

BELLA KATALIN

**Daniel Ernst Jablonski and the “Res publica litteraria”
The role of a court priest in managing intellectual contacts
in the 18th century***Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola*

In this paper I will analyze the formation of the Hungarian intellectual class in the 18th century in a European context.

In Hungary it was the 18th century that witnessed the emergence of the intellectuals as a social class. This process was the product of a period lasting for several centuries and was characterized by an increasing rate of secularization, including the divergence of intellectual and clerical positions, which had already started in the late Middle Ages. This formation reached its climax by this time by the gradual increase of professionalization, specialization and functional expansion of the intellectual class.¹

Since initiatives to establish institutions providing higher education in Hungary mostly failed, the production of well-trained intellectuals was only possible by studying at Western European universities. Throughout the 18th century, Hungarian intellectuals, acquired their higher training at foreign universities, formed the impetus of the national movements that would come in the 19th century. Because of these studies, Hungarian intellectuals were able to participate in contemporary European academic and cultural life abroad, and to channel themselves into the “Res publica litteraria”. After returning to Hungary, these intellectuals aimed at implementing the initiatives they learned abroad, while simultaneously maintaining their cultivated foreign academic networks.

The diffusion of scientific knowledge through letters was already a prosperous method in the 18th century; the concept of “Res publica literaria” (“the commonwealth of letters”) has its roots in Humanism and refers to the abstract community of learned men as well as to the knowledge embodied in them.² The term first appeared in its Latin form in the fifteenth century and was used increasingly in the sixteenth and seventeenth.³ Correspondence was a crucial medium of the “Res publica literaria”, joining other important practices such as conversation, research travels, academic journals and the trafficking of books - all of which were detailed in letters. Current events are reflected in learned correspondence in many ways. Letters are a medium for news; in the early Modern period, they were one of the most important such media. Notices or descriptions abound of events such as battles, epidemics, or the latest goings-on at the great European courts. Much of this news would otherwise have reached the recipients more slowly, less reliably or not at all. Some

¹ KOSÁRY 1981, 1–20.

² BENSUADE – VINCENT 2001, 102.

³ GOLDGAR 1995, 2.

of it is even based on privileged access to information; the interconnections between erudition and the centres of political and ecclesiastical power are manifold.⁴

My paper focuses on German – particularly Prussian – contacts to Hungary. I extensively investigate the role that Daniel Ernst Jablonski, Prussian court priest and initiator of the Prussian Royal Academy, played in the intellectual network of Central Europe, specifically his patronization of several Hungarian scholars.⁵ In fact, Jablonski's international correspondence network can be seen as a crucial “multiplier” of communication within the scientific community. The resulting commonwealth of the letters thus united European intellectuals, even though national cultural conditions exercised a deep impact on the limits of participation in this community.

Let us now see how Daniel Ernst Jablonski, a holder of high office at court and wielder of considerable power, was patronized the Hungarian Scholars.

At the end of the 17th century the majority of Protestant scholars attempted a thorough transcription of their churches' cultural history. The initiative was linked to Reformed: the first schematic ecclesiastical overview, *Rudus redivivum*, was written by Ferenc Pápai Páriz in 1684.

Ferenc Pápai Páriz, a graduate in medicine at Swiss and German universities, was the court physician of two princes of Transylvania. In 1678 he was elected professor of the College of Nagyenyed, a position he kept until his death in 1716. He taught philosophy, Greek language and the natural sciences, while also continuing his medical practice.

Pápai's above mentioned work, *Rudus redivivum*, deserves special attention as it was urged by readership acclaim, significant because it implies that a supporter felt inclined to bear the costs and convinced Pápai to proceed in writing.

The second attempt to compose a more comprehensive and detailed work emerged in 1696, now with the active co-operation of Jablonski.

Such an endeavour arose when a young Hungarian count named Paul Teleki arrived to the Prussian court, eventually making acquaintance with Jablonski upon paying duty to Frederick, Elector of Brandenburg (later King in Prussia). Jablonski confided in Teleki his failure to find sources related to the genesis and evolvment of the Hungarian Reformation, which he sought for his ecclesiastical history; he thus inquired whether or not Teleki might help. Teleki - rather than volunteering himself - proposed two professors from Nagyenyed, Ferenc Páriz Pápai and István Enyedi.⁶ Jablonski wished to write the history of the Slavic Protestant Churches, knowing well, of course, that the Hungarians - their origin and language - do not belong to the Slavs.⁷ However, it should be noted that in his opinion, Hungarians' location in the Slav milieu and the common fate and struggles of the two countries' churches, necessitated a publication of their history in a shared

⁴ SEBŐK 1999, 29–35. See also: SEBAN 2005, 29–47.; WARNER 1990.; MABER 2005.; OSTRANDER 1999.; JAUMANN 2001, 11–19.

⁵ BAHLCKE 2008, 34–41. See also: RÉVÉSZ 1962, 1–24.

⁶ NAGY 1977, 73.

⁷ Brief von Daniel Ernst JABLONSKI an Stefan Enyedi. 15. June 1696. Stab/F 11,2/10 : 36 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz.

text. Jablonski shared his notion about the structure of the work with Pápai, offering him the chance to publish his own work either as part of Jablonski's magnum opus or independently.⁸ In response, Pápai did not mention his previous published summary (*Rudus redivivum*) and did not offer encouragement to Jablonski. According to Pápai's words, until this time, there had not been a synthesis regarding the history of Hungarian churches, although the reason was not negligence or nonchalance but rather the struggles in which the Hungarian Protestants found themselves engaged. Pápai wrote that he had no information regarding such data collection, and was only able to present his gathered historical information using students who persisted in making the difficult journey to visit the university of Frankfurt an der Oder.⁹ Reading Pápai's letter now it is clear that Pápai was unaware of the notes of another Hung. minister, whose relation to Jablonski I'm going to discuss later and whose notes was already in making.

Jablonski was confronted with the possibility that his ambitious plan, a complete recorded history of Central and Eastern European Churches, might not be realized; however, he promised to preserve incoming information and data from Transylvania, and this was an anticipatory promise, since his work was never published.¹⁰

Let me now move on to analyze how Jablonski supported the creation of another significant work.

A Calvinistic minister, Pál Debreceni, was the person to whom fell the role of compiling a complete source compendium of the Hungarian Protestant Church's history.

In 1684, when Pápai Páriz's above mentioned work, *Rudus Redivivum*, was published, Debreceni was residing in the Netherlands.

According to Debreceni's own words, Pápai's work inspired Debreceni to likewise compile Ecclesiastical sources. In addition to his pastoral obligations, his duty to collect these sources was complicated by this period in Hungarian history, which did not foster quiet immersion in academic works. Debreceni himself was forced because of war to escape his home; he was even confined in prison on the order of the Hungarian Chamber. After he was released, he resettled in Losonc, in the northern Highland of the Hungarian Kingdom. Debreceni at last he spent six years there, during which he was afforded the opportunity to develop his text undisturbed, moreover, he could establish friendships with financial patrons, who offered financial support for the rest of Debreceni's life.

In spite of the fact that his work should have been acclaimed, there is no evidence that scholars were even aware of his project; at first Debreceni himself largely thought of his project as merely a potential supplement or appendix to Pápai's opus.

Despite this initial humble approach, it is presumable that Debreceni indeed knew about Jablonski's monumental/large scale plan about a comprehensive church history, to which he could join, he could become a more prestigious scholar. We know from a contemporary copy of

⁸ BOD 1890, 461–466.

⁹ PÁPAI PÁRIZ Ferenc to Daniel Ernst Jablonski. 4. May 1697, Nagyenyed. In: NAGY 1977, 457–458.

¹⁰ RITÓÓK 1973, 180.

Debreceni's work that he finished the supplement to Pápai's work in 1696, although he eventually amended it with new sources later obtained. This can be explained only by the fact that Ember had become aware of Jablonski's great project (comprehensive church history); therefore he wished to arrange his own work according to Jablonski's new method.¹¹

While Debreceni devoted effort to revise his manuscript to take advantage of Jablonski's invitation, Jablonski at the same time became aware of this Hungarian scholar, informed by one of Rákóczi's diplomats, Stephan Dobozi. On the 07th of June,¹² 1704 and 19th of March, 1709,¹³ Jablonski directly wrote to his newly discovered colleague, and in these letters advised some changes in the structure of Debreceni's work before encouraging its completion. Jablonski's suggestive concept was to open with an informative chapter for foreign readers about the general Hungarian conditions, to be followed by a historical chapter chronologically recording events from the beginning of the reformation through the end of the 17th century. Jablonski emphasized attention to accuracy and that the original sources should not be embedded in the text itself but should be attached at the end. The volume should also contain pictures, and should pay credence to those schools and ideologies that differed from the doctrines of the Church. However, it was also necessary to publish the official documents of the Church: publications, rituals, canons and synodial decisions. At the end of his correspondence, Jablonski expressed just how enthusiastically he was waiting to see the manuscript.

This cordial letter stimulated Debreceni, so with the consent and recommendation of his superintendent he requested the superiors of the churches to submit their data and facts regarding the history of the regions under their jurisdiction. His request garnered great volumes of response, necessitating that he edit the information down into a systematic, comprehensive volume. However, after receiving Jablonski's letter, Debreceni was only able to work for a few additional months before war threatened his work once again; in the miserable disaster that followed, he lost many of his books, and in particular his manuscripts which to him were more precious than gold. The majority of his correspondence with Jablonski was also destroyed, only summarized notes remaining.¹⁴

Despite the lack of their correspondence we have some evidence that Debreceni's relation with Jablonski remained continuous following the first above-mentioned letter, up until Debreceni completed work on the manuscript. As an example, Debreceni forwarded Jablonski an important document regarding the case of the Protestant ministers, who were forced by the government to change their religion.¹⁵ When forty of these ministers refused, they were sentenced to death but as mitigation were ultimately sold as galley slaves in 1673 – a well-known deterrent case in Europe.

¹¹ RITOÓK 1973, 181.

¹² Brief von Daniel Ernst JABLONSKI an Paul Ember. 07. June 1704. Stab/F 11,2/14 : 60 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz.

¹³ RITOÓK 1973, 182.

¹⁴ RITOÓK 1973, 183.

¹⁵ LAMPE – DEBRECENI 1728, 486.

If we consider the final structure of the compendium, in light of what it implemented from Jablonski's project, we discover that Debreceni's and Jablonski's conceptualizations did not exactly overlap. Debreceni crammed the precious collection of data into a single introduction, resulting in a rather opaque text containing many subchapters that continuously reset chronology and prevent readers from understanding properly the history and struggles of the Hungarian Protestant Church. In the introduction to his work, Debreceni himself asked the reader to be accommodating, given that he'd toiled through wartime and was deprived of his books and his possessions.¹⁶

As far as we know, at the end of 1708, with the consent of competent authorities, Debreceni's manuscript stood ready to be printed. The work, however, was mysteriously not sent to the publisher for ten years – after Debreceni had died.

We do not know the specific reason for the delay, as it can be potentially be explained by both external and internal events. For example, subsequent government resolutions in religious affairs outlawed Protestant Churches, thus prohibiting them from exchanging books and manuscripts with foreign countries.

There are also complications determining why the manuscript was sent to the Netherlands and was entrusted to the care of Fridrich Lampe - who played no role in its construction - rather than to the care of a Hungarian.¹⁷ It is quite possible that, given that Jablonski had committed himself politically, having confided with a Hungarian diplomat who turned out to be a traitor, therefore indicting Jablonski of much suspicion,¹⁸ Jablonski left the text in someone else's care. Therefore, perhaps Lampe was chosen given his familiar relations and scientific capabilities predestining him for such an assignment. Lampe knew Hungarian students at the university in Utrecht and always treated them with warm friendship; the affection for Hungarians is mentioned in his works and when he was appointed as professor he helped raise scholarship sums for them.

Although it is also suggested in the correspondence between contemporary Hungarian scholars during these times that Jablonski remained the main facilitator of Debreceni's work.

How did Lampe print this compendium? It was finally published in 1728 in Utrecht, but Debreceni's name was not mentioned; Lampe simply titled him „fidelis Dei Servus”, only citing Jablonski's name.¹⁹

Next I would like to examine Jablonski's contribution to university studies and assistance with peregrination.

The influential court minister continuously supported Hungarian peregrines, especially those who arrived from the Transylvanian city of Nagyenyed, throughout his life.²⁰

¹⁶ RITOÓK 1973, 185.

¹⁷ RITOÓK 1973, 364–365.

¹⁸ Köpecz 2000, 73–80.

¹⁹ RITOÓK 1973, 366–368.

²⁰ See „KIBÉDI András to Teleki Sándor. 19. February 1717.”: HOFFMANN 1980. 122–123.; „Ruardus ANDALA to Teleki Sándor. 11. September 1716.”: HOFFMANN 1980. 352.; Brief von Daniel Ernst JABLONSKI an Beresin [Bercsényi]. 18. September 1711. Signatur: Stab/F 11,2/17: 56 Staatsbibliothek

As an example, a monumental event in Hungarian cultural history must be discussed: given the re-foundation of scholarships at the university of Frankfurt an der Oder, Jablonski was able to greatly exercise influence at this town's university, allowing for most Hungarian students to be admitted there.

As mentioned above, Jablonski and Pápai played a significant role in the guidance of Paul Teleki's peregrination. In connection to this tour were performed the first steps of re-establishing the scholarship in 1696. When Jablonski and Pápai contacted each other, Pápai recognized a distinct opportunity: after three-quarters of a century, the scholarship, which was founded in 1626, could be renewed. In a letter to Jablonski, Pápai expressed the wish that the emperor might become inspired to allocate grants. Jablonski understood Pápai's wish, and acquired the scholarship, moreover, he developed a proposal to the head of the regal council regarding the admittance of students; the talented were to be chosen, while it was decreed that in the event of favouritism and predilection, the allocation would cease. Once informed by Jablonski regarding this positive verdict, Pápai quickly sledged his way to the chancellor of Transylvania, even in the middle of a cruel winter, to present him Jablonski's letters. When the chancellor saw these letters he was overwhelmed with joy.²¹

In spite of the prime minister's helpfulness, many difficulties remained. Firstly, it was uncertain how many scholarships ought to be maintained for students. While Pápai had worked to obtain three scholarships, he succeeded in acquiring merely two. Secondly, there was designation of the responsibility for selecting worthy students; While historically the choice was made by the governing board of the college, at the beginning of 1700 Pápai and his colleagues deviated from this practice and began to select students without the consent or knowledge of the council. Their reasons were twofold: the council's decision-making was very time-consuming, but also the teachers themselves best knew the talented students worthy of scholarship and thus wanted to make choices that did not need comply with the higher committee's interests and favouritism. This resulted in the head of the council eliminating entirely professors' right of recommendation. However, the greatest concern was the protection and maintenance of scholarship payment. Up until 1700, Pápai corresponded to definitively secure the sum, until it was finally secured through Jablonski's personal intervention, resulting in students being able to enjoy this grant for a century and a half.²²

Following this triumph, Jablonski's role in providing support for the College of Nagyenyed continued, although his subsequent act of benevolence arose from sorrowful circumstances.²³ On Palm Sunday in 1703 - while Rákóczi's war of independence was still being waged,- the city of

zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz., Briefe von Daniel Ernst JABLONSKI an Georg Ottlick. 27.03.1711 Signatur: Stab/F 11,2/17: 18, 18.05.1711., Stab/F 11,2/17: 30, 16.06.1711, Stab/F 11,2/17: 40, 24.07.1711, Stab/F 11,2/17: 50, 19.11.1711, Stab/F 11,2/17 : 63, 10.05.1712, Stab/F 11,2/17: 115 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz.

²¹ NAGY 1977, 74–75.

²² NAGY 1977, 692–693.

²³ BENDA 1955, 153–154.

Nagyenyed, by the order of the Austrian army commander in Transylvania, was set on fire in punishment for fraternization and sympathizing with *kuruc* troops. The city and its college burned to the ground. In the battle, most of the two hundred men slain were in fact students; those who survived had to abscond. Three years later, in 1707, the vengeful mercenaries returned, and again the College was devastated, while the library, archives and treasure stores were plundered. After the invasion, the College had to be re-established and education reorganized, thus necessitating collection of funds. Pápai, now sixty years old, flung himself into this onerous task with outstanding vigour, prudently using his cultivated relations with Jablonski in order to obtain a maximum amount of the potential subsidy to be used for the reconstruction of the College.

It must be mentioned that Pápai's son, Ferenc Pápai Páriz Jr., continued his studies abroad beginning in 1711. One part of his extensive travels is related to Jablonski and the restoration of the College of Nagyenyed. (Pápai's son was born in Nagyenyed in 1687 and matriculated from the College of Nagyenyed in 1703, and in the following year lived through the destruction of the College and the subsequent exile.)²⁴

For Pápai's proposal, the prefectures of the College wrote a request to King George I of Great Britain. The request and the cover letter were first sent to Frederick William I, King of Prussia and nephew and son-in-law of George I. Included were treasures (a golden goblet and canister, along with a sword in velvet sheath decorated with precious stones)²⁵ intended to procure a recommendation for Hungarian restoration efforts to be delivered to the British Sovereign. Jablonski also provided a letter to the superiors at the University of Oxford, recommending Pápai's son (who was responsible for fundraising), ultimately enabling him to cross the Channel. During the next ten years, Pápai Jr. collected a remarkable sum in England, the largest portion of it - nearly 7,000 sterling pounds - being deposited into English accounts to finance the College all the way until the 1850's, particularly to send its students abroad and to fund further development of the College itself.²⁶ He returned to Transylvania in 1726, with this great sum as you might think, but, a portion of this money reportedly having gambled away, either on lottery or on the stock market in France.²⁷

The stations along Pápai Jr.'s decade-and-a-half peregrination are well indicated by the notes in his *Album Amicorum*, as well as in his letters written mainly to his patron, Count Alexander Teleki.

This album includes notes in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, English, German, French, Italian, Spanish and Provençal. It includes no designs and coats of arms, but its notes are rich and various, informative and edifying, and in many cases offer the value of primary sources, including notes on thirty-seven Hungarian personalities. Upon visiting Protestant universities throughout

²⁴ NISHIKAWA 2008, 163.

²⁵ „PÁPAI Páriz Ferenc to Teleki Sándor. 12. February 1713.”: HOFFMANN 1980, 26.

²⁶ NISHIKAWA 2008, 167.

²⁷ NAGY 1977, 78–85.

Europe, Pápai Jr. petitioned for mementos from professors, famous scholars and fellow students,²⁸ as well as Jablonski, whose lines are as follow:

“Take care of these two things: your conscience and your reputation; your conscience in front of God, and your reputation in front of men. Speaking the truth, in love.” From St Paul then: „I wish all the divine blessings and fortune from my heart to the noble possessor [of this book], both outside of his fatherland and at home.”²⁹

Until now I have focused on Jablonski’s direct support, however, equally important is his exemplary behaviour. This can be exposed/explained the best, if I show, how Jablonski’s initiation to found a royal academy, stimulated Mátyás Bél.

Bél’s works were met with recognition and respect beyond the Kingdom of Hungary: he was a member of a number of learned societies abroad

In 1713, in scientific journal *Deutsche Acta Eruditorum oder Geschichte der Gelehrten*, published in Leipzig - and also published in a single edition the same year in Berlin - Matthias Bél published an appeal, *Invitatio ad symbola conferenda dum historia linguae hungaricae*, which concerned the history of Hungarian language. In this invitation he requested the assistance of contemporary erudite men by asking for all documents and materials related to the history of the Hungarian language, to be forwarded to him; in addition he invited his countrymen to become participants in the publication of this history, and therefore to become more significant participants in the public sphere. This deliberate plan summarized the main historical and linguistic challenges regarding Hungarian language. These are e. g.: the matter of Hung. Bible-translations and dictionaries and the history of the Hung. poets.

Bél’s appeal regarding the history of the language – in addition to the impact it had upon indigenous scholars – was due to witnessing the pietistic milieu in which he was raised in Halle.

Presumably this invitation was intended to inform a primarily German readership, who most likely, when imagining Hungarians, strictly saw the stereotypical one on horseback with unsheathed sword rather than pen. This derogatory attitude towards Hungarians was also found in many texts and was a recurring motif in Hungarian scientific works.³⁰

It must be considered that the publishing of Bél’s invitation in Berlin was intentional: during his juvenile peregrination Bél became acquainted with Jablonski. His project³¹ obviously correlated to Jablonski’s attempts that took place at the Royal Academy of Prussia;³² this could be the reason, why Bél solely dedicated the work to him. From the 18th December of 1713 there remains a letter from Bél in which he reports that his work is expected abroad, particularly by Jablonski, who would assume the duty of publishing.

²⁸ ROZSONDAI <http://ppf.mtak.hu/hu/album.htm> [Letöltés dátuma: 2013.06.28.]

²⁹ PÁPAI Páriz Ferenc: *Album Amicorum*. <http://ppf.mtak.hu/hu/026a.htm> [Letöltés dátuma: 2013.06.28.]

³⁰ KOMLÓSSY 2009, 113.

³¹ VIERHAUS 1990, 186–201.

³² LAITKO 1987, 38–49.

Bél's aid was not only restricted to the study of the genesis and history of the Hungarian language. Primarily – following the example of the academy in Berlin – he also sought to establish a common subject, around which scholars could collaborate, rather than work independently and separately from one another. Ultimately he aimed to form an academic society like those found in other countries. After Bél's death, amongst his handwritten papers, many detailed versions of the initiative remained, although Bél himself was never satisfied with the result. His despair manifested itself in 1718 in the following volume of the project, *Literatura Hunno-Scythica*. His correspondence and his project were – in his own words – like water off a duck's back; therefore he attempted to urge cooperation once again, again expounding upon the necessity of establishing a society as well as allowing scholars access to archives.³³

“Res publica litteraria” in the case of Hungary, despite its ubiquitous rhetoric of egalitarian friendship, was always subject to the laws of patronage and clientele. This fact acquired particular significance wherever the abstract community of the learned – with its claims to altruistic mutual assistance and constant increase in overall knowledge – intersected and interfered with concrete political and social conditions.

As Pápai wrote one point:

„Although I was constantly threatened by Fate to fetter me with difficulties, [...] I was not paralyzed with fear by the obstacles towering in front of me, on the contrary, I did not lose my bravery to forge ahead more courageous. Because finally won the hard work, to which I devoted myself from my youth, in order to serve the commonwealth of letters. [...] And here I whole-heartedly admit, that I was somewhat reckless, when before those enormous Herculeses me, the pygmy, dared to begin a dance in this arena of the public.”³⁴

Bibliográfia

- BAHLCKE, J. 2008. „Die Rekonstruktion der intellektuellen Kultur Europas um 1700. Forschungen zu Leben, Werk und Wirkung Daniel Ernst Jablonskis aus drei Jahrhunderten”: BAHLCKE J. – KORTHAASE, W. (szerk.): Daniel Ernst Jablonski. Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700. Harrasowitz, 34–41.
- BENDA Kálmán (szerk.) 1955. Ráday Pál iratai. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
- BENSAUDE-VINCENT, B. 2001. „A genealogy of the increasing gap between science and the public”: Public Understanding of Science 10, 99–113.
- BOD P. 1880–1890. Historia Hungarorum Ecclesiastica. Brill. Leyden.
- KOSÁRY D. 1981. „Értelmiség és kulturális elit a XVIII. századi Magyarországon”: Valóság 2, 1–20.
- GOLDGAR, A. 1995. Impolite learning. Yale University Press. New Haven. London.
- MABER, R. 2005. Publishing in the Republic of Letters. Rodopi. Amsterdam. New York.

³³ SZELESTEI 1989, 64.

³⁴ NAGY 1977, 325.

- JAU-MANN, H. 2001. „Respublica Litteraria/Republic of Letters. Concept and Perspectives of Research”: JAU-MANN, H. (szerk.): Die europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter der Konfessionalismus. Harrassowitz, 11–19.
- KOMLÓSSY Gy. 2009. „Bél Mátyás: Hungari et Transsylvani Aliquot Eruditionis Fama et Scriptis Celebres”: Lymbus, 113–134.
- KÖPECZI B. 2000. Egy cselszövő diplomata, Klement János Mihály 1689–1720. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
- LAMPE, Fridrich – [DEBRECENI EMBER Pál] 1728. Historia ecclesiae reformatae in Hungaria et Transylvania. Trajectae ad Rhenum.
- LAITKO, Hubert (szerk.) 1987. Wissenschaft in Berlin. Dietz-Verlag.
- NAGY Géza (szerk.) 1977. *Békességet magamnak, másoknak*. Kriterion.
- NISHIKAWA, S. 2008. „Jablonski und die englische Unterstützung kontinentaler Protestanten”: BAHLCKE J. –KORTHAASE W. (szerk.): Daniel Ernst Jablonski. Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700. Harrassowitz, 151–168.
- OSTRANDER, G. 1999. Republic of Letters. The American Intellectual Community. 1776–1865. Madison House Publishers, Madison. 1999.
- RÉVÉSZ I. 1962. „Comenius unokája. Daniel Ernestus Jablonski születésének háromszázados évfordulójára”: Századok 1–2, 1–24.
- RITOÓK Zs-né. 1973. „Debreceni Ember Pál egyháztörténetének kéziratái. 1. rész”: Magyar könyvszemle 2, 175–185.
- RITOÓK Zs-né. 1973. „Debreceni Ember Pál egyháztörténetének kéziratái. 2. rész”: Magyar könyvszemle 3–4, 364–376.
- ROZSONDAI M. Ifj. Pápai Páriz Ferenc európai peregrinációjának emlékkönyve. 1711–1726. <http://ppf.mtak.hu/hu/album.htm>.
- SEBAN, J. 2005. „Les Beausobre et la vie intellectuelle de Berlin”: SCHNEIDER U. J. (szerk.): Kultur der Kommunikation. Harrassowitz, 29–47.
- SEBŐK M. 1999. „The benefits of the Republic of Letters”: VISSER A. (szerk.): In search of the Republic of Letters. Intellectual relations between Hungary and The Netherlands 1500–1800. Study Centre on the Republic of Letters in the Early Modern Period, NIAS, 29–35.
- SZELESTEI N. L. 1989. Irodalom- és tudományszervezési törekvések a 18. századi Magyarországon. 1690–1790. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár. Budapest.
- Warner, M. 1990. The Letters of the Republic. Harvard University Press. Cambridge. London.
- Vierhaus, R. 1990. „Wissenschaft und Politik im Zeitalter des Absolutismus”: H. Poser – A. Heinekamp (szerk.): Leibniz in Berlin. Steiner.