

BYZANZ
UND DAS ABENDLAND VII.
Studia
Byzantino-Occidentalia



BYZANZ UND DAS ABENDLAND VII.
STUDIA BYZANTINO-OCCIDENTALIA

Antiquitas • Byzantium • Renascentia XLII.

Herausgegeben von

Zoltán Farkas
László Horváth
Tamás Mészáros

Eötvös-József-Collegium
2021

Byzanz und das Abendland VII. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia

Herausgegeben von

Erika Juhász

Eötvös-József-Collegium
Budapest 2021

Der vorliegende Band konnte im Rahmen des Nationales Forschungs-, Entwicklungs- und Innovationsbüro – NKFIH-Forschungsprojekts „Társadalmi kontextus a szövegkritika tükrében: Bizáncon innen és túl“ (NN 124539) realisiert werden.



Verantwortlicher Herausgeber:
László Horváth, Direktor des Eötvös-József-Collegiums

Anschrift: ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium
H-1118 Budapest, Ménesi út 11-13

© Eötvös-József-Collegium und die einzelnen VerfasserInnen, 2021
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

A nyomdai munkákat a CC Printing Szolgáltató Kft. végezte
1118 Budapest, Rétköz u. 55. A/fsz. 2.
Törvényes képviselő: Szendy Ilona

ISBN: 978-615-5897-43-6
https://doi.org/10.37584/BuA_7
ISSN: 2064-2369

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort.....	11
Peter Schreiner	
Liaisons dangereuses. Die Ehe zwischen Anna von Ungarn und Andronikos Palaiologos (1272) im Spannungsfeld der Mittelmeermächte	13
Stanoje Bojanin	
The Byzantine Penitential Nomocanon in the Serbian and South Slavic Early Modern Printed and Manuscript Book	31
Salvatore Costanza	
Ungarn, Byzantinische Welt und Türkenkrieg in Filefos <i>Episteln</i>	51
Péter Ekler	
Georgius Trapezuntius, Johannes Regiomontanus and the <i>Defensio Theonis</i> . Second part	87
Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann	
Byzanz und das Abendland – Heilkunde im Dialog Byzantinische Medizin im Spannungsfeld zwischen Ost und West	97
László Horváth	
Die neu entdeckten Hypereides-Fragmente aus Herkulaneum. Reflexionen	163
László Horváth	
Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Essay on Hyperides	187
Predrag Komatina	
The Kangar of <i>De administrando imperio</i> and the Hungarian-Bashkir Controversy	205
Tamás Mészáros	
France and the French from the Perspective of a 15 th -century Byzantine Historiographer.....	225
Bojana Pavlović	
Prophezeiungen und Träume im Geschichtswerk von Nikephoros Gregoras – Vorbemerkungen	237

Srđan Pirivatrić	
The <i>translatio</i> of the Relics of St John of Rila from Sofia to Esztergom and back.....	261
Márton Rózsa	
A Long Dispute about a Little Orchard. The Social Aspects of a Case from the Chartulary of the Monastery of Saint Paul on Mount Latros.....	279
Boris Stojkovski	
Remarks on the Serbian Foreign Policy in the Age of Despot Stefan Lazarević.....	293
Pál Szabó	
ὁ χρή πλείον τοῦ εἰκότος φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι – Edict of Manuel Komnenos Concerning the Right of Asylum (1166)	313
Iván Tóth	
Some Observations on Kritoboulos' Characterisation in the <i>Syngraphē Historiōn</i>	323
Vratislav Zervan	
Die Begegnung des heiligen Königs Ladislaus mit dem heiligen Sava. Rätselhaftes aus der russischen und moldauischen Chronistik des 15./16. Jahrhundert	339
Ábel Csigó – Viktor Rinkács – Keve Szász – Ábel Török	
<i>P.Vindob. G 40159</i> : A Cut out of a List of Payments from the Papyrus Collection of Vienna	355
Natasja Čičić	
Transcending Borders – Initiation of the Hero in the Epic Romance <i>Digenis Akrites</i>	365
Ábel Török	
A Byzantine Epic in the Chronicle of Morea The Heroic Deeds of sir Geoffroy de Briel.....	375

László Horváth

Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Essay on Hyperides*

From the Augustan Age and the first century A.D., when a major shift in aesthetic values occurred almost universally, apart from the work of Demetrius, we have only the works of two significant critics on contemporary rhetorical standards and thus on previous rhetoricians including Hyperides; the rhetorical treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the work of Ps. Longinus entitled 'On the Sublime'. Hyperides' renown was continuously high among later Greek, especially Rhodian rhetoricians, whose influence seems to explain his 'popularity' in first-century Rome, both B.C. and A.D.¹ However, the model represented by him from the second century onwards gradually lost its attractiveness and eventually became a mere curiosity. The roots of this later development can be observed even in the changing evaluation in Cicero, but ultimately they have to be traced back to the rising classicism of the Augustan Age, with its primary interests in Demosthenes as 'the orator'. Traditionally Dionysius is regarded as the father and inaugurator of this 'new' Augustan rhetorical classicism, i.e., Atticism. Moreover, he seems to be responsible for the rising and eventually overwhelming cult of Demosthenes.²

In this paper I focus on Hyperides' place in the Dionysian system, which seems to represent the negative turning point in his 'Nachleben'. I shall

* This paper is the extended version of the relevant chapter of my unpublished doctoral dissertation. My research was supported by NKFIH NN 124539 (Textual Criticism in the Interpretation of Social Context: Byzantium and Beyond).

¹ Cf. HORVÁTH, L., *The Nachleben of Hypereides*. (PhD Thesis) London 1997. esp. 106–138.

² HIDBER, T., *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass. Die Praefatio zu De Oratoribus veteribus*. Stuttgart – Leipzig 1996. highlights the different character of Roman "New Atticists" and of the Greek trends. WISSE, J., *Greeks, Romans and the Rise of Atticism*. In: ABBENES, J. G. J. – SLINGS, S. R. – SLUITER, I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*. Amsterdam 1995, 65–82 convincingly demonstrates that Dionysius' claim is true: the Atticism emerging in Greek literature was due to Roman influences. See also O'SULLIVAN, N., *Caecilius, the 'Canons' of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism*. In: DOMINIK, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London 1997, 32–49.

address basically two questions: 1. Did Dionysius keep his promises to write an independent treatise on Hyperides' style or not? 2. Which are the main characteristics attributed by him to the Hyperidean style and what is their relative importance in comparison with other orators? Some aspects of the answer to this latter question will perhaps help to solve the previous one too.³

Dionysius as a teacher realised the urgent need of practical advice for students and, therefore, instead of vague exultation over the long desired change in rhetorical values (i.e. from Asianism – to [Roman] Atticism cf. D.H. *Orat. Vett.* 4.9-14), he decided to present all the valuable models for imitation, since this was the only way of achieving skills in rhetoric in his consideration:

τίνες εἰσὶν ἀξιολογώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προαιρέσεις τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τί παρ' ἐκάστου δεῖ λαμβάνειν ἢ φυλάττεσθαι, καλὰ θεωρήματα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τὴν πολιτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ οὐ δῆπου μὰ Δία κοινὰ οὐδὲ κατημαξευμένα τοῖς πρότερον.

Who are the most important of the ancient orators and historians? What manner of life and style of writing did they adopt? Which characteristics of each of them should we imitate, and which should we avoid? These are worthy subjects, which students of political thought must examine, yet they have certainly not become commonplace or hackneyed through the attentions of earlier writers.⁴

The space is limited and therefore he promises to speak only about the most elegant orators (χαριεστάτους) in a chronological sequence (κατὰ τὰς ἡλικίας) – there is no implication about inventors and perfectors – and afterwards perhaps (ἐὰν δὲ ἐγχωρῆ) about historians too. And here we have his first specific promise about a Hyperidean treatise:

ἔσονται δὲ οἱ παραλαμβανόμενοι ῥήτορες τρεῖς μὲν ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, Λυσίας Ἰσοκράτης Ἰσαῖος, τρεῖς δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐπακμασάντων τούτοις, Δημοσθένης Ὑπερείδης Αἰσχίνης, οὓς ἐγὼ τῶν ἄλλων ἡγοῦμαι

³ For further surveys of Dionysius' literary criticism, which are not referred to below cf. KINDSTRAND, J. F., *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity*. Uppsala 1982, 30. n. 52.

⁴ Translated by Stephen Usher (as is any other quotation from Dionysius): USHER, ST., *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, The Critical Essays in Two Volumes*. I. Cambridge Mass. – London 1974.

κρατίστους, καὶ διαιερέθῃσεται μὲν εἰς δύο συντάξεις ἡ πραγματεία, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ ταύτης λήψεται τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων γραφείσης.

The orators to be compared will be three from the earlier generation, Lysias, Isocrates and Isaeus, and three from those who flourished after these, Demosthenes, Hyperides and Aeschines. These I consider to be the best orators. My work will be divided into two sections, the first dealing with the older orators.⁵

His promise is repeated at the very end of the first section:

ἐτέραν δὲ ἀρχὴν ποιήσομαι τοῦ λόγου περὶ τε Δημοσθένους καὶ Ὑπερείδου καὶ τρίτου λέγων Αἰσχίνου. ἡ γὰρ δὴ τελειοτάτη ῥητορικὴ καὶ τὸ κράτος τῶν ἐναγωνίων λόγων ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἔοικεν εἶναι.

I shall make a fresh start to my treatise, dealing with Demosthenes and Hyperides, and thirdly with Aeschines: for it was probably in these men that oratory reached its highest point of perfection, and forensic eloquence found its best exponents.⁶

However, the second book of the *De antiquis oratoribus* in the Usener-Radermacher edition contains only a treatise on Demosthenes and some fragments about the Aeschinean style collected from scholia. The shadow of an early Hyperidean *damnatio memoriae* has robbed us completely of the Dionysian essay, but did it really undergo the same fate as the Hyperidean oeuvre itself (i.e. that despite Dionysius fulfilling his promise, his writing was lost), or was it never written? Did he really become so insignificant in Dionysius' eye in comparison with Lysias and Demosthenes that he simply neglected him, so that Wilamowitz's more or less ex cathedra statement is right: "Who reads through Dionysius' work will obviously understand that he never wrote about Hyperides..."⁷ A long debate has developed about the question and scholars interpret the same evidence differently. A detailed presentation of the history

⁵ *Orat. Vett.* 4,28–35.

⁶ *Is.* 20,37–41.

⁷ VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFE, U., *Lesefrüchte. Hermes* 34 (1899) 626. „Hyperides aber lag dem Dionys dauernd fern.“

of research is given by van Wyk Cronjé.⁸ Without explaining in detail each proposed alternative, I will only refer to particular points of importance.

Still within Dionysius' oeuvre there is another crucial remark. In his essay on Dinarchus, he explains why he has not written about this minor orator in his previous books:

Περὶ Δεινάρχου τοῦ ῥήτορος οὐδὲν εἰρηκῶς ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφεῖσιν διὰ τὸ μῆτε εὐρετὴν ἰδίου γεγονέναι χαρακτήρος τὸν ἄνδρα, ὥσπερ τὸν Λυσίαν καὶ τὸν Ἴσοκράτην καὶ τὸν Ἰσαῖον, μῆτε τῶν εὐρημένων ἑτέροις τελειωτῆν, ὥσπερ τὸν Δημοσθένη καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην καὶ τὸν Ὑπερείδην ἡμεῖς κρίνομεν.

I said nothing about the orator Dinarchus in my writings on the ancient orators because he was neither the inventor of an individual style, as were Lysias, Isocrates and Isaeus, nor the perfecter of styles which others had invented, as I judge Demosthenes, Aeschines and Hyperides to have been.⁹

At first glance, this statement implies that – as opposed to Dinarchus – he did write about all the others.¹⁰ However, there arose some considerable doubts following the suggestions of Kalinka and the scepticism of other scholars.¹¹ Kalinka rather vaguely suggests that the aorist participle γραφεῖσιν refers only to the completed treatises on the first three orators, as if the expression περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων only covered the first generation and not all his Attic predecessors in Dionysius' terminology. So, the work on the first three was done, but on the other hand the κρίνομεν ('I judge') with its present tense means that the second book was only a plan. Moreover, the altered sequence in the mention of the three later rhetoricians (Demosthenes, Aeschines, Hyperides,

⁸ VAN WYK CRONJÉ, J., *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: De Demosthene: A Critical Appraisal of the Status Quaestionis*. Hildesheim 1986, 63–92; and HURST, A., Un critique grec dans la Rome d'Auguste: Denys d'Halicarnasse. *ANRW* II.30.1 (1982) 839–865. More recently: DE JONGE, C. C., *Between Grammar and Rhetoric. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Leiden – Boston 2008, 21ff.

⁹ *Din.* 1,1–6.

¹⁰ Cf. TUKEY, R. H., The Composition of the *De Oratoribus Antiquis* of Dionysius. *CPh* 4 (1909) 391.

¹¹ KALINKA, E., Die Arbeitsweise des Rhetors Dionys. I. *WS* 43 (1924) 159; RADERMACHER, L., Dionysios. *RE* V (1903) col. 965; BONNER, S. F., *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Study in the Development of Critical Method*. Cambridge 1939, 30.

instead of the 'original' in *Orat. Vett.* 4,31–32 and *Is.* 20,38–39: Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aeschines) is claimed to show that Dionysius did not have the essays in a fixed and completed form.¹² This latter suggestion might be thought to have a certain strength, but if we consider the generality of the context, these arguments lose their force.¹³

On the other hand, another piece of evidence in favour of a completed Hyperidean essay was discovered by Blass. In the anonymous commentary on Hermogenes' *περὶ ἰδεῶν*, he found the following sentence:

Τὸν Ἄλικαρνασσέα λέγει Διονύσιον, ὃς περὶ χαρακτήρος διέλαβε Λυσίου, Δημοσθένους, Ἰσοκράτους, Ὑπερίδου, Θουκυδίδου.

He speaks about Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who dealt with the styles of Lysias, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Hyperides and Thucydides.¹⁴

The value of this locus was questioned by Wilamowitz and Kalinka because of the author's obscurity.¹⁵

And finally, scholars arguing for the former existence of the treatise highlight that Dionysius' critical remarks on Hyperides' style (see below) give a strong impression that he must have dealt with the orator, though to what extent is questionable. The general characteristics of these comments in the *De Dinarcho* could certainly correspond to those about Lysias and Isocrates in the *De Demosthene*¹⁶ and so they too could be the echo of a more detailed and independent work, in this case devoted to Hyperides. Of course there is

¹² KALINKA (n. 11) 160; cf. GUDEMAN, A., *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus*. Leipzig – Berlin 1914², 382.

¹³ Cf. VAN WYK CRONJÉ (n. 8) 67.

¹⁴ WALZ, CHR., *Rhetores Graeci*. VII. Stuttgartiae – Tubingae – Londini – Lutetiae 1834, 1048.

¹⁵ KALINKA (n. 11) 159; BLASS, F., *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptis rhetoricis*. Bonn 1863, 11. Another recurrent argument against the existence of the treatises is the hurry and lack of time to which Dionysius often refers. This point certainly does not have any convincing force in itself. Nor is this valid in the case of the final sentence of the *De Demosthene* 58. (the opening essay of the second section) where Dionysius promises to write about the πραγματικός τόπος on a later occasion, namely: ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς γραφισομένοις ἀποδώσομέν σοι τὸν λόγον. To conclude from this statement that he had planned but never fulfilled the Hyperidean and Aeschinean treatises, since not even the second Demosthenic work was completed in time, is not justified: cf. KALINKA (n. 11) 159–160.

¹⁶ They are very often repeated without mentioning their previous occurrence. See *De Demosthene* passim.

no objective evidence.¹⁷ To try to reconstruct from these remarks the structure of a lost Hyperidean essay is merely a vain and unnecessary speculation.¹⁸

At this point, having surveyed the arguments for and against, it would be fruitless to go further, since any attempt to give a decisive answer would not surpass the level of a subjective hypothesis. If, however, we enumerate those aspects of Dionysius' stylistic analysis which he repeatedly mentions in his extant works on oratory, and compare them with his sporadic remarks on Hyperides' style, there could be a further argument, a kind of indirect evidence, which would perhaps bring some contribution to the dead-locked debate.

In Dionysius' estimation, Hyperides represented without any doubt the so-called plain style, which was introduced and basically developed by Lysias. In accordance with this principle, the majority of the stylistic observations on Hyperides – wherever the opportunity arises – are paralleled with the similar qualities of Lysias. From all these comparisons, two things are generally apparent. First, Dionysius considered Lysias better than Hyperides – not to say the best – in the strict sense of stylistic technique, linguistic expression (λεκτικὸς τόπος) within the bounds of the plain style. Second, however, the main virtue of the Hyperidean style lay in the arrangement of the subject matter, the treatment and arrangement of the content (πραγματικὸς τόπος), this constituting the element in Hyperides worthy of imitation. All the three 'lengthy' Dionysian statements give this same impression.¹⁹

Lysias' weakness in arrangement is of course especially discussed in its place, i.e. in the essay on him.²⁰ Outside of the framework of the essay on Lysias, however, where the analysis of Lysias is not foregrounded, it transpires that the virtues of Hyperides' and Lysias' styles – by accident or on purpose – seem to supplement the shortcomings of their respective counterparts and so create an ideal 'joint-model' for the plain style. In any case, in *Din.* 6,9–20 Dionysius suggests as the only appropriate method for separating the real and spurious speeches of Dinarchus a clarification of the main characteristics of his three models, Demosthenes, Lysias and Hyperides:

¹⁷ Cf. KALINKA (n. 11) 158.

¹⁸ Cfr. TUKEY (n. 10) 393, who undertook exactly this.

¹⁹ *Din.* 5,6–14, 6,1–20 and 7,1–18, as well as *Imit.* 31,5,6. In content, Dionysius deems Lysias to have been transcended by Isocrates, Isaeus, and Demosthenes, which he corroborates with extensive evidence in his treatise on these orators.

²⁰ *Lys.* 15.

ἄλλων ῥητόρων, οὓς μεμίμηται, μεγίστη γνώσις ἢ ὁμοιείδεια τῶν λόγων. αὐτίκα ὁ μὲν Λυσίας ἔν τε τοῖς ἰδίοις καὶ τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀγῶσιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ὁμολογούμενός ἐστιν εἰς δὲ τὸν λεκτικὸν τόπον κατὰ τῆν τῶν ὀνομάτων σαφήνειαν καὶ σύνθεσιν αὐτοφυῆ μὲν καὶ λείαν εἶναι δοκοῦσαν, παντὸς δὲ λόγου κατὰ τῆν ἡδονὴν διαφέρουσαν. ὁ δ' Ὑπερείδης κατὰ μὲν τῆν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἡττᾶται Λυσίου, κατὰ δὲ τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον διαφέρει. διηγεῖται δὲ πολλαχῶς, ποτὲ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν πορευόμενος. πιστοῦται τε οὐ κατ' ἐνθύμημα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' ἐπιχείρημα πλατύνων.

For in the case of the other orators whom he imitates (sc. Dinarchus), the most effective means of recognition is the uniformity of their speeches. For example, Lysias shows self-consistency in both his private and his public speeches and in respect of diction, the lucidity of his language, the apparent naturalness and smoothness of his composition, which, however is pleasing beyond all description. Hyperides on the other hand, is inferior to Lysias in his choice of words, but superior in his treatment of subject-matter. He composes his narrative in a variety of ways, proceeding sometimes according to the natural order of events, at other times from the end to the beginning. In his proofs he not only uses the enthymeme, but also expatiates by means of the epichireme.

As opposed to the latter feature of Hyperides' style, Lysias resorted most frequently to the terse enthymeme, although he is not characterised by a varied application of figures to such purposes.²¹ He ascertains the same in the previous chapter as well.

τοῦ δ' Ὑπερείδειου ταῖς τε οἰκονομίαις ἀκριβεστέρου καὶ ταῖς κατασκευαῖς γενναιότερου πως ὄντος τῶν Λυσιακῶν

²¹ *Lys.* 15. In the analysis of Lysias' style, several signs hint that Dionysius followed a peripatetic tradition, whose influence would gradually fade. Cf. WOOTEN, C. W., *The Peripatetic Tradition in the Literary Essays of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. In: FORTENBAUGH, W. W. – MIRHARDY, C. (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*. (RUSCH 6) New Brunswick 1994, 121–130. It can be demonstrated that in antique literature, Dionysius was the first to differentiate between *enthymeme* (rhetorical syllogism or logical deduction) and *epichireme*, although it is unlikely that he should have been the originator of the distinction. Cf. *Is.* 16. Dionysius discusses the difference between Isaeus and Lysias in this area. Cf. USHER (n. 4) 212–213, note 2, and LAUSBERG, H., *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*. Leiden 1998, 168–70.

of the Hyperidean, which is more precise in its arrangement and somehow nobler in its artistry than that of Lysias.²²

Similarly, further on, in *Din.* 7,11–16, Dionysius emphasises Hyperides' skills in the arrangement of the subject matter:

ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ὑπερείδου· ἐὰν τῆς μὲν λέξεως τὸ ἰσχυρόν, τῆς δὲ συνθέσεως τὸ ἀπλοῦν, τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων τὸ εὐκαιρον, τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς τὸ μὴ τραγικὸν μηδὲ ὀγκῶδες ἔχη (ταῦτα γὰρ μέγιστα ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιά ἐστίν), Ὑπερείδου λεγέτω.

The same applies to the speeches of Hyperides [i.e. examining the authenticity of the speeches preserved under the name of Dinarchus]: they contain his forcefulness of diction, his simplicity of composition and his effective timing in the treatment of subject-matter, and there is no melodramatic or bombastic artificiality (for these are that orator's most important characteristics), let him assert that these are by Hyperides.

The most extensive characterization comes in *De Imitatione*:

Ὁ δὲ Ὑπερείδης εὐστοχος μὲν, σπάνιον δ' αὐξητικός· καὶ τῇ μὲν τῆς φράσεως κατασκευῇ Λυσίαν ὑπερηρκώς, τῇ δὲ τῆς εὐρέσεως πανουργία πάντας, ἔτι δὲ τοῦ κρινομένου διὰ παντὸς ἔχεται, καὶ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις τοῦ πράγματος προσπέφυκεν, καὶ συνέσει πολλῇ κεχορήγηται, καὶ χάριτος μεστός ἐστι· καὶ δοκῶν ἀπλοῦς οὐκ ἀπήλλακται δεινότητος. τούτου ζηλωτέον μάλιστα τῶν διηγήσεων τὸ λεπτόν καὶ σύμμετρον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐφόδους, ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα βαδίζει.

Hyperides [always] hits the nail on the head, also applying magnification sometimes; with his poignant figures, he outdoes Lysias, and with the cunning selection of arguments, he outdoes everybody. In addition, he always has the essence before his eyes, he aptly recognizes the absolutely necessary elements of argumentation, he finds the place for everything with an acute mind, and he is witty; and although he makes the impression of simplicity, he does not lack rhetorical power. Let us

²² *Din.* 5,11–14.

mostly aspire to follow the subtle internal proportion of his narrations, and the way he introduces his matter.²³

From the extant treatises by Dionysius on orators, peculiar proportions characterize the treatment of linguistic expression and the handling of content. In his essay on Lysias, the examination of linguistic expression dominates by far, which may be explained by the opinion Dionysius voiced repeatedly to the effect that this was Lysias' greatest strength. In the essay on Isocrates, the proportion is reversed, favouring content. Dionysius is particularly appreciative of Isocrates' elevated themes, while his analysis is governed less by stylistic considerations and more by his enthusiasm for Isocrates' rhetorical principles and his related teaching activities. Dionysius considered Isocrates a model of sorts in terms of oratorical training targeting political wisdom as well.²⁴ The treatise on Isaeus also analyses the excellence of the orator in managing the content, which Dionysius demonstrates through the examination of excerpts from Lysias and Isaeus.

τὸν δὲ δὴ τρίτον Ἰσαῖον εἴ τις ἔροίτο με τίνος ἔνεκα προσεθέμην, Λυσίου δὴ ζηλωτὴν ὄντα, ταύτην ἂν αὐτῷ φαίην τὴν αἰτίαν, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τῆς Δημοσοθένους δεινότητος, ἣν οὐθείς ἐστὶν ὃς οὐ τελειοτάτην ἀπασῶν οἴεται γενέσθαι, τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ παρασχέιν.

As for the third orator, Isaeus, if anyone were to ask why I have included him, since he is an imitator of Lysias, I should give as my reason that it is in him that we find the seeds and the beginnings of the genius of Demosthenes, which everyone agrees to be oratory in its most perfect form.²⁵

After analysing the styles of the first three orators (first book or section), the treatise on Demosthenes came next in Dionysius' oeuvre chronologically.²⁶ In keeping with the projected structure of *On the Ancient Orators* (*Orat. Vett.*), Demosthenes' analysis came first in the second section. Although this is the only extant treatise from this second unit, it is a telling fact that the

²³ *Imit.* 31,5,6. (translation by LH).

²⁴ Cf. HUBBELL, H. M., *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides*. New Haven 1913, 41–53.

²⁵ *Is.* 20,26–32.

²⁶ Cf. USHER (n. 4) I. XXIII–XXIV.

volume of *De Demosthene* is approximately the same as the that of the three treatises in the first book taken together. It was in Demosthenes that Dionysius found the perfect orator that boasted of all the excellences of his precursors while eliminating their flaws. Somewhat exaggeratedly, his oratorical analyses helped Dionysius find the model making the thorough examination of other orators eventually redundant.²⁷ From the point of view of the simple style and Hyperides, chapter 13 is of special importance. It is here that Dionysius establishes that Demosthenes surpassed Lysias, who was nearly unbeatable in linguistic expression, not only in content, but also on his home ground. Demosthenes, if needed, can deploy the entire arsenal of the simple style with supple virtuosity, in a matchless way. Nevertheless, Dionysius admits himself that he has failed completely to analyse Demosthenes' style. In his last sentence, he says farewell to the reader thus:

ἐὰν δὲ σῶζῃ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἡμᾶς, καὶ περὶ τῆς πραγματικῆς αὐτοῦ δεινότητος, ἔτι μείζονος ἢ τοῦδε καὶ θαυμαστοτέρου θεωρήματος, ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς γραφησομένοις ἀποδώσομέν σοι τὸν λόγον.

If god preserves me, I shall present you in a subsequent treatise with an even longer and more remarkable account than this of his genius in the treatment of the subject-matter.²⁸

Such a treatise, however, we have none. The reason may have been shortage of time as well as didactic purposes behind Dionysius' decision.

For at the same time as composing the monumental treatise dedicated to Demosthenes' linguistic expression, Dionysius was also working on another piece.²⁹ In his introduction to *On Literary Composition* (περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων), he clearly formulates his pedagogic objectives and the subordinate tasks of stylistic analysis.

The introduction is addressed to the son of his friend, who at the same time happened to be his pupil as is revealed by a casual remark; ἐν ταῖς καθ' ἡμέραν γυμνασίαις ('in the daily exercises'). Dionysius promises nothing less than making

²⁷ The shift in Dionysius' perception is foregrounded in DAMON, C., *Aesthetic Response and Technical Analysis in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. *MH* 48 (1991) 33–58.

²⁸ *Dem.* 58.

²⁹ Cf. USHER (n. 4) I. XXIII–XXIV.

up in actual discussion for whatever was left out of this work – meaning examples in the first place.³⁰ The boy probably represents the same age-group which Dionysius supposedly had been teaching in his school, or at least some of those who were targeted by his rhetorical education. So, the programme outlined in the introduction, though it cannot be proved, could very possibly be valid both for the main aims of his rhetorical teaching and for his critical efforts, which went hand in hand with this practical purpose.³¹ Metilius Rufus was presented with this work on his birthday at the threshold of his coming of age. He must have been about seventeen. Dionysius considers his essay useful for everyone and promises

μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς μειρακίοις τε καὶ νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἀπτομένοις ὑμῖν, ὦ Ροῦφε Μετίλιε πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ κάμοι τιμιωτάτου φίλων. Διττῆς γὰρ οὐσης ἀσκήσεως περὶ πάντας ὡς εἰπέιν τοὺς λόγους, τῆς περὶ τὰ νοήματα καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα, ὧν ἡ μὲν τοῦ πραγματικοῦ τόπου μᾶλλον ἐφάπτεσθαι δόξειεν ἄν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ λεκτικοῦ, καὶ πάντων ὅσοι τοῦ λέγειν εὖ στοχάζονται περὶ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς θεωρίας τοῦ λόγου ταύτας σπουδαζόντων ἐξ ἴσου, ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις φρόνησιν ἄγουσα ἡμᾶς ἐπιστήμη βραδεῖά ἐστι καὶ χαλεπὴ νέοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀδύνατος εἰς ἀγενεῖων καὶ μειρακίων πεσεῖν ἡλικίαν· ἀκμαζούσης γὰρ ἡδὴ συνέσεώς ἐστι καὶ πολιαῖς κατηρτυμένης ἡλικίας [ἡ τούτων κατάληψις] οἰκειότερα, πολλῇ μὲν ἱστορία λόγων τε καὶ ἔργων, πολλῇ δὲ πείρα καὶ συμφορᾷ παθῶν οἰκείων τε καὶ ἀλλοτρίων συναυξομένη· τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς λέξεις φιλόκαλον καὶ ταῖς νεαραῖς πέφυκε συνανθεῖν ἡλικίαις. ἐπτόηται γὰρ ἅπαντα νέου ψυχῆ περὶ τὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὠραϊσμόν, ἀλόγους τινὰς καὶ ὡς περ ἐνθουσιώδεις ἐπὶ τοῦτο λαμβάνουσα τὰς ὁρμάς· ... εἰς δὴ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ὃ δεῖ πρῶτον νέοις ἀσκεῖσθαι, 'συμβάλλομαί σοι μέλος εἰς ἔρωτα' ... ἐὰν δ' ἐγγένηταί μοι σχολή, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἑτέραν ἐξοίσω σοι γραφήν, ἵνα τὸν λεκτικὸν τόπον τελείως ἐξεργασμένον ἔχης.

but particularly necessary to young men who are just beginning to take up the study, like yourself, Rufius Metilius, whose father is my most

³⁰ *De Comp.* 20,125–130.

³¹ See INNES, D. C., *Augustan Critics*. In: KENNEDY, G. A. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. I: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge 1989, 267. and DE JONGE (n. 8) 24: „However, it is clear that both literary criticism and the other language disciplines that Dionysius applies are always subservient to his rhetorical teaching: literary criticism is subsidiary to the production of texts.”

esteemed friend. In virtually all kinds of discourse two things require study; the ideas and the words. We may regard the first of these as concerned chiefly with subject-matter, and the latter with expression; and all those who aim to become good orators pay close attention to both these aspects of discourse equally. But the knowledge which guides us towards the selection and judicious management of our material is attained slowly and with difficulty by the young; indeed, it cannot be acquired by beardless boys. Understanding of these things belongs rather to a mature intelligence and to an age disciplined by grey hairs – an age whose powers are constantly being augmented by examination of discourses and of actions, and by many experiences of its own and of sharing in the fortunes of others. But the love of fine literature flowers no less naturally in the days of youth than in later life, for all young minds are excited by fresh beauty of expression, and are attracted towards it by feelings which are instinctive and akin to inspiration ... So it is to supply this latter faculty, the first to which the young should apply themselves, that... ‘for the sake of love I offer you a song’.. If I am granted the time, I shall produce another book for you, on the choice of words, in order that you may have a complete treatment of the subject of style.³²

Thus, there were aspects neither of principle, nor of pedagogy that would lead Dionysius thoroughly to treat of Hyperides’ style. On the one hand, his rhetorical analyses concluded that from the point of view of the Attic model, Demosthenes’ speeches meet all the criteria; on the other, the age-group he probably taught would primarily study the area of linguistic expression (λεκτικὸς τόπος) in the introductory phase of rhetorical training. Hyperides, a representative of the simple style, however, as it transpires from Dionysius’ sporadic remarks, was less strong precisely in this, while excelling in content (πραγματικὸς τόπος). In *On Literary Composition*, not even Lysias, let alone Hyperides, features among the references made predominantly to Demosthenes. Had Dionysius fully kept his various promises, I believe the first item on the list of lost works would be an independent essay on the selection of words or on Demosthenes’ treatment of content. But Dionysius, presumably following his own historiographic interests, embarked on an analysis of Thucydides’ style.³³ From Hyperides’ point of view, it would be of particular

³² *Comp.* 1,15–50, with omissions.

³³ In his examination of the historiographers, Dionysius pays special attention to questions

interest how far Dionysius considered him an example in *πραγματικὸς τόπος* in his work *On Figures*. This work has been lost, but it was very influential in the antique world.³⁴ Ultimately, I believe we may agree with Wilamowitz's summary opinion: if we read through Dionysius' writings attentively, we may be convinced that he never authored a separate treatise on Hyperides' style.

*

Among the undoubtedly elusive concepts of Dionysius' literary criticism, two terms related to Hyperides deserve closer inspection, as they may help us come closer to their exact semantic extent and thus gain appropriate additions to the characterization of Hyperides' style.³⁵

He is inferior to Lysias in choice of words: *κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἡττᾶται Λυσίου*.³⁶ It is very uncertain what is meant by this exactly. Dionysius praises Lysias for using everyday language,

ποιητὴς κράτιστος λόγων, λελυμένης ἐκ τοῦ μέτρου λέξεως ἰδίαν τινα [λόγων] εὐρηκῶς ἀρμονίαν, ἧ τὰ δνόματα κοσμεῖ τε καὶ ἡδύνει μηδὲν ἔχοντα ὀγκῶδες μηδὲ φορτικόν.

He is the most accomplished literary artist, who has invented a uniquely melodious style that is yet free from metre, in which he makes his language beautiful and attractive without bombast or vulgarity.³⁷

of structure. Cf. HEATH, M., Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Imitation. *Hermes* 117 (1989) 370–373.

³⁴ Quint. *Inst. Or.* 9,3,89.

³⁵ For a study addressing the exact meaning of Dionysius' terminology see GEIGENMÜLLER, P., *Quaestiones Dionysianae de vocabulis artis criticae*. Lipsiae 1908. Cf. WOOTEN, C. W., Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the Style of Demosthenes. *AJP* 110 (1989) 586; SCHENKEVELD, D. M., Theories of Evaluation in the Rhetorical Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In: LAIRD, A. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*. (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies) Oxford 2006, 299 [= SCHENKEVELD, D. M., Theories of Evaluation in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *MphL* 1 (1975) 107] perceives a complete lack of consistent terminology in Dionysius: "he may well seem to operate within a coherent system, but in reality he discusses isolated aspects of a rather vaguely defined whole: he appears to lack a consistent view of the foundations of his literary criticism." DAMON, 58, concludes that Dionysius' literary critical approaches are consistent but rudimentary: "Dionysius' critical system is not inconsistent, only incomplete." DAMON argues that Dionysius was continually refining his system, while SHENKEVELD, 69, connects the expansion of his knowledge with his stay in Rome.

³⁶ *Din.* 6,15.

³⁷ *Lys.* 3,37–41.

No other orator could ever surpass him in ‘force and power while using only standard and ordinary words’ (ἐν ὀνόμασι κυρίοις καὶ κοινοῖς). Irrespective of Lysias’ special capacity to bring harmony into a seemingly ordinary conversation the point from the Hyperidean perspective is perhaps that his words were neither ‘puffed up, bombastic’ nor ‘vulgar, low’. Hyperides belongs to the same category as Lysias, but he was inferior to him, so he must have failed in one of these two aspects. Scarcely, however, by being bombastic, as a general remark on his artistic treatment also suggests: τῆς κατασκευῆς τὸ μὴ τραγικὸν μῆδε ὀγκῶδες (*Din.* 7,14). But perhaps by his inclination to apply expressions from ordinary usage with a more than necessary audacity, a kind of phraseological extravagance or vulgarity, which puzzled the lexicographers of the ‘real Attic’ so much.

Hyperides shows a proper sense of timing in subject-matter – τῶν πραγμάτων τε εὐκαιρον (*Din.* 7,12). Dionysius mostly uses the expression for a virtue with the general meaning of changes for necessary variety, which is an essential component of good prose,³⁸ and once for Lysias’ well-placed, ‘apt sayings’ γνῶμαι εὐκαιροί.³⁹ However, in the case of Hyperides’ style, it is introduced to describe a strategic quality, i.e. the placing of ideas and actual parts of the speech effectively, which incorporates variety, too. This meaning is evident from the form εὐκαιρία in *Dem.* 42,4. Dionysius excuses himself for not scrutinising more a certain subject, but he cannot delay any more, and in his essay he has to avoid ‘the charge of lacking a sense of proportion’ – δόξαν ὑφορώμενος ἀκαιρίας. This latter virtue is complemented by another, which is described as ταῖς οἰκονομίαις ἀκριβέστερος (sc. than Lysias). Οἰκονομία could mean the proper balance between particular parts within the whole speech and imply that he was more conscious in preserving it and did not forget their sequence or importance. Lysias was somehow liberal and not taking pains (easy-going) in his arrangement ἀπέριττός τις ἐλευθέριός τε καὶ ἀπόνηρος οἰκονομήσαι,⁴⁰ and this is one of the points which Dionysius cannot approve and recommend for imitation; ‘they should draw these elements from certain other orators who were his superiors (οἱ κρείττους οἰκονομήσαι ... ἐγένοντο) in the arrangement

³⁸ *Comp.* 11; 12,19 passim.

³⁹ *Lys.* 17,122.

⁴⁰ *Lys.* 15,26–27. According to GRUBE, G. M. A., Thrasymachus, Theophrastus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *AJP* 73 (1952) 260, n. 13, ‘oikonomia’ here rather refers to the less effective elaboration of ideas and the limited use of figures, contrary to the earlier expressed view in chapter 6 of the same treatise.

of the material they have invented. I shall speak of these later.⁴¹ The notion that he was also thinking of Hyperides at this point cannot be dismissed. In any case, ἀκρίβεια is attributed to the less effective though well-balanced orators by Aristotle;⁴² it does not, however, apply completely to Hyperides' case, but defines further the rhetorical meaning of the word.

⁴¹ *Lys.* 15,32–33.

⁴² GEIGENMÜLLER (n. 35) 21.

Bibliography

Sources

- GUDEMAN, A., *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus*. Leipzig – Berlin 1914²
- USHER, ST., *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, The Critical Essays in Two Volumes*. I. Cambridge Mass. – London 1974.
- WALZ, CHR., *Rhetores Graeci*. VII. Stuttgartiae – Tubingae – Londini – Lutetiae 1834.

Literature

- BLASS, F., *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptis rhetoricis*. Bonn 1863.
- BONNER, S. F., *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Study in the Development of Critical Method*. Cambridge 1939.
- DAMON, C., Aesthetic Response and Technical Analysis in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *MH* 48 (1991) 33–58.
- DE JONGE, C. C., *Between Grammar and Rhetoric. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Leiden – Boston 2008.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004166776.i-456>
- GEIGENMÜLLER, P., *Quaestiones Dionysianae de vocabulis artis criticae*. Lipsiae 1908.
- GRUBE, G. M. A., Thrasymachus, Theophrastus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *AJP* 73 (1952) 251–267.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/292136>
- HEATH, M., Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Imitation. *Hermes* 117 (1989) 370–373.
- HIDBER, T., *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass. Die Praefatio zu De Oratoribus veteribus*. Stuttgart – Leipzig 1996.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110958096>
- HORVÁTH, L., *The Nachleben of Hypereides*. (PhD Thesis) London 1997.
- HUBBELL, H. M., *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides*. New Haven 1913.
- HURST, A., Un critique grec dans la Rome d'Auguste: Denys d'Halicarnasse. *ANRW* II.30.1 (1982) 839–865.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110844108-020>
- INNES, D. C., Augustan Critics. In: KENNEDY, G. A. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. I: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge 1989, 245–273.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521300063.009>
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521300063>

- KALINKA, E., Die Arbeitsweise des Rhetors Dionys. I. *WS* 43 (1924) 157–168.
- KINDSTRAND, J. F., *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity*. Uppsala 1982.
- LAUSBERG, H., *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*. Leiden 1998.
- O'SULLIVAN, N., Caecilius, the 'Canons' of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism. In: DOMINIK, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London 1997, 32–49.
- RADERMACHER, L., Dionysios. *RE* V (1903) col. 965.
- SCHENKEVELD, D. M., Theories of Evaluation in the Rhetorical Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In: LAIRD, A. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*. (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies) Oxford 2006, 284–299.
- TUKEY, R. H., The Composition of the *De Oratoribus Antiquis* of Dionysius. *CPh* 4 (1909) 390–404.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/359326>
- VAN WYK CRONJÉ, J., *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: De Demosthene: A Critical Appraisal of the Status Quaestionis*. Hildesheim 1986.
- VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U., Lesefrüchte. *Hermes* 34 (1899) 601–639.
- WISSE, J., Greeks, Romans and the Rise of Atticism. In: ABBENES, J. G. J. – SLINGS, S. R. – SLUITER, I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*. Amsterdam 1995, 65–82.
- WOOTEN, C. W., Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the Style of Demosthenes. *AJP* 110 (1989) 576–588.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/295281>
- WOOTEN, C. W., The Peripatetic Tradition in the Literary Essays of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In: FORTENBAUGH, W. W. – MIRHARDY, C. (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*. (RUSCH 6) New Brunswick 1994, 121–130.

ANTIQUITAS • BYZANTIUM • RENASCENTIA

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Zoltán Farkas – László Horváth – Tamás Mészáros

ISSN: 2064-2369

I: Szepessy Tibor: *Bevezetés az ógörög verstanba*. Szerkesztette: Mayer Gyula. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-10-3. 266 p.

II: Kapitánffy István – Szepessy Tibor (szerk.): *Bevezetés az ógörög irodalom történetébe*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-08-0. 276 p.

III: Tóth Iván: *Alexandros Homérosa. Arrhianos-tanulmányok*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-03-5. 208 p.

IV: *Philologia Nostra. Bollók János összegyűjtött tanulmányai*. Szerkesztette: Mészáros Tamás. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-00-4. 516 p.

V: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland: Begegnungen zwischen Ost und West. Bibliotheca Byzantina 1*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-15-8. 375 p.

VI: Achilleus Tatiós: *Leukippé és Kleitophón története*. Fordította: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-27-1. 151 p.

VII: Szepessy Tibor (szerk.): *Római költők antológiája*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-25-7. 575 p.

VIII: Maywald József – Vayer Lajos – Mészáros Ede: *Görög nyelvtan*. Szerkesztette: Mayer Gyula. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-31-8. 333 p.

IX: Jacqueline de Romilly – Monique Trédé: *Az ógörög nyelv szelleme*. Fordította: Vargyas Brigitta. Szerkesztette: Horváth László. TypoteX Kiadó, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-963-2793-95-5. 135 p.

X: László Horváth (Hrsg.): *Investigatio Fontium. Griechische und lateinische Quellen mit Erläuterungen. Beiträge der Tagung Klassisches Altertum – Byzanz – Humanismus der XI. Ungarischen Konferenz für Altertumswissenschaft*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-33-2. 281 p.

XI: Horváth László: *Az új Hypereidés. Szövegkiadás, tanulmányok és magyarázatok*. TypoteX, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-963-2798-18-9. 301 p.

XII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland II. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 2*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-36-3. 257 p.

XIII: János Nagyillés – Attila Hajdú – Gergő Gellérfi – Anne Horn Baroody – Sam Baroody (eds.): *Sapiens Ubique Civis. Proceedings of the International Conference on Classical Studies (Szeged, Hungary, 2013)*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-40-0. 424 p.

XIV: Zsuzsanna Ötvös: „*Janus Pannonius's Vocabularium*”. *The Complex Analysis of the Ms. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-41-7. 354 p.

XV: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland III. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 3*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-44-8. 300 p.

XVI: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident II. Tradition, transmission, traduction*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-46-2. 236 p.

XVII: Ágnes Ludmann (ed.): *Mare nostrum. Studia Iberica, Italica, Graeca. Atti del convegno internazionale Byzanz und das Abendland – Byzance et l'Occident III (24-25 novembre 2014)*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-45-5. 186 p.

XVIII: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung II. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung II am 26. November 2014. (EC Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, I.II.)*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2015. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-47-9. 159 p.

XIX: Dión Chrysostomos: *Tróját nem vették be*. Fordította, előszóval és magyarázatokkal ellátta: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-55-4. 172 p.

XX: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Drei deutschsprachige Handschriften des Opusculum tripartitum des Johannes Gerson. Synoptische Ausgabe der Fassungen in den Codices StB Melk, Cod. 235, StB Melk, Cod. 570 und Innsbruck, ULB Tirol, Serv. I b 3. (Quelle und Deutung, EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. II.I.)*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2016. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-66-0. 331 p.

XXI: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland IV. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 4*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-68-4. 271 p.

XXII: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.): *Byzance et l'Occident III. Écrits et manuscrits*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-63-9. 333 p.

XXIII: Ágnes Ludmann (ed.): *Italia Nostra. Studi filologici italo-ungheresi*. Collegio Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-65-3. 275 p.

XXIV: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung III. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung III am 25. November 2015. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.III.)*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2016. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-67-7. 202 p.

XXV: Dora E. Solti (ed.): *Studia Hellenica*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-69-1. 132 p.

XXVI: Mészáros Tamás (szerk.): *Klasszikus ókor, Bizánc, humanizmus. A XII. Magyar Ókortudományi Konferencia előadásából.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-77-6. 189 p.

XXVII: Horváth László: *Középhaladó ógörög nyelvkönyv. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló I.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-75-2. 339 p.

XXVIII: Farkas Zoltán – Horváth László – Mayer Gyula: *Kezdő és haladó ógörög nyelvkönyv. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló II.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-83-7. 442 p.

XXIX: *Philologia Nostra II. Kapitánffy István válogatott tanulmányai.* Szerkesztette: Farkas Zoltán és Mészáros Tamás. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-78-3. 512 p.

XXX: László Horváth – Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Investigatio Fontium II. Griechische und lateinische Quellen mit Erläuterungen.* Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-76-9. 262 p.

XXXI: Philostratos: *A szofisták életrajzai.* Fordította és szerkesztette: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-86-8. 198 p.

XXXII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland V. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia.* ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-91-2. 196 p.

XXXIII: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung IV. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung IV am 23. November 2016. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.IV.)* ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2018. [ISSN 2064-969X] ISBN 978-615-5371-90-5. 256 p.

XXXIV: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident IV. Permanence et migration.* Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2018. ISBN : 978-615-5371-92-9. 280 p.

XXXV: Gellérfi Gergő: *Allúziós technika és műfaji hatások Iuvenalis szatíráiban*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-95-0. 276 p.

XXXVI: *Studia Hellenica II*. Horváth Endre válogatott tanulmányai. Szerkesztette: Horváth László – Nakos Konstantinos – Solti Dóra. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5897-07-8. 359 p.

XXXVII: Horváth László: *Az Öreg lovag*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5897-13-9. 266 p.

XXXVIII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland VI. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2019. ISBN: 978-615-5897-24-5. 278 p.

XXXIX: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung V. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung V am 19. April 2018. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.V.)*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2019. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5897-28-3. 227 p.

XL: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident V. Ianua Europae*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2019. ISBN: 978-615-5897-29-0. 230 p.

XLI: Alszászy Judit – Lina Basoucou – Solti Dóra: *Újgörög nyelvtan és gyakorlókönyv. Studia Hellenica III. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló III*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2021. ISBN: 978-615-5897-34-4. 462 p.

XLII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland VII. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2021. ISBN: 978-615-5897-43-6. 404 p.

Antiquitas – Byzantium – Renascentia (ABR – ISSN 2064-2369) ist eine unabhängige wissenschaftliche Publikationsreihe des Forschungszentrums für Byzantinistik am Eötvös-József-Collegium der ELTE Budapest. Die Reihe umfasst eine breite Palette von Sammelbänden, Monographien, Anthologien, Texteditionen und Handbüchern zur Erforschung des klassischen Altertums und der byzantinischen Welt sowie von deren Einflüssen auf die Kultur des Abendlandes.

Die Reihe wird vom ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium Budapest herausgegeben. Verantwortlicher Herausgeber der Reihe ist Collegiumsdirektor László Horváth.

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Zoltán Farkas (PPKE, Institut für Geschichtsforschung / ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

László Horváth (ELTE, Lehrstuhl für Griechische Sprache und Literatur / Eötvös-József-Collegium / ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Tamás Mészáros (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Bollók János-Seminar für Klassische Philologie)

Herausgeber der Sammelbände:

Emese Egedi-Kovács (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Aurélien-Sauvageot-Seminar)

Erika Juhász (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Ágnes Ludmann (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Seminar für Italianistik)

Balázs Sára (ELTEEC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik/ Germanistisches Seminar)

Dora E. Solti (ELTE, Lehrstuhl für Neogräzistik/ ELTEEC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Gemäß den Richtlinien für die professionelle Begutachtung wissenschaftlicher Publikationen werden die Herausgeber der mehrsprachigen Sammelbände der Reihe ab dem 1. Dezember 2016 von einem wissenschaftlichen Beirat unterstützt.

Mitglieder des beratenden Gremiums der Reihe:

Prof. Dr. László Borhy, KMUAW, Professor für römische Provinzarchäologie

Dr. Christine Glassner, Leiterin der Abteilung Schrift- und Buchwesen des Instituts für Mittelalterforschung der ÖAW

Univ.-Prof. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Hermann Harrauer, Hofrat Dir. i. R. der Papyrussammlung und des Papyruseums der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek

Prof. Dr. Ljubomir Maksimović, Direktor des Instituts für Byzantinische Studien der SASA

Gyula Mayer, PhD, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter, MTA–ELTE–PPKE Forschungszentrum für Klassisch-Philologische Studien

Dr. Srđan Pirivatrić, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter des Instituts für Byzantinische Studien der SASA

Dr. Filippo Ronconi, Professor, EHESS – Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales PSL – Paris Sciences et Lettres, Césor (Equipe byzantine), Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales du Religieux

Prof. Dr. Peter Schreiner, Professor i. R., Universität zu Köln

Prof. Dr. Renzo Tosi, Professor für Altgriechische Philologie und Italianistik an der Universität Alma Mater Studiorum – Bologna

Prof. Dr. Georgia Xanthaki-Karamanou, Professorin für Altgriechische Philologie an der Universität des Peloponnes