources regarding Saint Stephen's founding letter in Pannonhalma, and after leaving Eger, in 1785, he published the first volume of his extensive ecclesiastical collections. The earliest topic Batthyány was concerned with was the liturgical history, related with studying old manuscripts and the discovery of an old St. Stephen Mass. He was also a pioneer of Hungarian historiography and a well trained codicologist, accepted as well as the first to study the Hungarian medieval manuscript heritage²⁶.

1794 - the first research institute of science in Transylvania: Institutum Batthyaneum

In 1781 Batthyány arrived in Transylvania as a Bishop with great plans of building one kind of a lifetime dream, that of establishing a Library with an observatory tower, just like in Eger. He started buying rare manuscripts, founded the scientific society «Societas

Litteraria Assiduorum», having a chart that allowed members both clerical and secular, with equal ranks, regardless of religion, origin and dignity, but according to their usability in scientific work²⁷. Batthyány continued to study ecclesiastical affairs of Transylvania and Hungarian History, as his personal research plan was related especially to Hungarian church history and focused upon the oldest possible documents, those on the Gerardus of Cenad and his *Deliberatio*.

His acquisition of rare books was well known in the time and received help. It was his former co-worker, Imre Dániel, that informed Batthyány in May 1781 about the opportunity to achieve the Vienna Cardinal Migazzi's library of medieval codes, which contained half of the *Codex Aureus* (the half containing *Matthew* and *Marcus*); Batthyány obtained it at all costs, in 1785, and, together with other collections that were brought to Alba Iulia, the library summed up to 8000 volumes²⁸, and among these, it boasted six hundred different editions of the Bible and valuable codices²⁹. In 2018, the Romanian Researcher Adrian Papahagi inventoried 301 medieval manuscripts still resident in the Alba Iulia Batthyanaeum Library³⁰.

It took Batthyány one decade to complete organizing the building of the library. It was organized inside the former baroque-style parish church of the dispersed Trinitarian Order; the ground floor sheltered a printing house, the library occupied the upper two levels and the tower was to become an observatory, together with a cabinet of natural history and an antiquity museum. The whole complex was developed as a scientific workshop known as Batthyaneum, an unparalleled cultural institution in Europe³¹.

The interior space of the institute are entirely dedicated to astronomy, which is, historians have noticed, rare in Transylvania; I would rather suggest to take it as related to Batthyány's baroque scholastic education and not as an esthetical feature that has to be traced within a Transylvanian context. As D. Hendre Bíró maintains, the entire building is dedicated to Urania and has a complete iconography consisting in describing astronomy and its connections with sciences and especially its role in the history of mankind³². The tiled ceiling resembles the astronomical observatory in Wien and has been decorated with eight allegories surrounding Urania, an iconographic concept interpreted as an apotheosis of Urania, referring to the theme of astronomy, both in the Observatory and in the large room of the library:

fin du xviiiè siècle», in F. Barbier, I. Monok & A. De Pasquale (dir.), *Bibliothèques décors (xviiiè -xixè siècle)*, Paris, Éditions des Cendres, 2016, 158.

²³ Z. Jakó, «Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező», *Erdélyi Múzeum*, 53, 1/4 (1991), 77.

²⁴ *ibid.*, 84-85.

²⁵ *ibid.*, 84.

²⁶ *ibid.*, 80.

²⁷ *ibid.*, 96.

²⁸ *ibid.*, 87-90.

²⁹ Gates, «Aristocratic Libraries, Censorship, and Bookprinting in Late-Eighteenth-Century Hungary», 33.

³⁰ A. Papahagi, A.c.dincă, A. Mărza, *Manuscrisele medievale occidentale în România*, Polirom, Iași, 2018, 29-115.

³¹ Jakó, «Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező», 91.

³² D. Hendre Bíró, «Batthyaneum, o bibliotecă a Luminilor», *Historia*, 11 (2015), 40.

tile A represents the Chronology as Saturn, the head of Janus bifrons, the winged clepsydra and the genius noting the narrative; in tile B, the geography, with the muse that reveals the globe, allowing the discovery of the new lands of America, while busts designate the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa and America. In tile C, Urania teaches Apollo «the shortest way». In tile D, Urania as protector of navigation: during the sinking of a ship, she teaches sailors to orient themselves according to the stars. In tile E, optics or Dioptria, with geniuses working on optical devices. In F, under the title of astronomy, Urania fights pseudo-astronomers. In G, meteorology is represented by mercury. Finally, in H, the architecture, with the goddess Pallas Athénée and an allegory containing in the background the building of Batthyány. Urania does engrave in the marble the name of the founder, com [es] IG [natus]³³.

Although the disputes surrounding Batthyány's plans have many times insisted on such stereotypes as that the library and all his related investments were part of his aristocratic social obligations that were only synchronous with the tendencies of the time³⁴, eventually a direct effect of his erudite studies, it is time to admit that the Bishop was dedicated to a more complex plan of a Scholastic nature.

Even before these preparations, Batthyány had already taken steps to properly train a colleague, Imre Dániel, for research on the library and its future resources. In 1794 the institution was ready to function as the first research institute of Hungarian science in Transylvania³⁵.

As a result of his personal research, Batthyány wrote two large works: *Leges ecclesiasticae regni Hungariae et provinciarum*, (1st Thl., Albae Carolinae 1785, 2nd Th., Klausenburg 1811, a third part unpublished in manuscript), and *Sancti Gerardi Episcopi Chanadiensis Scripta, et Acta hactenus inedita, cum serie Episcoporum Csanadiensium, Opera, et studio Ignatii Comitis de Batthyan, Episcopi Transylvaniae, Albo-Carolinae*, 1790. Mostly qualified by the Hungarian historiography as an Enlightenment-influenced intellectual or representing the mid-18th century «aristocratic library» wave³⁶ for his preoccupations for Hungarian Church History, the context of his education as well as his institutional concept of a library qualify him fully as a late scholastic or baroque scholastic scholar. After the dissolving of the convents and monasteries in the early 1780s by the emperor Joseph II, the official

ensorship started to harden the efforts of the aristocratic passionate book collectors; as the censors had traditionally been representatives of the Catholic Church, especially the archbishop of Esztergom and his committee of Jesuit censors focused to act mainly against Protestants bringing books from their Protestant universities³⁷, Batthyány had surely been familiar with a context that encouraged him to favor books of classical learning, especially old manuscripts. New books, especially «naturalistic» philosophy had to be considered unacceptably offensive to established religion and were banned by the Austrian Monarchy. This context enables us to consider that Batthyány's interest in astronomy and natural sciences, as well as his library's specialization in valuable manuscripts, incunabula, and first printings of classical works, is of a Scholastic nature and does not allow such a labelling as Enlightenment or «Modern»³⁸. His collection was according to all criteria so out of fashion.

On the Batthyány's edition of *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Isingrimum liberalem*

Towards the end of his career as a Bishop, in 1790, Batthyány will accomplish another lifetime dream, apart from building his library: editing and printing the entire literary legacy of the 11th century bishop St. Gellért or Gerardus of Cenad, the first bishop of the region called today Banat.

Giuseppe Garampi was the scholar who pointed the bishop's attention to the original manuscript kept in the library of the Freisgenau Chapter. Garampi first recommended it to the bishop of Csánád of the time, but he did not recognize that strange text to be the earliest product of medieval theological literature in Hungary³⁹. Batthyány, perhaps in 1779, learned of this code and borrowed it to Vienna; he completed the copying together with his later librarian Imre Dániel, in 1781, when Batthyány was ready for the introductory study and the plan of the future edition. Due to administrative obligations his work had to slow down in intervals but he was able to finish the edition in 1790.

Batthyány's introductory text of the edition of 1790 is composed of two parts, an exegetical one (*De Opere Sancti Gerardi*) and the second dedicated to sources of the biography of Gerard (*De Actis Sancti Gerardi*). Batthyány's reading is historical, philosophical and philological; Batthyány assigns Gerard

³³ Hendre Bíró, «Le décor de la bibliothèque», 167 (my translation from French).

³⁴ *ibid.*, 156.

³⁵ Jakó, «Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező», 98.

³⁶ Gates, «Aristocratic Libraries, Censorship, and Bookprinting in Late-Eighteenth-Century Hungary», 23-41. G. BARANY, «Hoping Against Hope: The Enlightened Age in Hungary», *The American Historical Review*, 76, 2 (Apr., 1971), 319-357.

³⁷ Gates, «Aristocratic Libraries, Censorship, and Bookprinting in Late-Eighteenth-Century Hungary», 28.

³⁸ Sometimes one can encounter even stereotypical anachronistic judgments such as: «In building their collections Brukenthal, Teleki, and Batthyány followed an enlightened ideal of learning and knowledge as keys to progress», evidently not taking into account the philosophical differences among these three intellectuals. Cf. J. P. Niessen, «Museums, Nationality, and Public Research Libraries in Nineteenth-Century Transylvania», *Libraries & the Cultural Record*, 41, 3 (Summer, 2006), 303.

³⁹ Jakó, «Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező», 82.

merits of a philosopher, having no other sources than the two medieval biographical sources that are strictly hagiographic, which proclaim the original nature of the Bishop's effort to recover Gerard as a representative of an intellectual tradition⁴⁰, which can be directly traced back to Batthyány's formation as a late scholastic intellectual.

Section IV (*De operis ipsius ratione*) introduces the text of Gerard to the 18th century reader – whichever the profile of such readers might be – as an obscure text (*obscuritatem inextricabilem*), due to the style of writing or argumentation⁴¹ (*ex ipso Scriptio- nis argumento*) of which Batthyány argues that, as it is «sublime and mystical», it could never be any clearer, because the mystics speak about things they themselves do not possess, being *arcana Verba*. It remains a matter of further research whether Batthyány was familiar or not with the Areopagitic texts and to which extent he was able to recognize Gerardus's method as having such philosophical background⁴². Still, he admits Gerardus' mysterious style and subject as unusual. Batthyány then discusses⁴³ the identity of the character Isingrim the philosopher, to whom Gerard's text is addressed, formulating the assumption that he may be a bishop, judging by Gerard's salutation formula, but such an interpretation is however hard to sustain; given other contexts when Isingrimus is addressed in the book, he was most probable a liberal arts teacher⁴⁴. This might be just another instance of Batthyány's attempt to assume Gerardus as part of a projected Hungarian Scholastic tradition.

Section V (*De Theologia Sancti Gerardi*) contains an exhortation on the concept of tradition starting from a parallel between Pre-Christian and Christian philosophy: Ancient philosophy would include Greek and Egyptian traditions, while the Christian begins with the Patristic authorities and includes the Hungarian Christian tradition begun by St. Gerard. Then Batthyány seems to be fully aware of the problem of the hyper-essentiality or at least the dilemma regarding naming God as One or Multiple. He discusses on the unity of God in relation to the concept of *Monad*⁴⁵, claiming that the philosophers of antiquity, such as the Pythagoreans and Platonists, followed the Orphic tradition and the books of Moses when they called

God One (*Monada, Unitas*), while other ancient philosophers had refused to assert God as one, betraying the tradition of which they were part, for the fear of a Socratic fate⁴⁶. Thus the dialectics between affirmative theology and negative theology, seen in the light of the Pre-Christian philosophical traditions, is completed a few lines ahead where Batthyány discusses the Fathers of the Church saying that they too refused to assert God as *unum, monas, unitas* or *initium numeri*, fearing the Pitagorean and Platonic dogmatic traps and therefore *out of humility* the thesis of God as One, only in order to avoid offending the divine dignity. The theological chapter ends with a strange discussion on the Trinity, introducing the Holy Ghost as having two functions: *connexio* and *Gluten*. This is surely Batthyány's insertion and it says something about his own instruction, since the theory is weakly grounded on Gerardus's text.

In the sixth section Batthyány discusses philosophy and makes significant notes that constitute the starting point for the philosophical exegesis on Gerardus of Cenad. He claims that Gerard's eruption is at least as important as his Holiness because it adds beauty (*peritia ipsam ornate Sanctitatem*), establishing that the intrinsic relation between philosophy and theology resides in some form of expression or maybe even the ability to speak or interpret theological truth. It is nevertheless another clue for Batthyány's scholastic education.

Another clue for Batthyány's scholastic traditional conceptual frame is the fact that he takes distance from the fact that Gerardus was a Platonist, as he says⁴⁷. Gerardus's text is difficult for the fact that it is of a platonic nature and that explains as well the difficulty to understand his ideas, such as the theory of first principles: it is hard, Batthyány maintains, to distinguish between what is in intellect and what is only in relation with it (*affinia illis*), because the Platonists used to mingle corporeal with incorporeal and the intelligible with the sensible. Batthyány has a grasp here for the problem of universals, which is certainly, to the extent that Batthyány could access, of an Aristotelian scholastic tradition. He offers a different list as well from what we can find in the text of Gerardus and that may be due to Batthyány's on source-

⁴⁰ The first part discusses the following topics: I. *De codice Frisingensi*, II. *Opus Sancto Gerardo vindicator, ubi de aliis libris Sancti Gerardi*; III. *De Statu Litterarum aevi illius*; IV. *De operis ipsius ratione*; V. *De Theologia Sancti Gerardi*; VI. *De Philosophia Sancti Gerardi*; VII. *Historica quaedam adnotatur*.

⁴¹ I. BATTYÁNY, *Deliberatio Sancti Gerardi Moresenae Ecclesiae Episcopi supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Isingrimum liberalem*, in *Sancti Gerardi Chanadiensis Scripta et Acta*, ed. Batthyány, I., Albo-Carolinae, 1790, XXV.

⁴² On Gerardus of Cenad's philosophical thinking and Areopagitical background, see more in C. Mesaroş, «An Eleventh Century Transylvanian Philosopher and his Modern Doxographer. Gerard of Cenad and Ignatius Batthyány», *Proceedings of the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy*, 14 (2018), 119-123; C. Mesaroş, «On the Meaning of *Deliberatio* in Saint Gerard of Cenad», *Philobiblon, Transylvanian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in the Humanities*, vol. XXII (2017), 1, 47-56; C. Mesaroş, «*Concordia Doctrinarum* Or The Concept Of Cosmic Harmony In Gerard Of Cenad», *Dialogue and Universalism, quarterly by Institute Of Philosophy And Sociology Of The Polish Academy Of Sciences and by Polish SEC (Société Européenne De Culture)*, 1 (2015).

⁴³ Batthyány, XXVII, IV.

⁴⁴ Batthyány, III, 3; VII, 14, but especially VIII, 35.

⁴⁵ Batthyány, 70, 71.

⁴⁶ Batthyány, XXX-XXXI.

⁴⁷ Batthyány, VI. Other references of Batthyány suggest sources in Plotinus and Dionisius the Areopagite.

es⁴⁸. In interpreting this problem, Batthyány refers to the glossary of du Cange, most probably Charles du Fresne, sieur du Cange (1610 - 1688), historian of the Middle Ages and Byzantinologist, author of a *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Niort: L. Favre, 1883–1887, 10 vols.), and *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* (Lugduni, 1688).

Batthyány's evaluation of the *Deliberatio* is a supplementary evidence *per se* of the bishop's Jesuit

education and baroque specific thinking, apart from his work of building the Alba Iulia library. Ideas like philosophy as beauty of saints, the interpretation of Gerardus's work as a complex philosophical and intellectual endeavor not limited to its role of Biblical interpretation, are the results of the systematic philosophical study performed by the Jesuit educated Transylvanian Bishop in the second half of the 18th century.

Bibliography

- Barany, George (1971): «Hoping Against Hope: The Enlightened Age in Hungary», *The American Historical Review*, 76, 2 (Apr.), 319-357.
- Barnes, Andrew, E. (2004): «Philosophy», in Philip M. Soergel (ed.), *The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600–1800*, Thomson-Gale, 276-327.
- Batthyany, Ignatius (1790): *Deliberatio Sancti Gerardi Moresenae Ecclesiae Episcopi supra hymnum trium puerorum ad Iningrimum liberalem*, în *Sancti Gerardi Chanadiensis Scripta et Acta*, ed. by Batthyany, I., Albo-Carolinae.
- Bugarski, Stevan (2008): *Lyceum Temesvariense*, Tempus, Timișoara.
- Eschweiler, Kurt (1928): «Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts», in *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft I, Aschendorff*, Münster, 1928.
- Gates, Rebecca A. (1987): «Aristocratic Libraries, Censorship, and Bookprinting in Late-Eighteenth-Century Hungary», *The Journal of Library History* (1974-1987), 22, 1 (Winter), 33.
- Hendre Biró, Doina (2015): «Batthyaneum, o bibliotecă a Luminilor»: *Historia*, 11.
- Hendre Biró, Doina (2016): «Le décor de la bibliothèque et de l'observatoire astronomique fondés par le comte Ignác Batthyány, évêque de Transylvanie, à la fin du xviii^e siècle», in F. Barbier, I. Monok & A. De Pasquale (dir.), *Bibliothèques décors (xviii^e -xix^e siècle)*, Paris, Éditions des Cendres.
- Jakó, Zsigmond (1991): «Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező», *Erdélyi Múzeum* - 53.
- Kenny, Anthony (2006): *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: A New History of Western Philosophy. Volume 3*, Oxford University Press.
- Mercer, Christia Irvine (1990): «The Seventeenth-Century Debate Between the Moderns and the Aristotelians: Leibniz and Philosophia Reformata», in I. Marchlewitz, A. Heinekamp, *Leibniz' Auseinandersetzung mit Vorgängern und Zeitgenossen Herausgegeben*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Mesaroş, Claudiu (2015): «Concordia Doctrinarum Or The Concept Of Cosmic Harmony In Gerard Of Cenad», *Dialogue and Universalism, quarterly by Institute Of Philosophy And Sociology Of The Polish Academy Of Sciences and by Polish SEC (Société Européenne De Culture)*, 1.
- Mesaroş, Claudiu (2017): «On the Meaning of Deliberatio in Saint Gerard of Cenad», *Philobiblon, Transylvanian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in the Humanities*, XXII, 1, 47-56.
- Mesaroş, Claudiu (2018): «An Eleventh Century Transylvanian Philosopher and his Modern Doxographer. Gerard of Cenad and Ignatius Batthyány»: *Proceedings of the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy*, 14.
- Mora, Ferrater (1953): «Suárez and the modern philosophy», *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14, 528–547.
- Niessen, James P. (2006): «Museums, Nationality, and Public Research Libraries in Nineteenth-Century Transylvania», *Libraries & the Cultural Record*, 41, 3 (Summer), 298-336.
- Novotný, Daniel D. (2009): «In Defense of Baroque Scholasticism», *Studia Neoaristotelica*, 6, 2, 209-233.
- Papahagi, Adrian; Dincă, Adinel-Ciprian, Mârza, Andreea (2018): *Manuscrisele medievale occidentale în România*, Polirom, Iași.
- Stone, M. W. F. (2002): «Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy», in S. Nadler (ed.), *Blackwell Companions to Philosophy: A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, Blackwell Publishers.
- Wolfschmidt, Gudrun (2009): «Cultural Heritage and Architecture of Baroque Observatories», in *Proceedings of International ICOMOS Symposium in Hamburg, October 14--17, 2008*. Berlin, Hendrik Bäbler-Verlag (International Council on Monuments and Sites, Monuments and Sites XVIII).

⁴⁸ Batthyány divides the so called prime principles of philosophy in two categories: peripatetic (*Res, Ens, Unum, Bonum, Aliquoad, Verum*) and platonian (*essentia, motum, statum, Idem, Alterum, esse, terminus*) and says that principles are grounded on (*termini communes*).