

BABEŞ–BOLYAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LETTERS
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUNGAROLOGY STUDIES

ARANKA GYÖRGY'S POETRY
SUMMARY OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

Doctoral supervisor

PROF. DR. EGYED EMESE

Doctoral candidate

KERTI JÓZSEF

CLUJ-NAPOCA

2021

Contents

<i>Introduction: research history and methodological considerations</i>	3
1. <i>The flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus: the collection of manuscript poems by György Aranka in public</i>	18
1.1. The beginnings	18
1.2. Manuscript collections, copies	19
1.3. The journey of the collection in Hungary	20
2. <i>Paratextes of György Aranka's collection of manuscript poems</i>	32
2.1. The concept of paratext	32
2.2. Source of reception – epitexts	33
2.3. Why Hungarian Parnassus Flowers?	37
2.4. Author's name	39
2.5. Description of the collections	40
2.6. Poetic traditions and principles of volume composition in the last third of the 18th century	47
2.7. Compositional principles and prosodic questions of Aranka's verse	53
2.8. Is Aran(y)ka all that shines? A few thoughts on the issue of authorship	68
3. <i>Flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus in word pictures. Manuscript poems of György Aranka in the light of Antal Szirmay's collections of poems</i>	70
3.1. Tradition – saving programming	70
3.2. On the relationship between Antal Szirmay and György Aranka	71
3.3. Nature of the collections of poems	74

3.4.	Szirmay copies Aranka	76
3.5.	Szirmay rewrites Aranka. Aranka's Poems in the Szirmay Collections	77
4.	<i>„So dare my works, dear friend...” From the manuscript to the print: The publication history of György Aranka's volume of poems</i>	88
4.1.	„Becoming a Book Author.” Author intention of György Aranka (book)	88
4.2.	„Man shall sacrifice himself for his own country [and] his cost, and shall be able to sacrifice his labor.” Aranka's views on book publishing	92
4.3.	„I take a small critique of words and verses in a very good name [...].” Before publication: Criticism of Aranka's poems	95
4.4.	„The wings of the mind are unfit to fly” – The Writing Crisis of György Aranka	100
4.5.	The Road to Poetry and Readers	104
4.6.	In what public and private collections can Aranka's work be found?	113
5.	<i>Classical patterns in the poetry of György Aranka (example of Horace)</i>	115
5.1.	The classicist György Aranka	115
5.2.	Horatius influences in Aranka's poetry	119
5.3.	The translator Aranka	128
6.	<i>The relationship between nation, language and literature at György Aranka</i>	139
6.1.	The situation of the Hungarian language in the second half of the 18th century	139
6.2.	The language of science and literature	143
6.3.	The necessary evil: the Latin as the opponent to be defeated	156

6.4.	The relationship between the change of national concepts and the issue of language and literature	158
6.5.	The sign of a nation is its language	169
6.6.	Prestige issue: the potential of the Hungarian language	175
7.	<i>Allegory games in the poetry of György Aranka. From the occasional verse to the philosophical-moralizing patriotic didactic poem</i>	183
7.1.	Games of the Mind	183
7.2.	Free play of imagination. Allegory Games in the Poetry of Aranka	184
7.3.	From the dissertation verse to the philosophical (patriotic) occasional didactic poem: For a Good Young Francis's Day	186
7.4.	Excursion. The „crisis” of Ferenc Kazinczy	199
7.5.	Presumed address of the poem: Count Ferenc Teleki (Paszmosi), the zealous patriot	202
7.6.	The social benefit of literature in György Aranka's verse	204
	<i>Summary</i>	206
	<i>Bibliography</i>	216
	<i>Appendix</i>	233

Keywords

Aranka György, 18th century, history of literature, enlightenment literature, classicism, popular poetry, literary publicity, language question, reception history, source criticism, textology

The structure of the thesis and the results of the research

György Aranka (1737–1817), a prominent figure in the Transylvanian Enlightenment movement, came into the public consciousness of literature mainly through his activities as a science organizer and became famous throughout the history of reception. His most important activity is the establishment of the Language Culture Society of posterity, and – as his second patriotic activity – the establishment of the Society, which undertakes to publish manuscripts as Hungarian historical sources.

The poetry of György Aranka, although it does not belong to the canonical authors of Hungarian literature, was not distinguished by special attention in the history of literature, therefore his literary work, especially his poetry, is much less known and processed. Aranka's poetic legacy is mostly manuscript in nature, with only one book of poems entitled *Games of the Mind* published in print in 1806, as well as a few occasional compositions as special prints. After the death of György Aranka, part of his manuscript legacy became the property of the former Catholic High School in Cluj-Napoca (later to the Romanian State Archives), another was bought by Count Imre Mikó for the Transylvanian Museum Association (hence the "Lucian Blaga" University Library in Cluj-Napoca after the First World War). Another significant part of the legacy (mainly his letters and a part of his manuscript poetry collections) went to Hungary (National Széchényi Library Manuscript Archive, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Manuscript Archive) thanks to such art collectors as József Pónori Thewrek (Török) and Miklós Jankovich. Presumably, the manuscript nature as well as the difficult access to the texts may have contributed to the fact that few people have dealt with his poetry, and so far no comprehensive work has been done that would have provided the fullest, most nuanced picture of Aranka's poetry.

For the first time, the small monography of Elemér Jancsó *The life and work of György Aranka* (1939) tell more about Aranka's poetry. Jancsó's important finding is that Aranka was the poet of the objective lyric. He considers the only merit of his poems to be the cultivation of

philosophical poetry by the means of objective lyricism. He concludes that his taste, readability, and writer's diligence are not commensurate with the results achieved. In the anthology of the poet Sándor Weöres – literary historian –, *Three Sparrows with Six Eyes* (1977; 1983; 2010), he selected several Aranka poems. In a note to that he notes that “the themes and rhythms in them are very varied” and encourages that Aranka should be rehabilitated: “they have been undeservedly forgotten, waiting to be resurrected”. The poetry of György Aranka was studied more thoroughly by literary historian Emese Egyed. For her 1994 study – *Was George Aranka a Poet?* – its main merit is that it points very concisely and comprehensively to Aranka's role plays, the versatility of his poetry (sometimes the author of occasional poems, sometimes a gallant poet, sometimes the Stoic sage), and Aranka's philosophical ideas, while balancing individual, subjective views with research objectivity. In another study, *Except for my books and writings and other manuscripts ...* (2000), she recalls Aranka's career, shape, and intellectual legacy. Finally, we can mention Zsuzsa Varga's study *Mind and Play: The Poetic Philosophy of György Aranka* (1998), which examines the philosophical side of Aranka's poetry as a result of Emese Egyed's study. The novelty of the study from the point of view of Aranka research is that it points out the influence of Schelling's philosophy of nature, Kant's moral philosophy and antique philosophy (Stoic doctrines, Epicurean life) in Aranka's texts, drawing attention to Anacreon's textual effects and motifs.

This doctoral dissertation is a continuation of the two previous, basic (*Preliminary works for the poetics of György Aranka*, 2012) and master's dissertations (“*Flower Songs*” of György Aranka, 2014), which served as preliminary work for the present research. The gaps in knowledge about Aranka's poems and Aranka, as the study of other, much more extensive and in-depth collections of archival and manuscript poems showed the most that a huge Aranka text corpus lies unprocessed (most of the manuscript poems did not appear in any form, so by definition György Aranka). The aim of the research was to explore hitherto unknown Aranka texts (to verify and prove Aranka's authorship by means of source-critical methods), to expand Aranka's poetic corpus, to create Aranka poems (and not only, as many can be found in the manuscript collection texts) typological cadastre, census; to determine the genre of the poems and to place the different textual variants in chronological and original order in the Aranka oeuvre with the help of archival identification and textual philological methods.

Philological work is fundamentally interpretive data, and as such, contextualizing the Aranka texts, that is, putting them into context, was one of the tasks of the dissertation and at the same time a methodological procedure that was essential to understand why the examined texts were born just then. The common code (not only the language, but also the terminology used in the age), the speech situation (not only the answer to the questions of who, when, what and how, but also the examination of the given historical, political, social situation), the culture, in which the texts were created, or the dialogues between the individual texts are all carriers of the primary context, so without their reconstruction and interpretation it would have been inconceivable to examine and embed Aranka texts in the literary tradition of the age and to find the author's place in the literary canon of the age. . It was clear at the beginning of the research that I would not examine the manuscript and printed Aranka texts on their own, but together with the texts of such contemporaries as Dávid Baróti Szabó, Benedek Virág, József Péteri Takáts, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz, etc. József Mátyási. Without the works of ancient classics such as Horace, Virgil, Ovid, or without the knowledge of ancient philosophy, it would also have been impossible to study and draw appropriate conclusions about Aranka's poems, since in addition to following and imitating antiques, it is an era-specific phenomenon (not just Enlightenment. in addition to the incorporation of antique-classicist literature), the poetic-stylistic, and thus basically the incorporation of external, form-based solutions, Aranka also embraced the doctrines of moral and moral philosophy and built his own philosophy of life on it.

The dissertation examines the poetry of György Aranka divided into two large blocks: the first block brings to life the moments of Aranka's poetic departure from the first written occasional verse to the fulfillment of the poetic career and the publication of his volume of poetry. The direction of the second block is the study of Aranka's poetic habitus, his poems, his approach to language and literature, his historical and philosophical attitude by comparative, text- and art-centered methods.

The source identification and exploration work of the chapter entitled *Flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus: György Aranka's Manuscript Collection of Manuscripts in the Public Hand* presents the initial steps of György Aranka's poetic career through its journey through Hungary with his collection of manuscript poems. Based on the Aranka correspondence as the primary source, this section also looks for the answer to whether the manuscript collection

entitled *Flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus* is mentioned by name, either by Aranka or by his contemporaries, in whose hands they occurred and finally what happened to the further manuscript sent to Hungary. In the same place, I also list Aranka's poems selected from the collection of manuscript poems and published in the major fiction journals of the time.

The collection of manuscripts is extremely important not only in Aranka's oeuvre because it contains the "young poems" and the poetic development of Aranka can be well traced on this basis, but also because the poems appearing in the leading fiction journals of the age (Hungarian Museum and Orpheus) come from this collection – except one poem. The excavation also revealed that three different copies of the manuscript collection of poems can be found, two of which are kept in the Manuscript Archive of the NSZL in Budapest, and one in the Cluj County Branch of the Romanian State Archives. After tracing the tangled path and bitter fate of the collection based on the data, the chapter revealed that the copy sent to Hungary was presumably either lost or lurking, which is also painful because I assume it could be a unique copy that could contain variants and even works. also not found in the other copies. As a result of a more thorough examination of textual philology, it turned out that in one of Aranka's single printed volumes, 16 of the 72 poems published in *The Games of the Mind*, 16 can be found in the verse string entitled *Flowers of Hungarian Parnassus*, so almost a quarter of the volume's poems.

The next chapter, as a logical continuation of the previous one, tries to nuance György Aranka as a poet, using the possibilities offered by the paratexts (title, biographical data, entry in his manuscript poem collection, including his own or possessor entry, but also the volume schedule) organized around György Aranka's collection of poems entitled to trace our knowledge, the supposed path of his collections, to identify the former owners, to recontextualize, clarify, and shed new light on our reception history data using source-critical methods. In fact, this chapter can be divided into two large blocks: the first half is closely related to the study of paratexts, while the second half examines the principles of contemporary volume editing and volume arrangement along microphilological analysis, and then shows the structure of Aranka's collection of manuscript poems, the volume logic behind it, and places special emphasis on presenting the genre and prosodic issues of the poems.

The first half of the chapter pointed out that Aranka's collection of manuscripts was not only in the hands of the editors of fiction magazines, but also in the form of copies that reached other art-collecting writers. In Hungary, in addition to the editors of the Hungarian Museum and Orpheus, Károly Fejérváry, Antal Szirmay, Miklós Jankovich, and Count Zsigmond Haller, József Pónori Thewrek (Török) and Count Imre Mikó were identified as possessors. Aranka's manuscript volume is closely related to the poetic traditions and principles of volume organization of the age, but it also seemed that he tried to develop a unique concept of volume organization based on a specific invention, which faithfully represents his poetic guidelines, attitudes and connection to each poetic tradition. After analyzing his volume composition, it became clear that the principle of variety (lighter and heavier pieces mixed in one block) prevails in the collection of poems. According to the delighted to teach method of Horatius, the pieces of the bile, refined, gallant Rococo lyric alternate cyclically with the pieces of the occasional poems. The prosody of the works of the verse garland testifies that Aranka was happy to try and experiment different forms of poetry, and even tried the classical verse scale. As a result of the prosody analyzes, it can be stated that Aranka was a devotee of the Hungarian poetic style, the twelve-fold dominance of the double rhyme (42 of the 77 poems in the collection were written in twelve half-rhyming halves). Based on the content analysis of the verse string, it was clear that he chose a genre and assigned a form to his works based on his genre and verse approach and beliefs, as well as how aware he was of his poetry talent and abilities. This is evidenced by the genre analysis of the works of the verse string: epistles, epigrams, and occasional poems make up the verse string.

In the chapter entitled *Flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus in word pictures. Manuscript Poems of György Aranka in the Light of Antal Szirmay's Poetry Collections*, I am primarily looking for the answer to which Aranka poems he takes over in Szirmay's Hungaria in parabolis and other manuscript collections, how he uses them and how he receives and selects the Aranka texts through his own taste filter (for practical reasons). Source-critical means must be used to verify on what basis we can identify and prove Aranka's authorship, since in the system of public poetry it is not always clear who is the "host" and who is the "guest". I compare the texts with comparative and philological methods, pointing out how the techniques of public poetry are realized with conscious poetic procedures at certain textual levels (lexical, syntactic, semantic). Thus, from the perspective of an 18th century intellectual nobleman, we can re-read Aranka's

texts, and consequently it becomes visible how Szirmay rhetorized certain texts according to his own purpose and taste, and at the same time canonized Aranka as a Transylvanian poet in the pages of *Hungaria in parabolis*.

In this chapter, Aranka's verse was examined from the point of view of the way of life of public poetry, based on the public poetry research and textological methods of István Csörsz Rumen and Imola Küllös. As we know, György Aranka's collection of manuscript poems entitled *Flowers of the Hungarian Parnassus* also reached Hungary. His contemporary, Antal Szirmay, also an art collector, antique diver and poet, was guided by the value-saving gesture in the creation of his cultural history work (*Hungaria in parabolis sive commentarii in adagia, et dicteria Hungarorum*, 1804, 1807) chose public poetry material, even works of art poetry by canonized authors. Although Szirmay mentioned the name of Aranka only once, there are seven Aranka poems (excerpts) in the volume; they are listed as their own or anonymous works. Elsewhere, 22 of the 75 poems in Aranka's verse string were copied, albeit in text and letter form, into the Manuscript Book entitled *Collectio*, and other Aranka texts can also be identified in the *Poemata Collection*, also in manuscript. He did not always leave the poems taken from Aranka untouched, he abbreviated some, modified, or supplemented with his own lines. I checked with the help of source criticism and philological methods on the basis of which we can identify and prove Aranka's authorship, since in the system and exchange processes of public poetry it is not always clear who is the original author of the text and who is merely a compiler or a "creator" creating a variant. In the case of the adopted texts, I examined by a comparative method how Szirmay used, reworked the texts, adapted them to his own sayings and recontextualized them (for example, the didactic-moralizing "face" of one of Aranka's suitor poems was completely removed which he used for practical purposes to prove the aptitude of Hungarians for poetry). As a result of the comparison of the texts, I also showed how the techniques and procedures of public poetry (eg different essence techniques, alternation) smoothed and adapted to the Szirmay poetics of Aranka's poems at certain text levels (lexical, syntactic, semantic) following conscious poetic procedures. .

From manuscript to print: The history of the publication of György Aranka's volume of poems presents the history of the publication of Aranka's volume of poems, reconstructing also to map the number of copies sold and the prevalence of the work. In order to compile the

publishing history of the texts to be published, a primary study such as the Aranka correspondence had to be thoroughly studied, as well as the social situation and sociocultural context in which the fibrous collection could eventually become a book.

This chapter highlighted that at the beginning of his creative career, his poetic work was basically based on the leisure, manuscript style of creation. Prior to the publication of his long-considered volume of poetry, he was quite careful and cautious, as he felt the weight of responsibility inherent in his status as an organizer of culture and science, and as a poet he did not want to disappoint his nation and the literary audience. Not only is the challenge of gaining access to the print public a caution and prudence, but he is also convinced by his scientific and utility belief that an author should stand in front of his homeland if he can provide something useful and building for his nation (transmitting wise doctrines, enrichment of national poetry, etc.). The poems of his volume were sent to critics one by one, including János Fekete, József Mátyási, Dávid Baróti Szabó, Lajos Schedius, Gergely Édes, Miklós Révai, and Count József Dessewffy – all of them writers and they all wrote their opinions on the poems. Even after the favorable feedback, he does not even intend to edit them as the correspondence revealed that due to his deep creative crisis, the edition plan was delayed for years. Finally, based on the censor's registration, the volume was approved for printing on October 8, 1805, so Aranka printed the volume in the printing house of the printer Mihály Szigethy in Oradea. Putting the work of financing, printing, propaganda and sales into context, and taking into account the publishing and sales indicators of the time, I formulated my assumption that the volume could have sold in very small numbers (including gift-sent copies, hardly more than 100 volumes). which presumably did not affect Aranka deeply from a financial point of view, as his publication was basically a patriotic act, a moral duty to publish his volume of poetry, completely ignoring the hope of possible financial gain.

One of the characteristics of Enlightenment poetry is that ancient (classical) poets were imitated, referred to as authorities, examples to follow, but a rich translation literature was also to be reckoned with. The Transylvanian cultural organizer and writer György Aranka is no exception, as he not only incorporated his classical education into his poetry, but also tried translations in his collections of manuscript poems (eg Catullus, Horatius, Ovidius, Vergilius, Iuvenalis). In the chapter *Classical Patterns in the Poetry of György Aranka (The Example of*

Horace), in addition to examining translations, I try to point out the classical passages that he has adopted and incorporated into his poems, and I present them through intertextual text analysis, comparative methods, what are his own poems like from the point view of the often cited poems by classical authors, especially Horatius. Among other things, I outline how he embraced their poetic images, style, how he adapted and endowed their ideological message with a national, local (ethnic) character and applied it to his own poems. To conclude the chapter, I explain Aranka's translation theory views of age translation together with its theoretical considerations.

In this chapter, I examined what the ancient poet highlighted from his poetic publication, how their ideas were incorporated into the works of his late followers, how he acquired the images and style of the ancient poet, and how he adapted (pragmatic adaptation) and incorporated them into his own poems. In addition to the content-form, thematic and stylistic identification, Horatius's domestication also meant identification with the Horatian and antique philosophical approaches to life. Such a lifestyle attitude is evidenced, for example, by the need to withdraw from the noise of the world to meditate, to create inner, spiritual peace, balance important for creation, which is related to a measured, stoic way of life, a life free from passions and emotions, and the mediocre philosophy of gold. The time spent usefully is the essence of Aranka's way of life and professed philosophy of life, as he arranged his whole life keeping this in mind. The epicurean worldview also resonates in the teachings of the *carpe diem* sense of life, which does not mean a hedonistic search for pleasures, but is related to the meaningful use of time, the need for immediate action. His translating activity is also carried out in the spirit of the principle of wanting to use, his aim was to convey knowledge about the world, educational intent, as well as to enrich and pallorize the Hungarian language and to shape the taste of contemporary literature. Its translation principles were thus primarily determined by practicality, from a practical point of view the need to balance form and content lies in the need for classicist, perfect literary translation, and behind its free translations there are imprints of experimenting with language and style, rhetorical practices born from the recognition that science can be made perfect.

As a continuation of the previous one, the chapter on the *Relationship of Nation, Language and Literature at György Aranka* examines the peculiarity of the Enlightenment, according to which the issue of literature and language is closely intertwined in this era. Based

on this, he outlines the situation of the Hungarian language in the second half of the 18th century, and then revolves around the issue of language choice in science and literature, including imitation and originality, by comparatively examining the texts of Aranka and his contemporaries. The examination of Aranka's approach to language is related to the issue of translations, the problem of what can be transposed from certain languages into Hungarian, what – in the words of József Péczeli – “the test of language” is and how the test of translations became a competition for writers. The study of nation concepts is a very important key, as a change in the nature of a nation will bring to life a totally new concept of nation. This will not only create an inseparable link between nation and language, but will also shed new light on it, which will have no lesser consequences than an increase in the prestige of the national language and literature written in the national language. The latter also complements the mission of poetry with another task, namely the role of representation of the nation. From the point of view of Aranka's oeuvre, it is extremely important to go around the contemporary issues of language and literature, as it was the desire to do for the mother tongue and the homeland that prompted Aranka to connect with contemporary linguistic and literary works for the first time into spiritual currents, and soon – with the founding of the Transylvanian Hungarian Language Education Society, considered his oeuvre – to become one of the unavoidable, central figures of the Hungarian Enlightenment.

In this chapter, I pointed out that the use of Latin was still popular in the field of science in the era, and this resulted in bilingual literature (Latin and Hungarian) in many cases also characterizing the work of authors who considered the dissemination of Hungarian as their vocation, such as the work of János Fekete, Miklós Révai or József Benkő. There were mainly pragmatic reasons for writing in Latin, as this made it possible to engage in the discourse of European scholarship, so Latin was clearly the language of science as opposed to Hungarian, which had a more modest role in disseminating knowledge. As I explained in this chapter, Aranka did not accept such a role of the Hungarian language or the writing of Hungarian-related scholarly works, mainly of local knowledge and cultural history, in Latin, nor of Neolatin poetry, which he considered anachronism with József Péteri Takáts. The juxtaposition of the poetic thoughts of the two contemporary poets showed that they had strong reservations about Latin poetry, whether ancient or modern, both condemning slavish copying, and instead possessing authentic, unique features.

The need to cultivate national poetry, paying attention to the national unique character and peculiarities, was formulated by József Kármán in his program writing, in the Introduction to *Urania*, the fiction edited by him, or in some of Benedek Virág's poems. In the same section, I also outlined Aranka's approach to language. Based on his statements, I can state that this is related to the rationalist approach to language, and within this to József Péczeli's view of language, to linguistic universalism, which saw language as a means of knowledge, a mere mediator and did not believe in the specifics of each language. Aranka's view of language has, over time, moved in the direction of an empiricist view of language, which already pays attention to the idioms of each language, the two philosophical tendencies of language agree that both profess the primacy of thought over language. The possibility of translating thoughts from a foreign language occupied much of the literature of the age, and there were also heated debates between the two camps, the proponents of free and close translation. In it, both camps agreed that translations were important not only for language development, moral education, but also for sweetening the sons and daughters of the homeland to the fine sciences (which is the first degree to the deeper sciences). It should also be noted that not only such practical considerations worked in the background of the translations, but also from the 1790^s the question of prestige appeared, insofar as Latin was already seen as an opponent to be defeated, and the Hungarian language could only be raised against Latin, for it dominated every field from administration to the academic science language. In this context, the translation of Latin works was a field of competition between writers, so they tried to prove the equality of the Hungarian language over Latin, its full education and, last but not least, its suitability as a language of sciences and as a state language. The change in the concepts of nation showed that due to the image of the nation perceived by its linguistic-cultural factors, the significance not only of the literature written in Hungarian, nor of the Hungarian language itself, but also of the relationship between language and nation grew. Aranka and his contemporaries repeatedly state in their verse or program statements that the sign of a nation is its language, but that language as a guarantee of the nation's existence is conditional, as the language of the nation can only be valid through it. That is why the prestige of Hungarian-language literature is growing so much, as high-level national literature is a proof of the power of language (the state of language is related to the state of literature) and at the same time the cultural and even economic well-being of the nation. This thus also serves purposes of representation, since after a while literature is already seen as a

cultural medium representing the nation, for which it acquires eternal merits, glory and elevates it to the ranks of the great European nations. Like his contemporaries, Aranka regarded poetry as a stepping stone to deep science, accustoming him to reading and cultivating, so he thought he could find the purpose of poetry in the service of his homeland. Hungarian-language poetry is also a representative of the nation's strength and glory, and this is precisely related to what I stated when his volume was published, that its caution and hesitation in publishing the volume stemmed from the awareness of the weight of responsibility that it is only legitimate to stand up if it can offer something new, something useful to its nation, and in this way not only self-representation was important to him, but also the representation of Hungarian poetry. Another aspect of the relationship between language and nation is the awareness and exploitation of the potential of the Hungarian language, which was dealt with in the last part of this chapter. Assessing and trying the potential of the Hungarian language and its possibilities of linguistic expression was embodied not only in the expansion of vocabulary, in bringing the hidden treasures of the language (be it expression or writing – think only the publishing of Miklós Zrínyi's works) or in the form of translations. This includes the rediscovery of an important feature of the language of literature, namely the fact that the Hungarian language is much more suitable for the cultivation of metric poetry than the languages of developed Western nations such as French or German. Proponents of poetry renewal, with the growth of the prestige of Hungarian poetry and the emphasis on its uniqueness, begin to mention the Hungarian language and culture on the same page as antique culture, from which it follows that there is no need to follow-up, which is probably related to what Aranka and Péteri Takáts formulated in the context of authentic national literature. Aranka's thoughts, recorded in the preface to his volume, that Hungarian is suitable for cultivating all three poetical forms in just 15–20 years, faith and hope in the strength and development potential of the language of the nation became self-conscious certainty.

The chapter concluding the dissertation examines a complex, multifaceted poem that shows Aranka's new, more philosophical face from the late 1790^s from a poetic point of view. *Allegory Games in the Poetry of György Aranka. From the occasional verse to the philosophical-moralizing patriotic didactic poem* attempts to present the philosophical side of Aranka's poetry (including the philosophy of language) through a larger composition poem turned into an allegory game (*For a Good Young Francis's Day*), pointing out philosophical,

ideological sources. In this chapter, I compare his thoughts with the works of other contemporary poets and poetic descendants in a comparative way, referring to the sources and textual parallels of the poem, and finally to the contemporary reception of the poem. In the concluding part of the chapter, I undertook to find the original addressee of the Aranka poem and, placing it in the context of the addressee's life, to interpret the text taking into account previous insights into Aranka's poetry.

As mentioned above, the last chapter of the dissertation is *Allegory Games in the Poetry of György Aranka. From the occasional verse to the philosophical-moralizing patriotic didactic poem*. Aranka's didactic poem *For a Good Young Francis' Day* focused on Aranka's allegory games, which I interpreted as a poetic game based on the duality of concealment-thought-solving, as simulations of reality and fiction. At the beginning of the chapter I reflected on the fact that towards the end of the nineties Aranka's attention gradually and deeply turned to the study of philosophy, as a result of which poems of this new poetic era reveal a poet who tirelessly tries to understand nature and human function and the relationship between the two, so the textbook itself can in fact be interpreted as a summation of Aranka's philosophical views. Aranka, leaving the content framework of the occasional poems, circumventing the horizon of expectations – endows the work with philosophical meaning, so the occasional poem gives him the opportunity to express his moralizing, philosophical, linguistic and philosophical views. During the structural examination of the poem, I pointed out the triple articulation: the sentimental overture is a summation of different philosophical views: the Newtonian mechanical worldview, the doctrine of soul migration – ancient philosophy – and the transformation of species – Diderot's conception of nature – dissolution in nature neo-Platonist idea. This is followed by the middle, negotiating part (consideration of the situation of the country and the nation in relation to the past and the present, the situation of Hungarian society, language and culture), then the closure, turning to the addressee, drawing conclusions. Aranka connects the idea of the constant change of the world, the transience of man in a philosophical dimension, turned into an allegory game with the transience of the nation's existence, which gives him a reason to play with the idea of the death of the nation for the sake of dramatic effect. He does all this in order to encourage the recipient of the poem to make a sacrifice for the Hungarian nation and language. One of the central themes of the fable is the question of language, and within that the relationship between language and nation, about which I have explained Aranka's views here

and in connection with this poem. I also pointed out one of the sources of inspiration for his poem, after a comparative and contextual examination it was clearly outlined that Aranka's poem was one of those poets who believed in the important role and timeless merit of the writers for the heroic salvation of the Hungarian language in the literature. The conclusion of his poem is that the only good and useful goal in life is to do for the nation, for the language, to improve the fate of the nation, this is the real, acceptable, eternal work. As a result of the manuscript research, I also presented a slice of the reception history of the poem by the critique of Ferenc Kazinczy, and I interpreted the life story of the possible recipient of the poem (Count Ferenc Teleki of Paszmosi).

The dissertation was not born out of the need for recanonization or rehabilitation, but rather out of the incentive consideration – we can call it old debt and perhaps also a tradition-saving intention – to get to know the writing legacy of Transylvanian poets and small masters. The research viewed Aranka texts not only as a curiosity, as a corpus of texts, a oeuvre that is valuable because of its historicity and age document, but also because of its uniqueness, which is worth exploring, interpreting and helping to better understand this multifaceted era, the Enlightenment literature, its world of ideas.

Selective bibliography:

Manuscripts

ARANKA György, *Ifj. gr. Teleky Ferencz úrfi neve napjára 1803*, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kézirattár, Oct. Hung. 442.

ARANKA György gyűjteménye, Román Nemzeti Levéltár Kolozs megyei Fiókja [Serviciul Județean Cluj al Arhivelor Naționale ale României], Kolozsvár, fond 258, 26., 87. csomók.

Aranka Györgyhöz írt levelek 1792–1818, Román Nemzeti Levéltár Kolozs megyei Fiókja [Serviciul Județean Cluj al Arhivelor Naționale ale României], Kolozsvár, Mikó–Rhédei-hagyaték VII./30-as csomó.

Aranka György *levelezése*, OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 1994.

Aranka György *levelezése*, OSZK Kézirattár, Jancsó-hagyaték.

Aranka György Fekete János grófhhoz, OSZK Kézirattár, Levelestár.

Egyes versek gyűjteménye, Kolozsvár, „Lucian Blaga” Központi Egyetemi Könyvtár Különgyűjtemények, Ms. 2991.

Elme Játékjai, „Irtá Aranka György”, Kolozsvár, „Lucian Blaga” Központi Egyetemi Könyvtár Különgyűjtemények, Ms 184.

KAZINCZY Ferenc, *Stadiumok*, II. kötet, MTAK KIK Kt., Magy. Ir. RUI 2-r 2./II.

Keresztes Komlósi Fejérvári Károly külömbféle Magyar Verseknék, – Enekeknek, – és Szirmay Antal Apophtegmainak Gyűjtemennye (1782), OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 179.

Rákosi Sámuel *Holmija (1785–1791)*, Kolozsvár, „Lucian Blaga” Központi Egyetemi Könyvtár Különgyűjtemények, MS 353.

SZIRMAY Antal, *Collectio Ingeniosarum Cogitationum inchoata 1a Julij 1782o Per Antonium de Zirna*. [...], OSZK Kézirattár, Fol. Lat. 1699.

SZIRMAY Antal, *Poemata, Elegiae, Epigramata, Versus, tam Latini, quam Ungarici, Antonii Szirmay: de Szirma* [...]. OSZK Kézirattár, Fol. Lat. 1634.

SZIRMAY Antal, *Quodlibet, az az: Minden=Féle. idő töltésül őszve irta a' Szinyéri magánosságában Szirmay Szirmay Antal, Császári, 's Királyi Apostoli Felség Udvari Tanátsossa, és a' Magyar Nemzeti Könyv=Tárnak ajánlja*. 1812dik Eszt. OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 225.

Zágoni Aranka György versei, OSZK Kézirattár, Oct. Hung. 37.

Periodicals and printed paper

Magyar Hírmondó, 2(1781), 79. levél (október 13., szombat), 624–632.

http://real-j.mtak.hu/1020/1/Magyar_hirmondo_1781.pdf [2020. 08. 14.]

Magyar Hírmondó, 3(1782), 5. levél (január 16., szerda), 33–38.

http://real-j.mtak.hu/1021/1/Magyar_hirmondo_1782.pdf [2020. 10. 18]

Magyar Hírmondó, 7(1786), 3. levél (január 11., szerda), 22–24.

http://real-j.mtak.hu/1444/1/Magyar_Hirmondo_1786_1_102_cs.pdf [2020. 09. 02.]

Mindenes Gyűjtemény, 1(1789), II. negyed, Mind Szent hava, 2. levél (október 7.), 21.

Mindenes Gyűjtemény, 1(1789), II. negyed, Mind Szent hava, 4. levél (október 14.), 49–54.

Mindenes Gyűjtemény, 2(1790), III. negyed, Boldog Aszszony hava, 6. levél (január 20.), 91–93.

JAKAB Elek, *Aranka György és az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő és Kéziratkiadó Társaság*, külön lenyomat a Figyelő márciusi füzetéből, Rudnyánszky A. Könyvnyomdájából, Budapest, 1884.

SZÉKELY Márton, *Méltóságos Aranka György Úrnak élete*, Tudományos Gyűjtemény, Pest 2(1818), 12. kötet, 68–91.

Literature

- BÁN 1971 = BÁN Imre, *Irodalomelméleti kézikönyvek Magyarországon a XVI–XVIII. században*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtörténeti füzetek, 72), 1971.
- BENE 2002 = BENE Zoltán, *Az újságíró és könyvtáros Mátray Gábor* [szakdolgozat, OSZK], 2002, hálózati változat: <http://mek.oszk.hu/03200/03237/html/#f5> [2020.08.14-i elérés]
- BENKŐ 1960 = BENKŐ Loránd, *A magyar irodalmi írásbeliség a felvilágosodás korának első szakaszában*, Budapest, Akadémiai, 1960.
- BIRÓ 2004 = BIRÓ Annamária, *Aranka Ember Esmérete: Egy kéziratos filozófiai értekezés*, in *Az emberarcú intézmény: Tanulmányok Aranka György köréről*, szerk. EGYED Emese, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek [Aranka György gyűjteménye I.], 249), 2004, 73–96.
- BIRÓ 2011 = BIRÓ Annamária, *Nemzetek Erdélyben: August Ludwig Schlözer és Aranka György vitája*, Kolozsvár, Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek, 272), 2011.
- BIRÓ 2017 = BIRÓ Annamária, „*A Levél pedig iratik és megyen első tűzzel*”, in *Hortus amicorum: Köszöntőkötet Egyed Emese tiszteletére*, szerk. Uő, BARTHA Katalin Ágnes, DEMETER Zsuzsa, TAR Gabriella-Nóra, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2017, 190–204.
- BÍRÓ 1984 = BÍRÓ Ferenc, *Nemzet, nyelv, irodalom: Az 1780-as évek értelmiségének ideológiájához*, ItK, 88(1984), 558–577.
- BÍRÓ 2005 = BÍRÓ Ferenc, *Bevezetés*, in *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv ügyének 18. századi történetéből*, szerk. Uő, Budapest, Argumentum, 2005, 7–21.
- BÍRÓ 2012 = BÍRÓ Ferenc, *A nemzethalál árnya a XVIII. századelő magyar irodalmában*, Pécs, Pro Pannonia Alapítvány (Thienemann-előadások 7.), 2012
- BÍRÓ 2013 = BÍRÓ Ferenc, *A felvilágosodás korának magyar irodalma*, Budapest, Balassi (digitális változat), 2013.
- BORIÁN 2016 = BORIÁN Elréd, *Faludi Ferenc kötetkompozíciója a kéziratok és a kiadások tükrében I.*, ItK, 120(2016), 503–527.
- BORIÁN 2017 = BORIÁN Elréd, *Faludi Ferenc kötetkompozíciója a kéziratok és a kiadások tükrében II.*, ItK, 121(2017), 372–391.
- BURJÁN 2003 = BURJÁN Mónika, „*Ez a ’ nyugtalan törekedés, dolgozásomat minél hasonlóbba tenni az eredetihez...’*: Kazinczy Ferenc nézetei a fordításról, ItK, 107(2003), 43–74.

BURKE 2004 = BURKE Peter, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

CSANAK F. 1976 = F. CSANAK Dóra, *Az Erdélyi Magyar Kéziratkiadó Társaság megalakulása*, MKSz 92(1976), 333–349.

CSATA 2020 = CSATA Adél, *Benkő József, a historia litteraria művelője: Egy kontextualizáló olvasat*, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek, 291) 2020.

CSETRI 1981 = CSETRI Lajos, *A „világosság” korának irodalomszemlélete*, in *A magyar kritika évszázadai I. Rendszerek: A kezdetektől a romantikáig*, írta és összeáll. Uő, TARNAI Andor, Budapest, Szépirodalmi, 1981, 249–507.

CSETRI 1990 = CSETRI Lajos, *Egység vagy különbözőség? Nyelv- és irodalomszemlélet a magyar irodalmi nyelvújítás korszakában*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtudomány és kritika), 1990.

CSETRI 2007a = CSETRI Lajos, *A magyar irodalmi nyelvújítás kora irodalomszemléletének nyelvfilozófiai alapjairól* in Uő, *Amathus: Válogatott tanulmányok I*, összeáll. SZAJBÉLY Mihály, ZENTAI Mária, L'Harmattan (ligatura), 2007, 9–57.

CSETRI 2007b = CSETRI Lajos, *A magyar irodalmi nyelvújítás korának irodalomszemlélete* in Uő, *Amathus: Válogatott tanulmányok I*, összeáll. SZAJBÉLY Mihály, ZENTAI Mária, L'Harmattan (ligatura), 2007, 67–71.

CSÖRSZ 2005a = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *„Csipkebokor, kormos agyag énekemet énekeli”*: *Közköltészeti cserefolyamatok Pálóczi Horváth Ádám Érthetetlen énekében*, in *Folklór és irodalom*, szerk. SZEMERKÉNYI Ágnes, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (Folklór a magyar művelődéstörténetben, 1), 2005, 61–78.

CSÖRSZ 2005b = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *„Zörgettek rózsám ablakán”*: *Csokonai a közköltészet kapujában*, in *„Et in Arcadia ego”*: *A klasszikus magyar irodalmi örökség feltárása és értelmezése*, szerk. DEBRECZENI Attila, GÖNCZY Mónika, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai Könyvtár, 36), 2005, 150–170.

CSÖRSZ 2006 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *A „Régi Magyar Közbeszéd Tára”*: *Szirmay Antal és a Hungaria in parabolis (1804, 1807)*, in *Historia litteraria a XVIII. században*, szerk. Uő,

HEGEDŰS Béla, TŰSKÉS Gábor, munkatárs BRETZ Annamária, Budapest, Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika: Tanulmányok), 2006, 528–544.

CSÖRSZ 2007 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *Közköltészet Erdélyben a XVIII. század második felében (Néhány kutatási szempont)*, Erdélyi Múzeum 68. köt. (3–4. füzet), 2007, 157–166.

CSÖRSZ 2008 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *Stoll 1099.*, in *A Stollwerk: Stoll Béla 80. Születésnapjára*, szerk. ÁCS Pál, SZÉKELY Júlia, Budapest, MTA Irodalomtudományi Intézet – Balassi, 2008, 40–41.

CSÖRSZ 2009 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *Szöveg szöveg hátán: A magyar közköltészet variációs rendszere 1700–1840*, Budapest, Argumentum (Irodalomtörténeti Füzetek, 165), 2009.

CSÖRSZ 2016 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *A kesergő nimfától a fonóházi dalokig: Közköltészeti hatások a magyar irodalomban (1700–1800)*, Budapest, Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika: Tanulmányok), 2016.

CSÖRSZ 2018 = CSÖRSZ Rumen István, *Aranka György közköltészeti gyűjteményei az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban*, in *Aranka György és a tudomány megújuló alakzatai*, szerk. BIRÓ Annamária, EGYED Emese, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2018.

DANN 1989 = DANN Otto, *A nemzet: egy régi fogalom különböző jelentései*, ford. KIRÁLY Edit, Helikon, 35(1989), 2. sz., 230–238.

DÁVID 2013 = DÁVID Péter, „*Itt van a’ legvégső óltára Pallásnak*”: *Az Erdélyi Kéziratkiadó Társaság és az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvművelő Társaság története*, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek, 278), 2013.

DEBRECZENI 2009 = DEBRECZENI Attila, *Tudós hazafiak és érzékeny emberek: Integráció és elkülönülés a XVIII. század végének magyar irodalmában*, Budapest, Universitas, 2009.

DEBRECZENI 2014 = DEBRECZENI Attila, *Kritikai kiadás papíron és képernyőn in Textológia – Filológia – Értelmezés: Klasszikus magyar irodalom*, szerk. CZIFRA Mariann–SZILÁGYI Márton, Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai Könyvtár: Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium, 55) 2014, 26–42.

DEÉ NAGY 1997 = DEÉ NAGY Anikó, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel*, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 1997.

EGYED 1994 = EGYED Emese, *Poéta volt-e Aranka György?*, in *Az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvművelő Társaság kétszáz éve (1793–1993)*, szerk. DÁVID Gyula, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek, 218), 1994, 27–34.

EGYED 1998 = EGYED Emese, *Gyökerészés Erdélyi Társaságunk 200 éves évfordulóján: Próbamunkák kései darabja*, in Uő, *Kard és Penna: Tanulmányok a felvilágosodás magyar irodalmáról*, Budapest, Osiris, 1998, 88–101.

EGYED 2000 = EGYED Emese, *Kivévén könyveimet és írásaimat és más kézírásokat...*, in Uő, *Olvadó nappal, író este (Esszék, tanulmányok, találkozások)*, Kolozsvár, KOMP-PRESS–Korunk Baráti Társaság, 2000, 127–160.

EGYED 2006 = EGYED Emese, *Ihletmodellek, verses írósorolók*, in *Historia litteraria a XVIII. században*, szerk. CSÖRSZ Rumen István, HEGEDŰS Béla, TŰSKÉS Gábor, munkatárs BRETZ Annamária, Budapest, Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika: Tanulmányok), 2006, 405–429.

EGYED 2016 = EGYED Emese, *A beavató műnem: Aranka György drámai munkái*, in *A szövegtől a szcenikáig: Tanulmányok a magyar dráma- és színháztörténet köréből II*, szerk. CZIBULA Katalin, DEMETER Júlia, PINTÉR Márta Zsuzsanna, Eger, Líceum (A Régi Magyar Színház, 6), 2016, 512–527.

ENYEDI 1988 = ENYEDI Sándor, *Aranka György erdélyi társaságai*, Budapest, Szépirodalmi, 1988.

FARMATI 2009 = FARMATI Anna, *Más régi ének: A XVII. századi katolikus népénekköltészet szövegtípusai és motívumrendszere*, Kolozsvár, Verbum, 2009.

FÜLÖP 1978 = FÜLÖP Géza, *A magyar olvasóközönség a felvilágosodás idején és a reformkorban*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtörténeti Könyvtár, 33), 1978.

GÁBOR 2001 = GÁBOR Csilla, *A szállásnak módgyát úgy ejteném...: Pázmány Péter és az anyanyelvűség programja*, Keresztény Szó, 12(2001), 8. sz. (augusztus) hálózati változat: <http://epa.oszk.hu/00900/00939/00031/text.htm#08> [2021.04.11].

GENETTE 1996 = Gérard GENETTE, *Transztextualitás* (ford. BURJÁN Mónika), Helikon 42(1996), 1-2. sz., 82–90.

GINTLI 2010 = *Magyar irodalom*, szerk. GINTLI Tibor, Budapest, Akadémiai, 2010.

HAJDU 2014 = HAJDU Péter, *Horatius visszafogott szerelmi költészete (Carm. III. 9.)*, in *Horatius arcai*, szerk., Uő, Budapest, reciti, 2014, 145–158.

HÁSZ-FEHÉR 2000 = HÁSZ-FEHÉR Katalin, *Elkülönülő és közösségi irodalmi programok a 19. század első felében: Fáy András irodalomtörténeti helye*, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai könyvtár, 21), 2000.

HÁSZ-FEHÉR 2006 = HÁSZ-FEHÉR Katalin, *Az intencionáltság szintjei a szerzői és a kiadói kötetekben*, in *A látható könyv: Tanulmányok az irodalmi medialitás köréből*, szerk. Uő, Szeged, Tiszatáj könyvek (Klasszikus – Magyar – Irodalom – Történet: Tanulmányok, 2), 2006, 55–82.

HEGEDÜS 2018 = HEGEDÜS Béla, *(Anya)nyelvelmélet és tudománytörténet: Aranka György a nyelvről*, in *Aranka György és a tudomány megújuló alakzatai*, szerk. BIRÓ Annamária, EGYED Emese, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2018, 37–46.

HEGEDÜS 2019 = HEGEDÜS Béla, *Bessenyei az anyanyelvről*, ItK, 123(2019), 764–771.

HORVÁTH 1978 = HORVÁTH János, *A magyar irodalmi népiesség Faluditól Petőfigig*, Budapest, Akadémiai, 1978².

JANCSÓ 1939 = JANCSÓ Elemér, *Aranka György élete és munkássága*, Kolozsvár, Minerva (Különlenyomat a „Magyar irodalomtörténet” című könyvből), 1939.

JANCSÓ 1940 = JANCSÓ Elemér, *Erdély Kazinczyja*, Nyugat, 33(1940), 9. sz. (szeptember), digitalizált változat: <https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00022/00656/21040.htm> [2021.04.19.]

JANCSÓ 1947 = JANCSÓ Elemér, *Aranka György levelezése*, Kolozsvár, Minerva, 1947.

JANCSÓ 1955 = JANCSÓ Elemér, *Az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság iratai*, Bukarest, Akadémiai, 1955.

KECSKÉS 1991 = KECSKÉS András, *A magyar verselméleti gondolkodás története a kezdetektől 1898-ig*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtudomány és kritika), 1991.

KESZEG A. 2011 = KESZEG Anna, *Gyöngyössi János: Szövegek és kontextusok*, Budapest, Ráció (ligatura), 2011.

KESZEG V. 2008 = KESZEG Vilmos, *Alfabetizáció, írásszokások, populáris írásbeliség*, BBTE Magyar Néprajz és Antropológia Tanszék– Kriza János Néprajzi Társaság (Néprajzi Egyetemi Jegyzetek, 3), Kolozsvár, 2008.

KIRÁLY 2006 = KIRÁLY Emőke, *Aranka György fordítói munkássága*, ErdMúz, 68(2006), 3–4. sz., 107–125.

KÓKAY 1997 = KÓKAY György, *A könyvkereskedelem Magyarországon*, Budapest, Balassi, 1997.

KOZÁK 2014 = KOZÁK Dániel, *Arany középszer és Augustus a II.10. Ódában*, in *Horatius arcai*, szerk. HAJDU Péter, Budapest, reciti, 2014, 111–130.

KÖNIG 1902 = KÖNIG György, *Népdalok és egyéb versek gyűjteménye (1812)*, ItK, 12(1902), 65–77.

KÜLLŐS 2004 = KÜLLŐS Imola, *Közköltészet és népköltészet: A XVII–XIX. századi magyar világi közköltészet összehasonlító műfaj-, szüzsé- és motívumtörténeti vizsgálata*, Budapest, L'Harmattan (Szó-hagyomány), 2004.

KÜLLŐS 2005 = KÜLLŐS Imola, *Amade László verseinek folklorizációja*, in *Folklór és irodalom*, szerk. SZEMERKÉNYI Ágnes, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (Folklór a magyar művelődéstörténetben, 1), 2005, 79–101.

KÜLLŐS 2012 = KÜLLŐS Imola, *Közkezen, közszájon, köztudatban: Folklorisztikai tanulmányok*, Budapest, Akadémiai, 2012.

LABÁDI 2006a = LABÁDI Gergely, *Az irodalom közegváltásai a felvilágosodás idején: az episztola példája*, in *A látható könyv: Tanulmányok az irodalmi medialitás köréből*, szerk. HÁSZ-FEHÉR Katalin, Szeged, Tiszatáj könyvek (Klasszikus – Magyar – Irodalom – Történet: Tanulmányok, 2), 2006, 19–54.

LABÁDI 2006b = LABÁDI Gergely, „meg-írott könyv” és „nyomatott ének”: *A kézirat és nyomtatott kultúráról a XVIII. század utolsó harmadában*, in *Historia litteraria a XVIII. században*, szerk. CSÖRSZ Rumen István, HEGEDŰS Béla, TŰSKÉS Gábor, munkatárs BRETZ Annamária, Budapest, Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika: Tanulmányok), 2006, 446–458.

LUKÁCSY 1989 = LUKÁCSY Sándor, *Ubi sunt: Egy formula rövid életrajza*. ItK, 93(1989), 217–241.

MARGÓCSY 1996 = MARGÓCSY István, *A magyar nyelv státusa a XVIII. század második felében*, in *Folytonosság vagy fordulat? A felvilágosodás kutatásának időszerű kérdései*, szerk. DEBRECZENI Attila, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai Könyvtár, 8), 1996, 251–259.

MARGÓCSY 2005 = MARGÓCSY István, *A magyar nyelv jelenléte a 18. századi iskoláztatásban*, in *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv ügyének 18. századi történetéből*, szerk. BÍRÓ Ferenc, Budapest, Argumentum, 2005, 71–152.

MEZEI 1974 = MEZEI Márta, *Felvilágosodás kori líránk Csokonai előtt*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtörténeti Könyvtár, 30), 1974.

MEZEI 1998 = MEZEI Márta, *A kiadó mandátuma: Kiadói nézetek és eljárások Révaitól Kazinczyig*, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai könyvtár, 15), 1998.

NAMÉNYI 1902 = NAMÉNYI Lajos, *A nagyváradi nyomdászat a XIX. században*, MKSz, ú.f. 10(1902), 127–145.

ONDER 2003 = ONDER Csaba, *A klasszika virágai (anthológia – praetexta – narratíva)*, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai könyvtár, 28), 2003.

OROSZ 1980 = OROSZ László, *A magyar verstani eszmélkedés kezdetei*, Budapest, Akadémiai (Irodalomtörténeti füzetek, 97), 1980.

PESTI 2013 = PESTI Brigitta, *Dedikáció és mecenatúra Magyarországon a 17. század első felében*, Budapest–Eger, Kossuth Kiadó–Eszterházy Károly Főiskola (Kulturális örökség), 2013.

Révai nagy lexikona, I. kötet, hasonmás kiadás, Budapest, Szépirodalmi és Babits Könyvkiadó, 1989. [Eredeti kiadás: *Révai nagy lexikona* –XXI., főszerk. RÉVAY Mór, Budapest, Révai testvérek Irodalmi Intézet Részvénytársaság, 1911–1935.]

SOÓS 2005 = SOÓS István, *II. József német nyelvrendelete és a „hivatalos” Magyarország*, in *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv ügyének 18. századi történetéből*, szerk. BÍRÓ Ferenc, Budapest, Argumentum, 2005, 261–301.

STOLL 2002 = *A magyar kéziratos énekeskönyvek és versgyűjtemények bibliográfiája (1542–1840)*, negyedik, javított és bővített kiadás, összeállította STOLL Béla, Budapest, Balassi, 2002.

SZABÓ 1986 = SZABÓ Zoltán, *Kis magyar stílustörténet*, harmadik kiadás, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, 1986.

SZAJBÉLY 2001 = SZAJBÉLY Mihály, „*Idzadnak a’ magyar tollak*”: *Irodalomszemlélet a magyar irodalmi felvilágosodás korában, a 18. század közepétől Csokonai haláláig*, Budapest, Akadémiai–Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika), 2001.

SZAUDER 1970 = SZAUDER József, *Az estve és az álom: Felvilágosodás és klasszicizmus*, Budapest, Szépirodalmi, 1970.

SZAUDER 1980 = SZAUDER József, *Az éj és a csillagok: Tanulmányok Csokonairól*, s. a. r. és jegyz. SZAUDER Mária, Budapest, Akadémiai, 1980

SZIGETI 2005 = SZIGETI Csaba, *Magyar versszak*, Budapest, Balassi, 2005.

SZILÁGYI 2014 = SZILÁGYI Márton, *Textológia, filológia, értelmezés in Textológia – Filológia – Értelmezés: Klasszikus magyar irodalom*, szerk. CZIFRA Mariann–Uő, Debrecen, Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó (Csokonai Könyvtár: Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium, 55) 2014, 15–25.

SZINNYEI 2000 [1891] = SZINNYEI József, *Magyar írók élete és munkái I*, Budapest, Hornyánszky Viktor, 1891, hálózati változat: Arcanum Adatbázis Kft., 2000.
<http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/a/a00412.htm> [2020. 08. 14.]

TAKÁCS 2012 = TAKÁCS Gábor, *Műgyűjtők Magyarországon a 18. század végétől a 21. század elejéig*, Budapest, Kieselbach Galéria, 2012.

TAKÁTS 2001 = TAKÁTS József, *Nyolc érv az elsődleges kontextus mellett*, ItK, (105)2001, 316–324.

THIMÁR 2006 = THIMÁR Attila, *Lingua et litteraria*, in *Historia litteraria a XVIII. században*, szerk. CSÖRSZ Rumen István, HEGEDŰS Béla, TÜSKÉS Gábor, munkatárs BRETZ Annamária, Budapest, Universitas (Irodalomtudomány és kritika: Tanulmányok), 2006, 68–85.

UNDI 2003 = UNDI Mária, *Úri és népviselet a barokk korban*, in *Magyar művelődéstörténet 1–5*, 4. kötet: Barokk és felvilágosodás, szerk. DOMANOVSKY Sándor et al., Budapest, digitális kiadás: Arcanum Adatbázis Kft., 2003. <http://mek.oszk.hu/09100/09175/html/66.html> [2020. 10. 25.]

VADERNA 2013 = VADERNA Gábor, *Az irodalom társadalmi használata gróf Dessewffy József életművében*, Budapest, Ráció (ligatura), 2013.

VADERNA 2017 = VADERNA Gábor, *A költészet születése: A magyarországi költészet társadalomtörténete a 19. század első évtizedeiben*, Budapest, Universitas, 2017.

VARGA 1998 = VARGA Zsuzsa, *Elme és játék: Aranka György poétikus filozófiája*, ErdMúz, 60(1998), 1–2. sz., 41–49.

VOGEL 2012 = VOGEL Zsuzsa, *Faludi Ferenc verseinek recepciója a XVIII–XIX. századi kéziratos énekeskönyvekben*, in *Doromb: Közköltészeti tanulmányok 1.*, szerk. CSÖRSZ Rumen István, Budapest, reciti, 2012, 103–140.

VOGEL 2020 = VOGEL Zsuzsa, *Az olvasás útjain, a biográfiától a közköltészetig: Faludi Ferenc műveinek fogadtatása*, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek, 292), 2020.

VÖRÖS 1985 = VÖRÖS Imre, *Állat-jelképek a felvilágosodás magyar irodalmában*, ItK, 89(1985), 147–159.

The author's publications in the topic of the doctoral thesis

KERTI József, *A Magyar Parnaszszus Virágjai: Aranka György kéziratos versgyűjteménye közközén*, in *Doromb: Közköltészeti tanulmányok 4*, szerk. CSÖRSZ Rumen István, Budapest, reciti, 2015, 173–184.

KERTI József, *Aranka György „virágénekei”*, in *Certamen III: Előadások A Magyar Tudomány Napján az Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület I. Szakosztályában*, szerk. EGYED Emese, PAKÓ László, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2016, 191–200.

KERTI József, *Emberkép Aranka György írásaiban*, in *Folyamatok, szövegek, események: a kolozsvári Hungarológiai Tudományok Doktori Iskola tanulmányai II.*, szerk. Uő, KESZEG Vilmos, Kolozsvár, Egyetemi Műhely: Bolyai Társaság, 2015, 75–89 (Egyetemi füzetek, 27).

KERTI József, *A Magyar Parnaszszus Virágjai szóképekben: Aranka György kéziratos versei Szirmay Antal versgyűjteményeinek tükrében*, in *Események, folyamatok, szövegek: a kolozsvári Hungarológiai Tudományok Doktori Iskola tanulmányai III.*, szerk. BENKE András, BILIBÓK Renáta, KESZEG Vilmos, Kolozsvár, Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó: Bolyai Társaság, 2017, 161–193 (Egyetemi füzetek, 34).

KERTI József, „*A Magyar Parnaszszus virágjai*”: *Aranka György kéziratos versgyűjteményének paratextusai*, in *Certamen IV: Előadások A Magyar Tudomány Napján az Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület I. Szakosztályában*, szerk. EGYED Emese, GÁLFI Emőke, WEISZ Attila, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2017, 37–49.

KERTI József, *Klasszikus minták Aranka György költészetében (Horatius példája)*, in *Római költők a 18–19. századi magyarországi irodalomban: Vergilius, Horatius, Ovidius*, szerk. BALOGH Piroska, LENGYEL Réka, Budapest, MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont–Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2017, 141–163.

KERTI József, „*Add ki tehát Kedves Barátom bátran munkáidat...*”. *A kézírattól a nyomtatásig: Aranka György verseskötetének kiadástörténete*, in *Aranka György és a tudomány megújuló alakzatai*, szerk. BIRÓ Annamária, EGYED Emese, Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2018, 47–71.

KERTI József, *Allegórijátékok Aranka György költészetében: Az alkalmi verstől a bölcséleti-moralizáló hazafias tankölteményig*, in *Irodalomról, nyelvről és társadalomról: A kolozsvári Hungarológiai Tudományok Doktori Iskola tanulmányai IV.*, szerk. BENKE András, BILIBÓK Renáta, KESZEG Vilmos, Kolozsvár, Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó: Bolyai Társaság, 2019, 187–212 (Egyetemi füzetek, 43).