

THE CONTRIBUTION OF HUNGARY TO INTERNATIONAL CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

ZSIGMOND RITOÓK

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest,
Hungary

The contribution of Hungary to international classical scholarship is considerable and significant.¹ But where should I begin? Should I start with the Renaissance epoch when J. Megyericsey, or Mezerzius, prepared a collection of Roman inscriptions in Hungary for publishing at Aldus, which although not printed, was worthy of the praise of Mommsen?² Or should I begin with Matthaëus Fortunatus who edited Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones* better than the first editor Erasmus, as the latter himself acknowledged?³ Or perhaps I might introduce E. Ponori Thewrewk, who prepared a new edition of Festus, did not finish the work, but gave his whole material to D. Lindsay, contributing by this to the edition of the British scholar, which has remained the standard edition of this important work till now?⁴ This would be a survey in thirty minutes, but it would be unavoidably superficial. Or should I give a *bibliographie raisonnée* of certain topics treated by Hungarian scholars?⁵ This would be unavoidably boring. Thus I have chosen a third way. I want to bring into prominence a contribution that seems to be of principal significance, and to examine at least briefly, what practical consequences, if any, it had, i. e. what practical contributions resulted from it. Since the process of this contribution started at about the turn of the century, let me begin there.

Classical scholarship seemed to be flourishing toward the end of the nineteenth century. The excavations of Schliemann, Dörpfeld and others had unearthed an immense mass of archaeological objects, the remains of towns or important buildings, many inscriptions, almost countless papyri, which gave deep insight into the life of the Hellenistic world, or contained texts of works known till then only from scanty fragments, and many oriental writings were deciphered. To make a long story short, the material for our knowledge of antiquity increased astoundingly. This multifarious material was collected in series of learned handbooks and many-volumed encyclopedias, and in most countries periodicals of classical scholarship were started. Still, behind this splendour a crisis was maturing.

Classical scholarship as developed by German classicism at the end of the eighteenth century and the first part of the nineteenth had two characteristic fea-

tures. First, it aimed at a synoptic view of Greek and Roman antiquity, i. e. it strived to know classical culture as a whole, in its totality; and second, it was in close contact with the ideas and problems of its age. Its outlook was a definitely historical one, historicity being of one of the great discoveries of the Enlightenment.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, however, due to the enormous increment of the material, the synoptic view was lost. It crumbled into detail-studies, and the special branches of scholarship made themselves independent. Handbook-series and monumental encyclopedias were necessary just in order to sum up, to tie up, as it were, the disintegrated parts of the once unified scholarship. This shift of accent onto the details and detail-investigations was dangerous, not the least because scholarship refrained in general from synthesis.

This fragmentation came about as a result of a general epistemological crisis. The trust in the reliability of cognition became undermined by new discoveries. Sciences thought to be on firm ground till then and even the belief in linear evolution, consequently the accuracy of the historical view, became problematic. The epistemological crisis came about because of the development of depth psychology and partly because of social and political problems. Classical scholars, however, mesmerized by the great achievements of their craft, did not take notice of these changes. Scholarship lost connection with the problems and sentiments of the age, and in turn the problems and outlook of classical scholarship seemed to be obsolete and dull to the greater public. Erudite spirits outside of the world of professional scholarship demanded a renewal of classical studies.

Among these erudit spirits were also Hungarians. As early as 1863 the outstanding poet and translator of all comedies of Aristophanes, János Arany protested against the way classics were treated in schools, where only grammatical explanations were urged and the aesthetic qualities of the texts were left out of consideration. The same line was continued by the aesthetician Ágost Greguss, who wrote a "literary tale," *The Locksmiths*. *The Locksmiths* had two lovely keys, the Greek and Latin language, and they were so fascinated by their beauty that they only admired the refinements of the keys, discussed them among themselves, but did not open the lock. At long last they opened the door of the treasury, but did not enter, nor did they allow others to do so. Finally some people, "though not worthy of the name 'classical scholar'" cast a glance into the treasury and told others what they had seen. The story does not need any comment. The most famous attack, however, because it was written in German and thus internationally available, was launched by Lajos Hatvany in his book *Die Wissenschaft des Nicht-Wissenswerten*,⁶ [The Study of Things Not Worthy to be Studied]. It was a satire, consequently exaggerated and in some respects unjust, but it pointed toward the same direction as Greguss or Arany. Classical scholarship needed to be reformed, otherwise it would lose its importance, unlike the classics themselves, which will continue to be studied by those outside the guild. Hun-

garians were not the first to criticize classical scholarship in its traditional German form, but certainly they were among the first. This criticism was probably the first principal contribution of Hungarians, but this is not to say that of Hungarian classical scholarship. Paul Friedländer's moving letter to his master Wilamowitz, published by W. Caulder some years ago,⁷ in which he exposes that he is desirous of a classical scholarship different from that of his most honoured and beloved master, was written only after the first World War; and even in 1936 when Eric Dodds argued in his inaugural lecture at Oxford that the progress of classical scholarship is to be expected not in textual criticism, but in seeking the message of the classics, somebody made him the scornful remark: „I hear, Dodds, you will kill scholarship at Oxford.”

But criticism, however proper and witty it may be, is only negative; and the road to a positive example proved more difficult. Even Hatvany referred to Saint Beuve's method, when Saint Beuve was some forty years dead. From the turn of the century, however, progress in positive direction also began. At first under the influence of British ethnology and French sociology, Frazer, Durkheim and especially Jane Harrison, who was herself also influenced by Durkheim, the positive steps were taken on old paths. The pioneer in this direction was Gyula Hornyánszky, a classical scholar by erudition, but in his activity he proved to be more of a sociologist and philosopher. Following the Cambridge school, he not only wrote interesting papers on some aspects of Greek religion but also a book on Hippocrates, a sketch of the sociography of ancient Greece, and based on the speeches in the Homeric epics investigated problems of Greek culture from the view-point of mass-psychology.⁸ As far as I know, no one had done similar research prior to him. All these important works passed, however, internationally unnoticed, because they were published in Hungarian.

Still, Hornyánszky's activity was stimulating, and soon Károly Marót continued this line of investigation.⁹ After publishing in a series of papers an immense comparative material to many passages of Homer, in the 1920s he elaborated a theory of poetry and religion based on up-to-date psychology. According to his argument, in poetry elements of the sub-conscious, the constant, historically non-determined world of the instincts, which Marót called essence — are moulded to conscious thought in a way historically determined, that is dependent on historical circumstances. This consideration and his knowledge of folklore epics led him to the recognition of the importance of constant structures in the epic as early as 1934. To term these structures he used the French word *chablon*, or mould, and the minstrel poured into these moulds the substance of his tale; and of course the minstrel also embellished the story. Later, in 1948 Marót spoke of sequences and referred to the Jungian archetypes. A. B. Lord only began to speak in the same vein in 1951; and the investigation of constant sequences started only hereafter, when M. Nagler started to explain of preverbal *Gestalts*, existant in the soul of the singer of tales.¹⁰

Marót's conception, nevertheless, also has another bearing. The same instincts, as in the singer, are operative in the auditorium. In order to be effective, the singer has to hit, so to say, the proper wave-length, the proper chord, which resounds sympathetically in the soul of his audience. According to Marót's understanding, the poet made a proposal and it depended on the public, whether it accepted the proposal unaltered, rounded it off according to its own taste, or rejected it. These are very similar ideas to those R. Jakobson and P. Bogatyrev put forward at about the same time.¹¹ Thus Marót, who was unaware of the later theories of communication, interpreted the process of poetic composing in much the same sense.

Marót strived to regain the lost totality by expanding classical scholarship toward deeper psychological insight. András Alföldi used his supreme knowledge of all kinds of sources to promote the unity of classical studies.¹² His first important works dealt with the archaeology and history of Pannonia and Dacia and, despite many in-depth studies, his book on the end of the Roman domination in Pannonia, published seventy years ago, still commands the field. He, however, knew not only the history of Pannonia and Dacia, but also that of the whole frontier from the Black Sea to the Rhine; and he also contributed a chapter to the *Cambridge Ancient History*. His expertise extended not only to the frontiers, but also to the ceremonies and insignia of the imperial court, not only to the pagan culture, but also to Christianity in the Roman Empire, not only to the conversion of Constantine, but also to the pagan counter-propaganda. The so-called contorniat-coins, had been totally misunderstood before him. I will not speak of his activity after he had left Hungary in 1947 and lived in the United States, though he confessed himself to be a Hungarian for the rest of his life. It is impossible to appreciate his work duly in such a short survey. I wish only to indicate that his entire lifework is one of the most important contributions to international scholarship. Still one element of his scholarly activity must be mentioned, because it is of principal importance; namely his investigations of the culture of the so-called border peoples and the mounted nomads. He published important papers on the theriomorphic world-conception of these peoples, on the social position of the smiths in these societies, on bear-cult in Eurasia, and knew how to use this material in the study of early Rome.

The third member of this significant generation was Károly Kerényi.¹³ From the beginning he emphasized the necessity of the synoptic view of antiquity. First, in the sense of Wilamowitz he stressed that all branches of classical scholarship constitute an indivisible unity and antiquity has to be studied in its totality by making use of all branches and all sorts of sources. Later, however, he understood totality in a different sense. First, influenced by Nietzsche and phenomenology, he understood classical scholarship as the expression and interpretation of the relationship of modern men to the ancient world in all its manifestations.

Later, under the influence of Jung, he came to the conviction that the basis of this relation are the archetypes to which manifestations of cultures can be traced.

Thus Hungarian scholarship incorporated the study of the border cultures and of the Ancient Orient into classical scholarship, restoring by this synoptic view of German new humanism on a higher level, insofar as it incorporated into the notion of classical – or, to use a perhaps more apt word, ancient – studies the achievements of scholarship from the second half of the nineteenth century on, and emphasized that the Greek and Roman world cannot be studied and understood without the Orient, the two having been in close contact with each other. Even today this does not seem self-evident to everyone because prior to this Hungarian conception of ancient studies only Ed Meyer treated ancient history in this spirit¹⁴ and contemporaneously with the Hungarians the Cambridge Ancient History. This, then, was a considerable contribution of Hungary to international scholarship.

There is, however, perhaps one more important contribution. During the nineteenth century people understood the unity of mankind and of human culture in the terms of evolution and history in a linear way. True, even the most developed peoples had lived sometime in circumstances similar to those of primitives, but they had overcome these victoriously through their development. Evolutionary and historical theory, however, became problematic at the end of the nineteenth century because depth psychology appeared to show that instincts primitive or barbarous or simply ancestral are not exceeded, merely suppressed and sublimated in present forms. Consequently by reducing manifestations of cultures to archetypes or some sort of „common denominators” the unity of mankind could also be understood in an unhistoric way. How far, of course, the historic approach could be abandoned was another question.

The sowing of the aforementioned concepts brought its fruits after the war. There were very few scholars in Hungary who remained untouched by Alföldi, or Kerényi, or both. A generation had grown up for whom the study of the Graeco-Roman world and the Orient, of archaeology and philology, of religion and literature were an indissoluble unity. This generation was active on several fields, and most of its members commanded a thorough knowledge not only of Greek and Latin, but also of several oriental languages.

Imre Trencsényi-Waldapfel dealt with the history of religion, philosophy, and epics. His paper on the Danae-myth in the East and the West analysed an immense mass of variants of the myth and their background. The same combined use of Greek, Roman and oriental sources was characteristic of his papers on Golden Age myths, on the Hesiodic prooemia and their eastern parallels, on the Homeric epics of Central Asia, especially the Kazakh epics (read by him in the original language), and a joint use of written sources and works of fine arts distinguished his paper on the Christopher legend.¹⁵

István Borzsák, however, had been principally a Latinist. He was the author of the article "Cornelius Tacitus" (practically a book in itself) in the *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* and editor of Tacitus and Horace. He threw new light not only upon the relation of Roman to Hellenistic historiography and showed that more than one element of the legendary Roman history is simply a transplantation of stories told by Hellenistic authors into Roman circumstances, but also analysed the images of the Orient and of some oriental monarchs (Semiramis and Xerxes) in Greek and Roman literature and the survival of these in later epochs. He also pointed out how oriental beliefs survived in Greek and Roman culture.¹⁶

István Hahn's papers on the movements of the poor free in the towns of late antiquity were important not only because these movements were not often treated, but also because they proved the untenableness of the rather wide-spread (and not only in marxist circles) view that the urban proletariat was a mere parasitic mass. Even more important was his paper on dependency relations in antiquity, which questioned the simplifying view that took notice only of slaves and free in general. Hahn revealed how many types of dependencies existed in the East and the West. The paper, originally published in German, proved to be so important that it was translated soon into English. Not less interesting is his paper on the forms of proprietorship in archaic Greece, which pointed out that citizens in the city-states were considered as co-proprietors of the land, and that this was of great importance for their way of thinking.¹⁷

Similarly active in the fields of both classical and oriental studies and both comparative philology and archaeology (but also familiar with problems of the migration period and of Hungarian early history) was János Harmatta. Here, too, I will mention only a few of his achievements. The problem, whether the word Ahhiyawa in the Hittite documents denotes the Achaeans had been a vigorously discussed problem since the beginning of the 1930s. From the point of view of comparative philology the identification seemed rather improbable, or even impossible, due to phonological reasons. Harmatta showed, taking into consideration cuneiform orthography, that the Ahhiyawa ~ Ἀχαιῶα identification with the Achaeans correct. It was he who deciphered the Parthian ostraca and papyri of Dura Europos and solved their problems in learned commentaries. He was the first to decipher a major Bactrian inscription and clarified several problems of a previously unknown Iranian language. He is the editor and to a considerable part also the author of two volumes of an important history on the civilizations of Central Asia, published under the patronage of the UNESCO. He also discoursed on the Hittite influence on Greek mythology and the Hyperborean myth, on the prehistory of Greek language and on the literary patterns of the Babylonian edict of Cyrus, as well as on the significance of the eagle as a symbol in Iranian royal ideology. These all proved to be rather important contributions to scholarship.¹⁸

Another combination of several different branches of classical studies can be seen in János György Szilágyi's work. Confidently at home in the world of both the monuments of classical art and the written sources, he published a collection of written sources of Greek art. This proved to be in several respects an unparalleled work in international scholarly literature and a penetrating study on the origins of Etruscan and Roman theatre as well as histrionic art.¹⁹ On the one hand he wrote elegant essays on the Pygmalion and on the Arachne myth of Ovid, an excellent treatise on Lucian, revealing him as a critic of an oppression, on the other he is the author of the first volume of series containing a scholarly description of all Greek vases to be found in Hungary.²⁰ This series is part of a larger one, an international undertaking under the patronage of the Union Académique Internationale of the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. He directed the Hungarian contribution to the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. His chef d'œuvre, nevertheless, is the monumental work on Etrusco—Corinthian vase-painting. It was Szilágyi who perceived the importance of this rather neglected field of classical art and having meticulously analysed the full material — which no one had done before — he established a detailed chronology. This again was of great importance for classical archaeology in general, since on the basis of Szilágyi's painstaking chronology many other works could be dated.²¹

The main field of Árpád Szabó's activity has been the history of Greek science, especially mathematics. He was led to it by his research in early Greek philosophy. First he demonstrated that under the influence of Eleatic dialectics Greek mathematics became an axiomatic, deductive science, in this surpassing methodically oriental mathematics. As a next step Szabó analysed the terminology of Greek mathematics and music, examined what common, or everyday, meaning lies behind the technical terms, how and why they became technical terms, and in doing so he could reveal important, but before him unrecognized details in the development of Greek mathematical thought.²² He, nevertheless did not neglect the study of literature either. As early as 1955 he pointed out that Achilles is a tragic hero in the Iliad — an idea picked up only in the last decades by C. MacLeod and R. Rutherford.²³

The combination of the knowledge and methods of different branches of scholarship survived in the next generation, though not in all fields in the same way. The late András Mócsy was not only well versed in all problems of Pannonia — he wrote the article Pannonia in the aforementioned *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* and wrote a book on Pannonia and Upper Moesia, as well as a number of learned papers — but also developed a school of onomatology, i. e. on the research of names. These investigations, continued after his death by his pupils, are of considerable importance both for historians of the Roman Empire and for comparative philology.²⁴

Research on Pannonia was and remains a field where Hungarians can always contribute to international scholarship, simply because so much material is in

Hungary. Although I have no time to delve into the details, I cannot omit to mention the contribution to the *Tabula Imperii Romani*,²⁵ likewise an international undertaking supported by the Union Académique Internationale.

In two respects Miklós Maróth combined Greek studies with oriental, especially with Arabic, in his investigations of the history of logic. On the one hand he explored how Greek logic and theory of science survived in Arabic scholarship, and on the other what lessons are offered by the texts of Arab philosophers for research in Greek philosophy, especially logic.²⁶

The indivisibility of ancient studies was promoted in another way by the Egyptologists headed by László Kákosy.²⁷ The simultaneous application of written sources – written in more than one language and scripture – and of archaeological objects on the one hand and the history both of society and of culture of some three thousand, or with the Meroitic age even more, years on the other makes the thorough knowledge of large areas of scholarship absolutely necessary. Instead of describing many detailed studies, however important they might be, I will mention only one important undertaking of Hungarian Egyptologists, the excavation of the grave of the high official Djehutimes. This was the first grave from Ramsesseean times that was properly excavated with due regard to all details by competent specialists. The excavation is still in progress, but even now it is clear that the discoveries resulting from it will enrich our knowledge of the age considerably. One of the best specialists of the Meroitic age is also working in Hungary.

May I include, finally, two fields not belonging to ancient studies in the strict sense of the word, but in Hungary considered as connected to them: Byzantine and Middle-Latin studies. In both there are achievements worthy at mention. At the centre of Gyula Moravcsik's interests stood the relationship of Byzantium and the Turcic peoples. (Turcic in the broadest sense of the word, more or less as Byzantine historians used the word, so even Hungarians were included.) His monumental *Byzantino-turcica* remains an indispensable instrument for all who deal with Byzantine history and with Turcic languages because the first volume of the work gives a detailed survey with a full bibliography of all Byzantine historians who mention some Turcic people. The second volume contains all references to Turcic peoples and records of their languages on the basis not only of printed texts, but also on the examination of the manuscript tradition. It was he, further, who produced the standard edition of Constantine Porphyrogenetus' work *De administrando imperio*.²⁸

On the field of medieval Latin studies I feel obligated to include the important series *Scriptores Latini Medii Recentisque Aevorum*, which was started by László Juhász, in which many unedited, or not duly edited, texts from the Middle Ages and from the Renaissance epoch were published and thus made accessible for international scholarship. The second significant achievement was an important dictionary of medieval Latin in Hungary.²⁹ Four volumes have been pub-

lished and some four more are still awaited. From this rich material Hungary is able to participate in the „new Ducange,” the new dictionary of medieval Latin in Europe, the *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis*.

By way of conclusion let me try to sum up Hungary's contribution. Hungarians were among the first who perceived that classical scholarship must move beyond its nineteenth-century traditions. Hungarians were among the first who developed a new conception of ancient studies. They thought of ancient studies as a unity, including not only diverse knowledge of the Greek and Roman world but also of the ancient orient. By this they expanded the synoptic view of German new humanism to a higher level. By taking into consideration the achievements of psychology, they came to understand the history and culture of antiquity not as precious but outmoded stage of cultural development, but as continually present at the center of human psyche. Thus they provided a new, non-historical interpretation of the idea of the unity of human culture. Hungarians, nevertheless, not only developed a new conception of ancient studies but also cultivated this spirit in studying special problems. In finding the points of contact and the possibility of perceiving the message of the past on a deeper level than the historical interpretation of the nineteenth century, they were eager also to understand this message and to reconnect classical studies to the ideas and problems of their own age. Of course many interesting papers and books written in a more traditional way contributed to international scholarship and are important and useful in their own way, but I think the contributions of principal significance are those that have been mentioned here.

Notes

1. For a brief outline of the history of classical scholarship in Hungary see J. Harmatta, *The Study of the Ancient World*. In: T. Erdey-Grúz and K. Kulcsár eds., *Science and Scholarship in Hungary*. 2. ed. (Budapest 1975), 343–63.
2. E. Ábel, „Johannes Mezerzius, der Begründer der dazischen Epigraphik,” *Ungarische Revue* 3, (1883): 373–83.
3. R. Weiss, „Matthaeus Fortunatus,” *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* 12, (1888): 346–62.
4. Zs. Ritoók, *Ponori Thewrewk Emil* (Budapest 1993) includes a bibliography of his works.
5. Bibliographies of classical scholarship in Hungary: E. Moravek, *A magyar klasszika-filológiai irodalom bibliográfiája 1901–1925* (Budapest, 1930); I. Borzsák, *A magyar klasszika-filológiai irodalom bibliográfiája 1926–1950* (Budapest 1952); Zs. Ritoók, *A magyar ókortudomány bibliográfiája 1951–1975* (Budapest, 1986). I. Bellus, *A magyar ókortudomány bibliográfiája 1976–1990*. (Budapest 1996).
6. J. Arany in the review of a translation of Vergil's Aeneid: *Koszoru* I. 2. 498–9; Á. Greguss, *Meséi* (Budapest, 1878); L. v. Hatvany, *Die Wissenschaft des Nicht-Wissenswerten* (Leipzig, 1908).
7. *Antike und Abendland* 26 (1980): 93–100.

8. On Hornyánszky K. Marót, "Hornyánszky Gyula" *Egyetemes Philologiai Közöny* 58 (1934): 45–72; 147–64. A bibliography of Hornyánszky's works has been compiled by L. Juhász in the periodical *Társadalomtudomány* 13 (1933): 350–7.
9. A bibliography of Marót's works, compiled by Á. Szalay, *Antik Tanulmányok* 2 (1955): 189–98; 11 (1964) 5–6.
10. A. B. Lord, "Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epic," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 82 (1951): 71–80; M. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1974).
11. P. Bogatyrev and R. Jakobson, "Die Folklore als eine besondere Form des Schaffens," in *Donum Natalicium Schrijnen* (Nijmegen–Utrecht, 1929), 900–913.
12. A bibliography of Alföldi's works, compiled by G. Alföldy in *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1964/65* (Bonn, 1966): XIII–XXVIII; *Gnomon* 53 (1981): 410–414.
13. On Kerényi see. J. Gy. Szilágyi, "Kerényi Károly emlékezete," *Antik Tanulmányok* 20 (1973): 200–10; "Károly Kerényi and his Greek Mythology," *The New Hungarian Quarterly* 19 (1978): 160–68; A. Magris, *Carlo Kerényi e la ricerca fenomenologica della religione* (Milano 1975). A bibliography of his works till 1943 are at the end of his selected papers *Halhatatlanság és Apollón-vallás* (Budapest, 1984), 548–63; and the works published in foreign languages at the end of his *Dionysos* (Princeton, 1976), 447–74 (compiled by M. Kerényi).
14. Ed Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* I–V. (Stuttgart, 1884–1902).
15. On I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel see J. Gy. Szilágyi, "Trencsényi-Waldapfel Imre," *Antik Tanulmányok* 17 (1970): 149–67. A bibliography of his works, compiled by Á. Ritoók-Szalay, *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 16 (1968): 465–75; 18 (1970): 231.
16. A bibliography of his works compiled by I. Tegyei in *Acta Classica Univ. Sc. Debrecen* 10–11 (1974–75): 209–18. Since then some of his works in foreign language, "Zentralasiatische Elemente im Alexanderroman": *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 28 (1980): 85–94; "Zu Tacitus' hellenistisch-orientalischen Beziehungen," *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 31 (1985–1988): 27–34; "Persertum und griechisch-römische Antike. Zur Ausgestaltung des klassischen Tyrannbildes," *Gymnasium* 94 (1987): 289–97.
17. A bibliography of his works, compiled by Gy. Németh: *Annales Univ. Sc. Budapest. Sect. Historica* 26 (1993): 271–91.
18. A bibliography of his works in *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 25 (1977) 13–24; some further works: "Migration of the Indo-Iranian Tribes," *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 26 (1978): 185–94; *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*. Vol. II edited by him (Paris, 1994), written by him: 19–23; 313–30; 397–416; 417–40; 485–93; "Annexation of the Hephthalite Vassal Kingdoms by the Western Türks," in *History of Humanity, Vol. III. From the Seventh Century BC to the Seventh century AD* (Paris, 1996) 475–77.
19. *A görög művészet világa*, I–II (Budapest, 1962) "Impletæ modis saturæ," *Prospettiva* 24 (1981): 2–23.
20. His essays, published originally as postfaces to translations, were published, alas! only in Hungarian in his volume *Paradigmák* (Budapest, 1982). – *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Hongrie. Fasc. I.* (Budapest, 1981).
21. *Ceramica etrusco-corinzia figurata I.* (Roma, 1992).
22. After many detailed studies published in periodicals in Hungary and abroad see his book *Anfänge der griechischen Mathematik* (München–Wien–Budapest, 1969) which has been

- translated into several languages, also the book written with E. Maula: *Enklima. Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte der griechischen Astronomie, Geographie und der Sehnentafel* (Athen, 1982); finally *Das geozentrische Weltbild. Astronomie, Geographie und Mathematik der Griechen* (München, 1992).
23. "Achilleus der tragische Held der Ilias," *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 4 (1956): 55–107; originally in Hungarian in his book *Homéros*. (Budapest, 1954); C. W. MacLeod in the introduction to his edition of the 24th Book of the Iliad (Cambridge 1982); R. Rutherford "Tragic and Feeling in the Iliad," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102 (1982): 145–60.
 24. A bibliography of Mócsy's works compiled by B. Lőrincz in *Acta Archaeologica Acad. Sc. Hung.* 41 (1989): 9–15. — The work referred to is *Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum. I. Aba – Bysanus*, ed., B. Lőrincz and F. Redó (Budapest, 1994).
 25. S. Soproni, *Tabula Imperii Romani L 34. Budapest/Aquincum – Sarmisegethusa – Sirmium* (Budapest, 1968).
 26. "Griechische Theorie und orientalistische Praxis in der Staatskunst von al-Farabi," *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 26 (1978); 465–69; "Galenos und die vierte Figur der Syllogismen," *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 27 (1979); 187–205; *Die Araber und die antike Wissenschaftstheorie* (Budapest–Leiden, 1994).
 27. A bibliography of his works: U. Luft, ed., *The Intellectual Heritage of Egypt* (Budapest, 1992), 17–25; compiled by M. Szűcs (*Studia Aegyptiaca XIX*).
 28. A bibliography of his works, compiled by R. Benedicty in *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 10 (1962): 295–313. From this year till 1982, when he died, many further works appeared, I will mention only *Byzantium and the Magyars* (Budapest, 1970); a revised English version of the book published in Hungarian in 1953; *Einführung in die Byzantinologie* (Budapest, 1976); posthumously: *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai* (Budapest, 1984); collected, introduced, translated and commented by him.
 29. *Lexicon Latinitatis medii aevi Hungariae*. I (1987–1989); II (1991); III (1992); IV (1993).