From Glosses to Dictionaries

From Glosses to Dictionaries:

The Beginnings of Lexicography

Edited by

Chiara Benati and Claudia Händl

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

From Glosses to Dictionaries: The Beginnings of Lexicography

Edited by Chiara Benati and Claudia Händl

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-3809-5
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-3809-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part IV: The Slavic Tradition

Part V: The Japanese Tradition

FROM GLOSSES TO DICTIONARIES? AN INTRODUCTION

CHIARA BENATI AND CLAUDIA HÄNDL

Whenever confronted with linguistic questions, uncertainty, doubts or curiosities, contemporary speakers, readers, students and scholars grab a mono-, bilingual, historical or etymological dictionary (either physically or metaphorically, using an online resource) to look up the word or phrase they need and find help. Dictionaries have been part of our culture for so long that they are often taken for granted, as if they had always existed. But how were dictionaries born? What do we know about the beginnings of lexicography in the various traditions? What was the aim of the first dictionaries? To whom were they addressed?

The origins of Western lexicography are often put in connection with glosses and glossaries, generally assuming a linear evolution from interlinear, marginal and contextual glosses, to single-text, thematically ordered *glossae collectae*, alphabetical glossaries and, finally, dictionaries. Nevertheless, the relationship between glosses and dictionaries is not so straightforward and cannot be reduced to this simplistic genetic and evolutionary dependence, since the glossographic tradition does not automatically stop with the emergence and diffusion of dictionaries. The weakness of the above-mentioned paradigm is further highlighted if one steps back from a West-Eurocentric perspective and moves toward a more global approach to the beginnings of lexicography, taking into consideration different epochs, languages and traditions around the world.

The present volume aims not only at sketching—on the basis of a series of significant case studies ranging from Antiquity to Modern Times—the relationship between glosses and dictionaries, but also at highlighting, on the one hand, the importance of glossographic sources for the compilation of modern-day dictionaries of the historical phases of a language and, on the other, the interpretative challenge connected to their use in a lexicographic context. These closely-related and often intertwined themes are approached from a wide spectrum of different perspectives in the five parts constituting this collection of essays, which are dedicated—

respectively—to Classical and Late Antiquity, the English, Irish, Slavic and Japanese traditions.

The complexity of the dependence relationship between glosses and dictionaries in a global perspective clearly emerges from the dialogue among various contributions. While, in fact, Theodor Georgescu's essay on the birth of modern lexicography in Hellenistic Greece as a result of the need to explain to the contemporary audience both Homeric poems and Attic drama proves the assumption of a linear development from glosses to dictionaries, in her piece on the relevance of Old English glossographic tradition for the history of the English language, Patrizia Lendinara underlines how, despite the exterior similarities between Anglo-Saxon alphabetical glossaries and dictionaries, the former had completely different sources, aims and expected readerships and cannot, therefore, "be described as lexicography *tout court*". In his article on Osbern Pinnock's twelfth-century Latin dictionary known as *Panormia*, John Considine epitomizes the difference between this text and earlier collections of glosses in terms of opposition between a theoretical and a practical approach to words and meanings.

A straight evolutionary development from glosses (to glossaries and from glossaries) to dictionaries is, on the other hand, excluded as sole explanation for the emergence of Japanese lexicography, as Antonio Manieri's contribution on the relation between the tenth-century bilingual Sino-Japanese dictionary known as *Wamyōruijushō* and the corpus of glossaries usually referred to as *Nihongi shiki* perfectly demonstrates, showing that the opposite path is also possible. This backward path and a substantial circularity in the relationship between glosses and dictionaries also emerge from the two essays dedicated to the Slavic tradition by Kira Kovalenko and Katarzyna Jasińska, Magdalena Klapper, Dorota Kołodziej, dealing with Russian sixteenth-century handwritten lexica and with the Polish redaction of the *Vocabularius ex quo*, respectively.

The interpretative challenge for modern readers and users represented by the use of medieval glossaries as sources is the main theme of Sharon Arbuthnot's contribution on medieval Irish glossographic material in the twentieth-century *Dictionary of the Irish Language* and, consequently, for its electronic version, the *Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language* (*eDIL*).

Apart from the question of a genetic dependence from glosses and glossaries, the beginnings of lexicography are also connected with the progressive distinction and differentiation of various kinds of dictionaries, such as, for example, mono-, bilingual, specialized or etymological dictionaries. This last category of lexica is at the center of Simona Georgescu's article,

which, on the basis of a corpus of terms related to the Dionysian cult, aims at showing how Byzantine etymological dictionaries provide important insights on contemporary mentalities.

Dictionaries play a fundamental role in the acquisition of a second language, as witnessed by the very existence of a particular category of monolingual dictionaries known—in English speaking countries—as 'learners' dictionaries'. The didactic use of word lists in Classical antiquity is thoroughly analyzed in Chiara Fedriani's essay on the lexicon and dialogic structure of bilingual Greek/Latin dialogues in the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, which highlights how second-language acquisition was considered a natural language performance connected to the completion of everyday duties and activities and, therefore, highly dependent on the learning of vocabulary and phraseology. Hence, again, the importance of dictionaries!

Going back to the questions posed at the beginning of this introduction, the present volume, which has no claim of being exhaustive, will probably only provide partial answers to some of them, while new questions and cues for reflection and further research will raise. In any case, we hope to have created the floor for a global, comparative and interdisciplinary approach to the earliest phases of the history of lexicography and, thus, to have laid the basis for an effective communication among scholars of different disciplines working on analogous topics and, possibly, for further collaboration in the research on the beginnings of lexicography across language areas and historical periods.

PART I:

CLASSICAL AND LATE ANTIQUITY

FROM GREEK CLASSICAL TEXTS TO THE FIRST DICTIONARIES: THE BIRTH OF MODERN LEXICOGRAPHY[1]

THEODOR GEORGESCU

Introduction

The Greek language provides us with probably the best tools to find out how the first dictionaries were born in the European culture. Given the uninterrupted written tradition in Greek, from the Homeric period to the Byzantine era—spanning nearly 20 centuries!—the old texts, often unintelligible in many ways, had to be explained to a contemporary audience. The need to explain Homeric texts and Attic drama was first felt during the Hellenistic era (4th century) in Alexandria, when the first scholia on the old texts were made in order to explain grammatical, dialectical and different issues of *realia*. This is how philology was born, while the grammarians who worked on the annotation of the old texts were the predecessors of the later lexicographers.

Our aim is to show how the first Greek dictionaries emerged, starting from the first scholarly annotations to classical texts. For modern lexicography, it is compulsory to understand how the first lexicon entries were created, what they contained, whether the first dictionaries were works of authorship or rather lexical encyclopaedias born from the combination of various grammar annotations. We will trace back these issues by focusing on lexicography works from late antiquity.

Studying the relationship between classical texts from the Homeric and the Classical periods, the scholia from the Alexandrian epoch and the first lexica from the beginning of the Byzantine era is perhaps the best way to observe the evolution from glosses to dictionaries.

---

[1] This article is a readjustment and partially a translation of an older study, published under the title of "Primele dicționare ale Europei" in *Studii Romanice I,* ed. Coman Lupu, 2018, pp. 497–505.

The political and social context of the birth of philology

By the end of the 5th century, when Sparta conquers Athens after the Peloponnesian War, major changes take place in the history of Greece. With the leadership of the thirty tyrants, Athens loses its independence, and in spite of restoring democracy over several years, it will not regain the climate of freedom that existed in the past. Over the next 50 years, a new power will slowly increase: Macedonia. It will end up by conquering the entire Greece and by extending the power far eastward, under the reign of Alexander the Great.

The loss of the Athenian democracy played an important part in the emergence of the first dictionaries.

After Alexander the Great's "adventure" in Asia, and—as a consequence of successive wars between his former generals and their descendants (*diadohoi* and *epigones*)—the division of the empire in what was then called the "Hellenistic" kingdoms, Ptolemy I Soter laid the foundation of the first University of Europe: it was to be set up in northern Africa, at the mouth of the Nile, in the city founded by Alexander himself—Alexandria. He established two institutions that would serve each other for a long time: the *Mouseion* ("shrine of the Muses"), a research center for various fields of knowledge (astronomy, medicine, philology, etc.), and the Library, a place where everything that had been written by that time was to be stored and consulted. Before the devastating fire in Caesar's times, during the Alexandrian War (1st century AD), the Library had accumulated about 700,000 *volumina*—rolls of papyrus on which great part of the literature had been copied. It was around these two institutions that scholars from all over the world would be drawn by a proactive policy led by Ptolemy II Philadelphus (Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos eds. 2011). The latter wanted, on the one hand, Alexandria to become Europe's new cultural center, after the fall of Athens, and, on the other hand, to turn some of the writers—hosted there at the expense of the state—into more or less active supporters of imperial propaganda.

As far as philology was concerned, the two institutions marked the beginning of the systematic study of classical literature. This concern can primarily be explained by the language difference that had developed between the "Greek of Homer" (most probably dating back to the 8th century BC), and the Greek language of the 3rd century BC: the latter was a common unified language (*koiné*), based on the Ionic-Attic dialect, but cleansed of its Attic regionalisms. The literary public of the Hellenistic period did not fully understand the Homeric texts, and even certain words in the tragedy and comedy of the 5th century BC remained obscure to them. Thus, the

readers needed explanations for a correct understanding of the words in each context.

Moreover, Hellenistic Age poets sought inspiration in the works of authors belonging to remote periods (both Homer and the poetry of the 7th–6th centuries BC), which, once again, determined the need for lexical explanations.

We must be aware of the fact that different versions of Homer and other classical writers were circulating at that time. Hence the urgent need to establish unitary texts. The efforts of the philologists hosted in Alexandria focused on inventorying the texts, determining their paternity and editing them; in parallel, they felt the need to comment upon these works from various points of view. It is these marginal notes that would give birth to the scholia—the first commentaries on old texts, preserved, in a subsequently completed form, to this day, for authors such as Homer, Pindar, Aristophanes, Sophocles and others (Dickey 2007).

To sum up, we can say that two major factors triggered the birth of what today we call "philology": on the one hand, the need to explain the out-of-use words found in archaic and classical authors; on the other, the fashion that emerged during the Hellenistic period to use old words in new poems; this called for a full-time "job" of indexing the out-of-use vocabulary with a view to reusing (or recycling, as we might say today) it. Together with the first editions of classical authors and the scholia or commentaries, the first lexica came into being.

The Library of Alexandria

Founded in 285 BC, the Alexandria Library was first led by Zenodotus of Ephesus (c. 325–270). Among other things, Zenodotus focused on editing the Homeric epic poems and works by the lyrical poets (in the Archaic era). He is also the first known author to have drawn up a glossary explaining the Homeric vocabulary, entitled Περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου συνηθείας, "About the Usage of the Words in Homer". A few excerpts of this glossary were preserved in Eusthatius's work, himself an author of commentaries on Homer, in the 12th century AD.

The oldest lexicon therefore emerged in the context of the growing need for explanations, in the Alexandrian period, of the author lying at the foundation of Greek education. It should be mentioned that certain terms in the epic poems were difficult to understand even in the pre-Alexandrian period. From the few preserved fragments, we can notice how the poetic terms that had come out of use were explained by a newer word:

(Zenod. fr. 254) αἶσα, ταυτὸν σημαίνει τῇ μοίρᾳ
"'by fate', which means 'by destiny'".

There is evidence that Zenodotos' professor, Philetas (born in 340 BC), was the author of a glossary of obscure words (Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι "Unorderly listed words"), testimonies of which were preserved in Byzantine dictionaries:

e.g. EM 330, 39 ἐλινός· ἡ ἄμπελος, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος. Φιλήτας δ' ἐν Γλώσσαις τὸν κλάδον τῆς ἀμπέλου
"ἐλινός: vine, as Apollodorus says. Philetas <calls it> 'vine shoot' in his *Words*".

The following chief librarians also created various lexicographical works:
- Callimachus, who, besides his poetry, drew up several lexicographical works: a catalogue of authors and works called Πίνακες "Catalogues"; a work of "dialectology", dealing with the geographical areas where certain words were used; Ἐθνικαὶ ὀνομασίαι "Ethnic names", excerpts of which can be found in Athenaios (e.g. how a fish is called in a community or another); he also wrote an author's lexicon devoted to Democritus's work (Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκρίτου γλωσσῶν καὶ συνταγμάτων "Catalogue of words and idioms used by Democritus").
- Apollonios of Rhodes (c. 295–215 BC), mainly known as author of the epic work *Argonautica*, was also a grammarian, following the tradition established by his professor, Callimachus.
- the third head of the Library was Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c. 280–c. 194 BC); just like the others, besides being a scientist, he also made an inventory of the technical vocabulary; he is thought to be the author of a treaty called Σκευογραφικόν, "Handbook of tools", which gathered the terms employed by craftsmen, mainly using the classical comedy as a source. Excerpts of this treaty were preserved in the works of grammarian Polydeukes (Pollux) (Bethe 1967[2]).

The most fertile period for philology began with the fourth librarian, Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–c. 180 BC). With the far-reaching capacity of a true scholar, he edited the texts of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar or the lyrical poets, as well as Aristophanes, and there are testimonies that he also worked on editing Sophocles, Euripides and Menander. We cannot know for sure whether he only edited the text or also left marginal notes explaining his editorial options. It is worth mentioning that the invention of the graphic accent is also attributed to him. It is certain that, by gathering information from his forerunners, he wrote numerous "introductions" to classical tragedies and comedies, giving details about the circumstances in

which the plays were composed: this pattern of philological introduction has been preserved to the present day, under different forms in various periods. Just like his predecessors, he also had lexicographic interests, born as a result of his editing work. Several headings of sections, out of a glossary titled Λέξεις "Words" have been preserved: Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν "About the Names of the Ages" (i.e., how various beings were called at a certain age), Περὶ συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων "About Kinship Terms", Περὶ τῶν ὑποπτευομνένων μὴ εἰρῆσθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς "About the Words that We Suspect our Ancestors Did Not Use" (i.e. about postclassical words), Περὶ βλασφημιῶν "About Insults", Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις "Attic Words", Λακωνικαὶ γλῶσσαι "Laconian Words". Excerpts from the sections were preserved in scholia or in late grammarians, such as:

(Ar.Byz. 274.12) βρέφος· τὸ ἄρτι γεγονός
"baby: the newly born".

Although scarce, the information about the next chief librarians nevertheless attests to a perduring lexicographic interest. The fifth librarian was a certain Apollonius, about whom we only know that he was called εἰδογράφος "the classifier of forms" (in *Etymologicum Magnum*). More famous was the sixth, Aristarchus of Samothrake (c. 216–145 BC), who made numerous commentaries on the classical texts and was particularly interested in Homeric studies. After him, the Alexandrian Philology School started disintegrating. The scholars left Alexandria in order to escape the persecution of Ptolemy VIII, as Aristarchus took the side of his rival in the dispute for the throne. Aristarchus's students spread to various cities. Apollodorus of Athens (c. 180–110 BC) went to Pergamon, where there was a school of grammar that equaled the Alexandrian school. There he would write a work on chronology and a commentary on the Iliad's ship catalogue (book II).

Another student of Aristarchus', Dionysios Thrax (approx. 170–90 BC), founded a school in Rhodes, where he wrote grammar treatises, of which a few fragments have been preserved in late commentaries. No work, from this entire "Alexandrian" period, has been preserved in its original form; the only traces that we find today of those philological works are citations in more recent authors. By studying them, we can still observe that, initially, the first lists of words, organized by semantic fields—not alphabetically—were intended not for the readers, but for the writers. The original purpose of most of the lexicographical works was not so much to explain the vocabulary, as to provide the writers of the time with lists of words, assigned to certain lexical fields, that would help them in their writing. These authors were drawing their inspiration from classical literature, and, by using rare

words found in Homer or in tragedies, aimed to impress a very refined audience of the imperial court in Alexandria. Moving further on, we could say that the first lexicographic attempts were born out of the desire to impress the contemporary audience of the Hellenistic era at a time when a certain loss of inspiration was balanced by strong erudition.

The School of Alexandria laid the foundation for philology. It was then that the first editions of classical authors appeared, annotated with grammatical, dialectological, semantic and cultural explanations. During the same period, the first glossaries were created—as seen previously, for the "internal use" of the Hellenistic authors. After this first phase of pioneering work (3rd–2nd century BC), there came the second phase (starting from the 1st century BC), that of creating the necessary instruments for studying the archaic texts. Some philologists devoted themselves to writing grammars or commentaries on post-classical authors (especially those of the Hellenistic period), others continued to deal with classical literature, writing syntheses of older commentaries. It is thanks to the latter that fragments from the Alexandrian scholars have endured.

Some names are worth mentioning: Tyrannion (c. 100–25 BC), a student of Dionysios Thrax, founded in Rome a new study center; fragments preserved in Herodian attest to his interest in the Homeric metrics. His student, Diocles (1st century BC–1st century AD), wrote a commentary on his professor's works. Tryphon (1st century BC) drew up glossaries and grammar treatises, from which several excerpts have been preserved. Philoxenos (1st century BC) is thought to be the author of a treatise about monosyllabic verbs (Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων ῥημάτων). The most prolific of them was, however, Didymos (1st century BC–1st century AD), nicknamed *Chalkenteros* "with copper intestines", due to his long-standing dedication to books, according to a testimony of the *Suda* lexicon. He is said to have written around 4,000 books—which owed him another nickname, Βιβλιολάθας "the one who can't remember how many books he wrote", as Athenaios put it. He compiled commentaries of his predecessors (especially Aristarchos).

It is to all these authors that we owe the continuation of studies that had commenced in Alexandria. The indications they provide, although very fragmentary, are of great value, for, apart from the fact that they were Ancient Greek speakers and interpreted classical texts from this perspective, they also had access to much older manuscripts, unlike us, who only have access to manuscripts dating from the Medieval Age. Moreover, they had in their libraries the works of authors that are lost today.

The Greek lexica

The oldest lexica preserved date back to the 1st century AD and are the result of the syntheses of previous works. They were conceived as glossaries containing difficult terms, focusing on certain authors, primarily Homer and Hippocrates. The first Homeric lexicon belongs to Apollonius the "Sophist" and appears in manuscripts with the title of Λεξικὸν κατὰ στοιχεῖον τῆς τε Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσείας "Alphabetical Dictionary of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*" (Steinicke 1957). Based on the research of the Alexandrian philologists, it helped preserve excerpts of lost works, such as those of a certain Heliodorus, cited several times, or of Aristarchus of Alexandria.

The lemmata of this dictionary are ordered alphabetically, according to the first two or three letters of the word, while the rest are generally not taken into account when it comes to the alphabetical order. Among the lemmata, there are out-of-use words (e.g. <ἀαγές> ἄθραυστον, ἰσχυρόν "unbreakable", "solid, strong"), or lexemes that were still part of the common language, but whose meaning had changed:

> e.g. (Apollon. *Lex*. 4.15) <ἀγορά> ἡ ἐκκλησία, τὸ πλῆθος καὶ ὁ τόπος καὶ τὸ συνάθροισμα
> "*agora*: assembly, crowd, people gathering".

In addition to its intrinsic lexicographic value, it also helps us understand the reading of Homer in antiquity. An important source of this lexicon was a work erroneously attributed to a certain Apion (1st century BC), a disciple of Didymos, entitled Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί "Homeric [obscure] words". Words were ordered according to their first letter and were explained briefly:

> e.g. (Apio *ad Hom*. 74.220.3) <ἄναξ> β΄ σημαίνει· τὸ βασιλεύς
> "*anax* ("absolute king") means 'king'".

A special interest in the study of words arose in the 2nd century AD, with the re-evaluation of part of classical literature, namely that written in the Attic dialect. The literary trend that imitated the language of the ancient Attic writers is known as "the second sophistic". One of the best-known authors who belonged to this trend was Lucian of Samosata. It is precisely to serve this purpose that linguistic tools, such as dictionaries of the "Attic language", appeared. Valerius Harpocration composed a glossary of terms used by Attic orators, Λέξεις τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων "The Words of the Ten Orators"—a canon of the best known rhetors (Keaney 1991). Unlike other dictionaries of the time, here the lemmata were perfectly ordered

alphabetically, not only according to the first, the second or the third letter. The lemmata also preserved peculiarities of word usage in the Attic orators' works:

> e.g. (Harp. 34.16) Ἀνδρεία: ἡ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡλικία· Ἀντιφῶν ἐν τῷ περὶ ὁμονοίας
> "Ἀνδρεία ("courage, manhood"): age of men; used by Antiphon in *About concord*)

We can also find longer explanations about various elements of the culture and civilization specific to the classical era. From this point of view, this is a gold mine of historical information about classical Athens. The form preserved to this day has suffered several contaminations and represents the result of a simplification process.

A much stricter selection of words of Attic origin was drawn up by Phrynichos (Arabius), a 2nd century lexicographer (De Borries 1911). Two works of his have made it to our days, works that lay down the rules for a correct use of the Attic dialect:

- Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή "Sophistic preparation", a lexicon that was preserved only in an *Epitome*, ordered alphabetically, but only according to the first letter; it contained words considered hard to understand, picked up from tragedies and comedies, with definitions and sometimes mentions of the source:

> e.g. (Phryn. *PS* 6.5) <ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὁδοῦ> (Eupolis): ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἐν ὁδοῖς καλινδουμένων.
> "man of the road (Eupolis): instead of 'a man of those who walk in the streets'"

The work was later used by Photios.

- the second work is Ἐκλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων, "Collection of Attic Verbs and Names" organized in two books; it dealt with the use of certain terms, for instance, it contained indications about how to form the comparative and superlative of irregular adjectives:

> e.g. (Phryn. *Ec*. 65.1) <Ἀγαθὸς μᾶλλον> λέγε, μὴ <ἀγαθώτερος>, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθώτατος ἀγαθὸς μάλιστα.
> "you have to say «ἀγαθὸς μᾶλλον» (analytic form, literally "more good"), not «ἀγαθώτερος» (synthetic form "better"), and instead of ἀγαθώτατος (synthetical form "the best") say «ἀγαθὸς μάλιστα» (analytical form "very good").

It also aimed to amend the spelling of certain terms:

(*ibid*. 31.1) <Ὀρθρινὸς> οὔ, ἀλλ' ὄρθριος χωρὶς τοῦ ν.
"not *orthrinos* «in the morning», but *orthrios* without *n*".

Another Atticisant lexicographer, Moeris, wrote a work that has been fully preserved, Λέξεις Ἀττικῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων κατὰ στοιχεῖον "Attic and Greek Words in Alphabetical Order" (Hansen 1998). Probably dating from the 3rd century AD and using dictionaries drawn up by other Atticisant lexicographers, it contains about a thousand lemmata, organized in pairs: one word is "used in the Attic dialect" and the other one is "used by the other Greeks":

e.g. (Moer. 190.12) ἀμπεχόνιον Ἀττικοί, λεπτὸν ἱμάτιον Ἕλληνες
"ἀμπεχόνιον (fine shawl) say the Attics, λεπτὸν ἱμάτιον (light coat) [the other] Greeks".

The term Ἕλληνες "Greeks" is sometimes replaced by κοινή "common language". Tragedy and comedy were excluded from this dictionary, which, however, did include Homer and Herodotus.

Apart from the Atticizing movement, other authors also dealt with the study of some special areas of the vocabulary. At the beginning of the 2nd century AD, Ammonius wrote a lexicon of homonyms and synonyms, Περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων "About Similar and Different Words" (Nickau 1966). The work brought together older lexica that were preserved only in *Epitomes*, such as the one attributed to a certain Ptolemy, Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων "About the Difference between Words", or a work by Herennius Philo, Περὶ διαφόρους σημασίας "About Different Meanings". Ammonius' lexicon was organized by juxtaposing two words with a similar meaning, which were accompanied by explanations concerning the differences between them.

e.g. (Ammon. *Diff*. 15.1) <Ἀθῆναι> καὶ <Ἀττικὴ> διαφέρει. Ἀθῆναι μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἐστίν, Ἀττικὴ δὲ ἥ τε πόλις καὶ ἡ χώρα.
"*Athena* and *Attica* are different. For Athena is the city, and Attica is both the city and the territory [around it]."

Ammonius could also juxtapose two homonyms or paronyms:

e.g. (*ibid*. 131.1) δῆμος "people", but δημός "grease"
e.g. (*ibid*. 7.1) <ἄγριος> καὶ <ἀγρεῖος> διαφέρει. ἄγριος μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ὠμός, ἀγρεῖος δὲ ὁ ἀγροῖκος.
"ἄγριος and ἀγρεῖος are different: for ἄγριος means cruel, while ἀγρεῖος means rustic".

The author drew his inspiration from classical texts, but also from the Alexandrian critique and various other—today lost—sources from the Roman period.

A dictionary of proverbs and idioms,titled Περὶ παροιμιῶν, "On proverbs" and attributed to Diogenianus, was also drawn up in the 2nd century AD. It was organized alphabetically, only in keeping with the first letter of the idioms, which were explained rather briefly:

> e.g. (Diogenian. 1.58.2) <Ἀεὶ γὰρ εὖ πίπτουσιν οἱ Διὸς κύβοι:> ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς πάντα εὐδαιμονούντων· ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀξίως τιμωμένων.
> "'Zeus's dice always fall right': on people who are always happy or on those who are honored on merit".

When speaking about specialized dictionaries we should also mention those dealing with medical vocabulary. Galenos wrote such a lexicon, entitled—in today's editions—Γλωσσῶν ἐξήγησις "Explanation of Words", inventorying rather obscure words and idioms from Hippocrates's vocabulary:

> e.g. (Gal. *Ling*. 19.71) Αἰγύπτιον μύρον: τὸ μύρον διὰ τοῦ ἄνθους τῆς ἀκάνθης
> "Egyptian perfume: Acanthus flower perfume".

He relied on older, now lost lexicons, the tradition of Hyppocratic exegesis being as old as the Homeric one. Noteworthy in this case is the fully alphabetical organization, not just according to the first letters, of the lemmata.

Another valuable dictionary, dating back to the second half of the 2nd century, has been preserved to this day: a synthesis of the research done by the Alexandrian philologists, that preserved excerpts from classical authors whose works were lost in their direct tradition. Iulius Pollux (Polydeukes) of Naucratis wrote an *Onomasticon* in ten volumes which have been preserved under the form of an *Epitome,* a version which was both shortened and subjected to interpolations. The organization of the lemmata is indicative of the way the first lexicographers worked, as they are ordered thematically, not alphabetically:

> e.g. (Poll. 1.221.1) Γεωργικὰ ὀνόματα· γῆ, γεωργία, ἀγροικία, ἀγροί ...
> "peasant terms: land, land tilling, life in the countryside, peasants ...".

Some definitions are very short, others are quite complex and detailed, similar to encyclopedia entries. Items dealing with various types of masks used on the stage have a remarkable documentary value.

Then came the lexicographic syntheses of the Byzantine period—the last in this series; by that time, numerous lexicons of different types (general, specialized, belonging to a single author, organized thematically or alphabetically) had been drawn up.

The lexicographers that appeared starting with the 5th century are a valuable source of information about lost works—whether literary (as these lexica included quotes from various authors), or philological, including grammars and dictionaries, dating from the Hellenistic and Roman eras. They should however be used cautiously, as their editing is still under debate.

In the 5th century (or the 6th according to other opinions), Hesychios of Alexandria drew up a lexicon putting together words and idioms difficult to understand at that time (poetic or dialectal words, idioms and proverbs) (Latte 1953–1966). An abbreviated version has been handed down to us, wherefrom sources were often eliminated while numerous interpolations were added— above all, glosses from sacred texts found in a lexicon attributed to Cyrillus. The latter relied on works by Aristarchos, Apion, Heliodoros and Herodian. The lemmata were separated from the definition by a high dot, while the definition was worded in a more recent Greek:

e.g. (Phot. 50.1) ἄβραι· νέαι δοῦλαι
"servants: young slaves"

(Hsch. 611.1) Ἀγλαυρίδες· νύμφαι παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις
"glaurides: nymphas with the Athenians".

These entries were extracted the way they were used in the text, the same as they had been extracted from texts by Hesychius's predecessors (they were not always used in the nominative or in the present tense, etc., as they are listed in modern-day dictionaries; we should note the large number of verbs starting with ἐ, the augment used when forming certain past tenses). The lemmata were generally ordered in keeping with the first three letters, while phrases preceded by prepositions were listed according to the first letter of the preposition. Hesychius's dictionary is quite useful today because many of the words it explains—often dialectal—are not to be found in any other lexicon (*hapax legomena*). It also provides factual information about the Antiquity, thus also performing the function of an encyclopaedia. The numerous quotes from ancient authors help today's editors establish the Classics' texts. It is moreover a gold mine for historians of the Greek

language, as it provides information about the evolution of the language, the coming out of use of various words and the way older texts were interpreted in the Antiquity.

A dictionary including more detailed definitions—a real encyclopedia—has come down to us from the 10th century. For quite a long time it used to be referred to as *Suidae lexicon* "Suidas's lexicon". Today, however, the title cited in manuscripts, Σοῦδα, is considered to be the title of the work, not the author's name, so that in today's critique it is cited under the generic name of *Suda,* while the author is considered to be anonymous (Adler 1928–1938). Even if the hypothesis of a single author cannot be completely ruled out, the lexicon, which includes about 30.000 lemmata, is today viewed as the fruit of team work. The entries are ordered alphabetically (with the peculiarity that the Byzantine pronunciation of vowels is used, so no difference is made between the various types of "i"). The definitions however vary a lot in terms of length: some are just short explanations, others are real articles, just like in a modern-day encyclopaedia. As in the case of the other lexicons, although it dates from the 10th century, *Suda* is quite valuable as it represents a synthesis of the Scholia and of older dictionaries going back to the Alexandrian era. It also encompasses information from a dictionary of literary biographies written by Hesychius of Miletes, hence becoming an excellent source for establishing the biographies of ancient authors.

Several dictionaries that have reached us under the generic name of *Etymologica* were compiled between the 9th and the 12th centuries. The name however can be misleading as they were not strictly etymological but, besides the attempts at inferring the origin of the word, they also included quite varied additional explanations. The lemmata were ordered alphabetically and followed by various explanations: a definition, an etymology, suggestions about the use of the word and sometimes even literary quotes; excerpts from authors whose work was lost have thus been preserved thanks to such lexicons. The oldest and most important one of this series is the *Etymologicum genuinum.* Etymologies are valuable as they offer information about the way the Greeks analyzed their own language and remind those suggested by Plato in *Cratylos*:

> e.g. (*Et.Gen.* 837.1) <Ἀνεμώνη>· τὸ ἄνθος· διὰ τὸ τὸ φύλλον εὐδιάσειστον εἶναι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ
> "anemona: flower, because the plant is easily moved by the slightest breath of wind (*anemos*)".

In this case we should not completely rule out the fact that the flower name may be related to ἄνεμος "wind", although this could only be a popular etymology. But things are quite different in the following case:

> (*ibid*. 823.3) <Ἀνδράποδον>· δοῦλος· παρὰ τὸ ἀποδόσθαι· ἢ παρὰ τὴν πέδην, ὃ σημαίνει τὸν δεσμόν, ἐπειδὴ τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις † καὶ τοῖς γε δραπετεύουσι † πέδας περιβάλλουσιν
> "Ἀνδράποδον": slave; from 'to surrender' or from 'handcuffs', meaning 'chain', because prisoners and runaways are handcuffed".

The glossed word, ἀνδρά-ποδον, is in fact a combination of ἀνήρ "man" and πούς "foot". Other dictionaries, datable from the following centuries, were born from this lexicon: *Etymologicum Gudianum* (11th century), which, besides etymological information, also glossed morphological and dialectal forms which it explains in their turn (De Stefani 1965[2]):

> e.g. (*Et.Gud*. 230.53) <Ζῆ>, τρίτου προσώπου, ζῶ, ζαεῖς ζᾶς, ζάει ζᾷ, καὶ κράσει Δωρικῇ τοῦ α εἰς η ζῇ.
> "Live: third person, I live, you live…".

This series also included the *Etymologicum magnum* and the *Etymologicum Symeonis,* going back to the 12th century (Lasserre and Livadaras 1976). The sources of these lexicons, deeply interconnected, date from the 2nd century AD, but, as they were in their turn compilations of older works, the first sources actually date from the Hellenistic period.

Conclusions

All the data above help us draw up a few characteristics of the first lexicons in the European area. They emerged naturally out of the need to explain the language gap between Homer's epic poems, classical literature and the reality of the Hellenistic period. The first forms of the science of lexicography were born from the annotations of Alexandrian scholars on Homer's texts. At the same time, lists of words ordered first thematically then alphabetically were drawn up, for the use of writers of the time who used them in their own works. The lexica were then compiled by successively putting together information. A major difference between ancient and modern-day dictionary resides in the fact that to us, a dictionary must be thorough, that is include all terms belonging to a specific field, whereas an ancient lexicon was rather a collection of glosses explaining difficult terms belonging to long-gone times or to a limited area.

We should not forget that the first dictionaries emerged when the urge and inspiration to create original literature declined while centuries of literature needed to be explained.

Bibliography

ADLER, Ada (ed.). 1928–1938. *Suidae Lexicon*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner. (see also *Souda* online http://www.stoa.org/sol/).

BETHE, Erich (ed.). 1900–1931. *Pollux: Onomastikon*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

DE BORRIES, Joannes de. (ed.). 1911. *Phrynichi Praeparatio sophistica*. Leipzig: Teubner.

DE STEFANI, Eduardo Luigi (ed.). 1909–1920. *Etymologicum Gudianum.* 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

DICKEY, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship, A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understading Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HANSEN, Dirk U. (ed.). 1998. *Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

KEANEY, John J. (ed.). 1991. *Harpocration. Lexeis of the ten Orators*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

LASSERRE, Franciscus and Nicolaus LIVADARAS (eds.). 1976. *Etymologicon Magnum Genuinum*. Vol. I. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

LASSERRE, Franciscus and Nicolaus LIVADARAS (eds.). 1992. *Etymologicon Magnum Genuinum*. Vol. II. Roma: Atena.

LATTE, Kurt (ed.). 1953–1966. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. i–ii*, (A–O). Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

LEUTSCH, Ernst Ludwig von and Friedrich Wilhelm SCHNEIDEWIN (eds.). 2010. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*. Volume I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MONTANARI, Franco, Stephanos MATTHAIOS and Antonios RENGAKOS (eds.). 2011. *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Vol. I. Leiden: Brill.

NICKAU, Klaus (ed.). 1966. *Ammonii Qui Dicitur De Adfinium Vocabulorum Differentia*. Leipzig: Teubner.

SLATER, William J. (ed.). 1986. *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG)*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

STEINICKE, Kurt (ed.). 1957. *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

ETYMOLOGY IN ANCIENT GREEK AND BYZANTINE LEXICA: THE CASE OF TERMS RELATED TO THE DIONYSIAC CULT

SIMONA GEORGESCU

1. Introduction

The ancient and Byzantine Greek lexica not only represent, for the modern philologist, an important source for determining the meaning of numerous Greek words, for attesting words otherwise lost from texts, or even for learning about lost texts, but they also expose, sometimes more clearly than the texts themselves, current outlooks on common realities, customs, actions. The perfect mirror for the mentalities of that time is provided by the etymologies that the lexica propose.

The concept of etymology as forged by ancient lexicographers is structurally different from the modern linguistic science concerning word history. We aim, on the one hand, at pointing out the characteristics of the ancient concept of etymology, and, on the other hand, at marking the common mentalities that underlie etymological explanations.

In order to highlight the strong relationship between the *ad hoc* etymologies and the general conceptions of the time, we shall approach as a case study the words concerning the Dionysian cult. These etymological proposals allow us to detect the ideas that circulated, after the 5th century, regarding this religious belief and its manifestation. In other words, they offer a panorama of the—mostly negative—perception about the Dionysian cult and its followers, that circulated long after its banishment/disappearance.

2. Corpus

For the present study, we shall approach the following lexica, that cover a wide temporal area, from the 5th to 10th century AD:

- *Hesychius' lexicon*, dating back probably to the 5th or 6th century AD (cf. Dickey, 2007: 88)
- *Suda*—10th century
- *Etymologicum Genuinum* (EGen.)—9th century, Constantinople
- *Etymologicum Gudianum* (EGud.)—10th century
- *Etymologicum magnum* (EM.)—a lexicographic compendium of the 12th century, compiled in Constantinople, for which EGen. and EGud. were important sources.

In their turn, the lexica were based on earlier glossaries or scholia, thus they perpetuate the earlier definitions and, along with them, the older general conceptions.

Sometimes we were able to complete the information provided by these lexica with various explanations encountered in scholia that were not compiled by the lexicographers.

3. General characteristics of the lexica—the concept of ἐτυμολογία

Ancient lexicographers and scholiasts base their etymological explanations on the premise that the meaning can always be revealed by the word's form. The ancient concept of etymology does not match the modern perspective on this linguistic issue.

For us, etymology supposes tracing back the word's stem, its language of origin, the most ancient form that can be attested or reconstructed, thus it implies *per se* a diachronic route. For the ancient lexicographers, searching for the etymology of a word is an approach that can be perfectly carried out in a synchronic perspective. The explanation derives from the synchronic relation that the lexicographer establishes with another word that is phonetically similar to the *explanandum*.[1] Thus, the formal similarity, as vague as it were, is the basis for an etymological explanation. At the same

[1] Sluiter 2015: 898 states: "Ancient etymology (…) is all about synchrony, even though it invokes a discourse that references the past. It is about the relationship between words and their semantic explanation or definition—it wants to know *why* anything is called what it is called, the reason for the name, and what motivates the name-giver—and the explanations it comes up with are not intended to give us insight into the past, into the historical processes and developments leading to the present situation; rather, and importantly, (ancient) etymology is about *understanding the present*. Hence, whereas modern etymology does not provide immediate insight into the contemporary semantics of a word that is actually precisely what ancient etymology is meant to do."

time, the formal connection is based on a previous remark on the semantic nearness between the words in discussion. As Sluiter (2015: 904) put it, "the etymology is a form of reverse engineering that will make it possible to read off that meaning from the surface of the word." In the words of Fowler (1999: 2, n.7, *ap*. Sluiter 2015: 904), ancient etymology supposes a sort of "retrospective shaping".

For example, in order to explain the word ἄνεμος 'wind', the lexicographer relates it to ἄω (ἄημι) 'blow', proposing thus a "reconstructed" form *ἄεμος:

> <Ἄνεμος>· παρὰ τὸ ἄω, τὸ πνέω, ἄεμος, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ <ν> ἄνεμος.

The formal incongruence is solved by a simple explanation: πλεονασμῷ τοῦ <ν> ἄνεμος "by adding an «n» <follows> ἄνεμος". However, according to the same lexicographer, this is not the only possible explanation. He also connects it to another word, slightly similar from a phonetic point of view, and whose meaning can be drawn as *explanans*:

> ἢ ἄμενός τίς † ἐστιν, ὁ μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μένων μηδὲ ἠρεμῶν, κατὰ μετάθεσιν τῶν στοιχείων ἄνεμος
> "or it is called ἄμενος because he doesn't stay in the same place (μένων), nor keeps calm (ἠρεμῶν); through a change of the sounds <follows> ἄνεμος".

We can clearly observe how, within the same definition, we find two formal connections, based on one cognitive association: by interpreting the 'wind' as 'the one that doesn't stand still', it automatically recalls to the speaker's mind two words that refer to a semantic component, μένω 'stay' and ἠρεμέω 'keep calm'. These two words are obviously unrelated to one another even for the lexicographer, yet this is far from being an impediment in placing both of them on the same level. By coordinating them syntactically (μηδὲ, literally "and not"), the lexicographer implies that one does not need to make a choice, the relation is valid with either of them or with both, as long as the meaning stands. The form is, from his point of view, easy to explain throughout certain sound changes (κατὰ μετάθεσιν τῶν στοιχείων).

The same kind of etymological analysis applies to most of the words discussed in the lexica. We can thus understand that, from the ancient linguist's point of view, the etymological approach consists in establishing as many lexical connections as possible, being assumed that the formal similarity traces back a semantic relation. In other words, the meaning of a word is strongly related to its form.

Actually, the meaning plays a double part, being at the same time the point of departure and the point of arrival of etymological investigation. On the one hand, the previous knowledge of the meaning leads to drawing connections with other words that are formally similar to the word in discussion. On the other hand, these relations shape the meaning in order to make it as fit as possible for the proposed connection and, at the same time, to approach the semantic substance from various points of view.

Going back to the example of ἄμενος, we can observe how it is defined by two important—but not essential—features: it blows (the verb ἄημι is also used for the breath, thus it expresses the air movement), and it doesn't stand still (a characteristic that allows the connection with two words that mean 'to stay (in a place)' and 'to stay calm'; the fact that these two roots can somehow be identified by the speaker in the word 'wind' is enough to explain one feature that defines the referent, and at the same time provides a justification of the word form.

As seen, the form of a word is completely relative in determining its etymology: ancient grammarians have always been aware of the fluidity of sounds. The concept of phonetic law and regular sound change will only appear millennia later, with the Neogrammarians. Before that, changes are considered aleatory, random, in any direction: the underlying idea is that, no matter how much a word is altered, the semantic core always stays the same. And it is precisely this core that the lexicographers are searching for.

In ancient linguists' view, finding the real meaning[2], according to a scholium on Dionysios Thrax[3], consists of "explaining the words according to their sonority, through which truth comes to light" (ἀνάπτυξις τῶν λέξεων ἁρμόζουσα τῇ φονῇ, δι΄ ἧς τὸ ἀληθὲς σαφνίζεται). Consequently, the object of the etymological investigation is not the origin *stricto sensu*, but the unchanging core, the stable part, the truth that lies hidden behind the form (cf. Georgescu 2016: 196).

Plato's dialogue *Cratylos* perfectly illustrates this idea, by showing that the *real meaning* is independent of the changes that occur in the acoustic layer of the word, these sound changes being completely insignificant as against the semantic core. A good example would be the explanation Socrates provides for the word βῆτα—the name of the letter *b* in Greek (*Crat*. 393e): "the addition of *e*, *t* and *a* (ἦτα, ταῦ, ἄλφα) was no impediment in seeing clearly the nature of the letter <b>".

---

[2] Note that ἔτυμος, -ον means 'true, real', and the noun τὸ ἔτυμον designates 'the real meaning'.

[3] *Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, 14, 24, *ap*. Lallot, 1991: 135.