

A New Lexicon of Classical Greek

R. Renehan

LEXICOGRAPHER: *A writer of dictionaries; a harmless drudge, that busies himself in tracing the original, and detailing the signification of words.* So pronounced the noblest English lexicographer in a familiar definition. Already in the Preface to his great *Dictionary of the English Language* Johnson had begun by describing the lexicographer as a “slave” and a “humble drudge.”¹ Yes, and Epimenides the Cretan said that Cretans were always liars. Dr Johnson’s self-mocking gibe has in the event, by an awful irony, turned out to be anything but harmless; in the minds of many, even, or especially, among the ranks of professional scholars, lexicography and drudgery have come to be inexorably associated as barren bedfellows. Modern lexicographers have not helped matters. *Webster’s International Dictionary* defines lexicographer as “an author or compiler of a dictionary,” a description that will affect the reader, in accordance with the particular *crasis* of his constitution, as forbidding or flat or both; the same dictionary proceeds to give one, only one, illustration of the usage: “a harmless drudge that busies himself in tracing the original, and detailing the signification of words—Samuel Johnson.” Housman, who knew better,² and who made major contributions to Latin lexicogra-

¹ What Johnson understood by the word ‘drudge’ he makes perfectly clear in his *Dictionary*, s.v.: “DRUDGE: One employed in mean labour; a slave; one doomed to servile occupation.”

² In fact Housman had an affectionate admiration for Dr Johnson, who was a significant influence on him, as I hope to demonstrate in a forthcoming paper in *HSCP*. To give one example relevant to the matter at hand, it is well known that Housman tried to be scrupulously accurate in attributing conjectures to their first proposers (“my superstitious practice of acknowledging obligations”), and often expressed contempt for the carelessness of certain editors in this regard. I quote from the Preface to *Manilius*² V xxxiii: “Operam maximam eamque satis fastidiosam posui in primo emendationis cuiusque auctore investigando”. I am one of the few who can echo these words of Lachmann’s: most editors have souls above such things, and some of them so much prefer error to knowledge that even when *we patient drudges* [emphasis mine] have ascertained the facts for them they continue to disseminate misinformation.” I have not the slightest doubt but that Housman’s ‘patient drudges’ derives from Johnson’s harmless and humble drudge. If that assertion seem rather too confident, let the reader recall Johnson’s own editorial practice as set forth in the Preface to his Shakespeare, a work which Housman certainly knew and elsewhere imitates: “Whatever I have taken from [my predecessors] it was my intention to refer to its original authour, and it is certain, that what I have not given to another, I believed when I wrote it to be my

phy, felt such self-satisfaction in some witty taunts against the *The-saurus Linguae Latinae* which he introduced into his Cambridge inaugural lecture that he could not resist the temptation to display them to his fellows a second time in his edition of Juvenal: "Here we find illustrated a theme on which historians and economists have often dwelt, the disadvantage of employing slave-labour . . . the chain-gangs working at the dictionary in the ergastulum at Munich: theirs not to reason why . . . This is the felicity of the house of bondage . . ." The passage is widely known, and is prominently displayed, so I am told, at the headquarters of the *TLL* in Germany. Less widely known is the fact that *Classical Quarterly* refused to print Housman's own article *Praefanda*, a lexical study of Latin erotic terms, even though the editor had accepted it and it had already been set up in type. The paper found a home in a German journal, *Hermes*. It would be an easy matter to draw up an imposing list of great classical scholars who did not feel it beneath them to undertake serious lexicographical research. According to Wilamowitz, Mommsen was responsible for the inception of the *TLL*. Wilamowitz's own enormous corpus is besprinkled *passim* with lexical observations, both acute and detailed. Fraenkel's study of *dies*, to mention but one contribution of his, is now classic. Bruno Snell founded the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*.

Yet the myth that lexicography is drudgery still persists. Presumably scholars in Great Britain are better informed, but in this country the name D'Arcy Thompson more often than not conjures up an ignorant picture of an eccentric Scot, doubtless of independent means and corresponding leisure, who amused himself with a harmless hobby, the compilation of a quaint dictionary of Greek fishes and a companion volume devoted to Greek birds. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (21 [1971] 1068) tells a different tale: "Thompson, Sir D'Arcy Wentworth (1860–1948), Scottish biologist whose classic work *On Growth and Form* (1917; new edition, 1942), written in rich literary style, exemplifies best his great erudition in physical and natural sciences, ancient and modern languages and the humanities . . . Thompson was a fellow (1916), vice-president (1931–33), and Darwin medalist (1946) of the Royal Society, president of the Classical Association (1929), knighted (1937), and honoured by learned institutions

own. In some perhaps I have been anticipated; but if I am ever found to encroach upon the remarks of any other commentator, I am willing that the honour, be it more or less, should be transferred to the first claimant, for his right, and his alone, stands above dispute" (*The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* VII [New Haven/London 1968] 101).

the world over.” A standard textbook of zoology concludes with a list of books and publications that have greatly influenced the development of zoology; the list is not unduly long, fewer than sixty names in all, among them Aristotle, Vesalius, Harvey, Descartes, Linnaeus, Lamarck, Cuvier, Darwin, Pavlov—and Thompson.³ Thus does Sir D’Arcy begin the Preface to his *Glossary of Greek Fishes*: “Ever since my day began I have done my share of the harmless drudgery of Lexicography. My *Glossary of Greek Birds*, to which this volume is a sequel and companion, was published fifty years and more ago; later on I read all through the proof-sheets of a famous Lexicon. All industrious men leave work unfinished and unused, and so shall I; but I am glad to have been able to complete this Book of Fishes, for it has been a work of love and predilection all along. A few more years spent on it would have been worth the while; but the night cometh when a man can work no more.” The English is simple and beautiful, even strangely wistful. Who would have thought to discover such treasure in a dictionary of fish names? We have come into the presence not of some harmless eccentric, but of a great scientist who was thoroughly steeped in polite letters. The reader perceives at once the familiar echo of Dr Johnson’s ‘harmless drudge’, at the beginning of the paragraph. The quotation from John’s gospel (9.4), with which the paragraph concludes, is also a learned allusion, if I mistake not, to the venerable doctor. Among his *Prayers and Recollections* is to be found “O God, make me to remember that the night cometh when no man can work.” Boswell relates in his *Life* how he observed upon the dial-plate of Johnson’s watch the inscription *νὺξ γὰρ ἔρχεται*.⁴

Since 1962 a team of collaborators under the direction of the most distinguished living Spanish hellenist, Francisco Rodriguez Adrados, has been engaged in work on a new dictionary of ancient Greek, the *Diccionario Griego-Español* (hereinafter *DGE*). The first fascicule (α-ἀλλά) appeared in 1980.⁵ For the history of this undertaking to date I may refer the reader both to the “Prologo” of the *DGE* itself, and to an informative paper published by Professor Adrados in 1979.⁶ There one can read not only of the numerous difficulties, both financial and technical, which are naturally to be expected in so ambitious a proj-

³ Hickman, Hickman, and Hickman, *Integrated Principles of Zoology*⁵ (Saint Louis 1974) 970–73.

⁴ *Boswell’s Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill/Powell, II (Oxford 1934) 57 (with nn.4 and 5 for further details).

⁵ *Diccionario Griego-Español* I, Redactado bajo la dirección de Francisco R. Adrados (Madrid 1980).

⁶ “La Lexicografía Griega: Su Estado Actual y el Diccionario Griego-Español,” *Revista española de lingüística* 9 (1979) 413–39.

ect, but also of the old prejudices, still flourishing like tares among the wheat: “Yo he oído a algún distinguido colega, en un tribunal de oposiciones, aquello de que el trabajo lexicográfico no tiene distinción ni brillo y he oído a otros que han oído en otro tribunal que ese tipo de trabajo no debe contársele a nadie como mérito.”⁷ An adage my father taught me when I was a little boy comes to mind: *contra ignorantiam nulla defensio est*.

Any assessment of a new lexicon of classical Greek must begin with a clear statement of its relationship to LSJ. Simply put, LSJ is the main foundation upon which the *DGE* is building. Were it otherwise, there would be something very amiss. All the entries in LSJ have been pasted on separate index cards; additions, revisions, corrections proceed therefrom. For details see *DGE* xxii ff. There are two central issues to which a reviewer of the *DGE* must address himself: first, the question of the need for a new lexicon,⁸ and, second, the quality of the work in the actual execution thereof.

In principle the *DGE* is a valuable, and what is more, a courageous project of major dimensions. The difficulties of adequate funding and staffing have been formidable, and must surely have proved discouraging on all too many occasions. We fully recognize this and cannot express enough admiration for such perseverance in less than favorable circumstances; the collaborators at the *DGE* have been fighting the good fight—and in a worthwhile endeavor. For the format of this new lexicon is sufficiently different from that of LSJ to justify its existence. There is room for both. Apart from new classical materials not to be found in LSJ, the *DGE* also includes numerous entries from Christian Greek down to 600 A.D. (albeit in less detail than in the case of ‘pagan’ authors), many proper names⁹ (even the old Lewis and Short *Latin Dictionary* is far more useful to the student than LSJ in this regard), and regularly provides etymologies,¹⁰ in

⁷ Adrados (*supra* n.6) 429.

⁸ Especially in view of the fact that the British Academy, in association with Oxford University Press, has undertaken an ambitious new supplement to LSJ under the capable editorship of P. G. W. Glare, who has already brought the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* to its successful completion.

⁹ One must take note of a project begun under the auspices of the British Academy, the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. See Peter Fraser, “A New Lexicon of Greek Personal Names” in *Tribute to an Antiquary, Essays . . . to Marc Fitch* (Leopard’s Head 1976) 73–81: “The aim of the *Lexicon* (*LGPN*) in the broadest terms is to provide a documented list of all personal names occurring in Greek literature, inscriptions, papyri, and on vases, coins and other objects” (73). I owe this reference to my friend Professor Clive Foss. For the most recent statement see *JHS* 102 (1982) 237f.

¹⁰ [After this was in press I read the balanced and competent review of the *DGE* by N. G. Wilson in *CR* N.S. 32 (1982) 210–13. At 212 he writes, “The etymology offered

contrast to the occasional odd entry in LSJ, adding, where relevant, Mycenaean evidence.¹¹ The publication of a companion lexicon of Mycenaean Greek is planned. One feature present in LSJ and missing from the *DGE* is the indication of genre and dialect distribution (“Tragic Word,” “Never in Attic Prose,” “Chiefly Epic and Ionic,” “also in later Prose,” etc.). Although LSJ at times make false statements here, in principle such information is extremely important, for the ancient Greek language perhaps more than for any other, and the failure to include it is a serious deficiency in the *DGE*. Nevertheless the very fact that the new lexicon is composed not in English, or German, but in one of the great Romance languages is itself one considerable justification for its existence. There has been for some time a conscious effort to foster Greek studies in Spain; this lexicon, if brought to a successful conclusion, could be the crowning achievement of our Spanish colleagues. Nor must one forget Mexico and the countries of Central and South America, where the *DGE* might well have a fructifying effect. National pride has its uses.

It is time to take the measure of the maiden fascicule of the *DGE*. The publisher furnishes the following figures:

	LSJ	<i>DGE</i>	Increase
List of authors	1309	2490	90%
List of papyri	143	250	75%
List of inscriptions	115	160	40%
Entries, α to ἀλλά	5000	8500	70%
Words, α to ἀλλά	148,500	324,000	120%

The statistical comparison with LSJ is somewhat misleading, inasmuch as the figures for the *DGE* include both Christian authors and numer-

for ἀβροβάτας strikes me as verging on the insane.” He is referring to the following: “Prob. adaptación griega del persa A(h)urapata ‘el protegido de A(h)ura (Mazda).’” While I have never believed in this etymology (the word is clearly a native Greek compound: Eur. *Med.* 830 βαίνοντες ἀβρῶς, 1164 ἀβρὸν βαίνουσα; and Hermann even conjectured ἀβρ<οβ>άτης in Aesch. fr.60 N.² = 75 Mette), this comment is perhaps a bit unfair, as it seems to suggest that the etymology is the creation of the editors of the *DGE* themselves. Actually no less an authority than Manu Leumann proposed it, and Bruno Snell judged it worthy of mention in his edition of Bacchylides ad 3.48: “etymologia q.d. populari immutatum esse ex voce persica *awra-pata, *a(h)urapata, ‘ab Ahura (Mazda) protectus’, i.e. ‘vir persa’ conicias collato nomine . . . Ἀβροδάτας i. *A(h)uradata—‘ab Ahura donatus’ . . . cf. etiam avest. adi. ahuradata—‘ab Ahura creatus, factus’. MLeumann per litteras.” Nevertheless Dr Wilson is right to reject the etymology.]

¹¹ For some etymologies the existence of laryngeals is assumed; for the specific kinds, see *DGE* xxxvii–xxxviii. Although my old teacher Joshua Whatmough impressed upon me the reality of laryngeals, it far exceeds my competence to pronounce upon them.

ous proper names, two categories which LSJ normally omit as a matter of policy. Some pages in fact consist almost entirely of proper names; for example, on 153 (Ἀλκιβιάδης–Ἀλκύννη) of sixty-six entries only fourteen are not such names. The corresponding section of LSJ (67, ἀλκιβιάδειον–ἀλκύνειος) has thirteen entries, only one of which is a proper name (Ἀλκμανικός, cited for the grammatical term, the σχῆμα Ἄλκμ.). Other than proper names the *DGE* has added here but one new entry not in LSJ,¹² the adjective ἀλκιμώδης which it cites from a recension of the *Alexanderroman* of Pseudo-Callisthenes. When one takes into account that the principles of inclusion for LSJ and the *DGE* are not the same, and that the new *Supplement* to LSJ, which will incorporate much, though not all, of the strictly ‘classical’ material in the *DGE*, is likely to be finished in ten years—that is to say, ten or more years before the completion of the *DGE*—and that moreover the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (*supra* n.9) will be much more comprehensive than the *DGE* in that category, then the claims and ‘percentage increases’ of the *DGE* seem, as stated above, misleading and somewhat exaggerated. This I felt bound to state in order to put things into proper perspective; the fact remains that the *DGE* will contain much new and useful material.

The best way to evaluate the quality of this lexicon is by an inspection of specimen entries, which I now propose to do. To begin with the page considered above, 153, the longest entry there is ἄλκιμος, an adjective of which LSJ state “less common in prose,” citing examples chiefly from Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, and Polybius. The *DGE* adds from Xenophon *Hell.* 7.4.30 and *Cyr.* 1.4.22 as well as a few instances from the late Ionic of the medical writer Aretaeus (influence of Herodotus rather than ‘Hippocrates’ here?); it could have added further instances from Xenophon, *Oec.* 4.15, 6.10, and *Hell.* 7.3.1. Under the entry ἀλκτήριος the *DGE* illustrates the substantival use of the neuter c. gen. from Euripides fr.697, ἀλκτήρια τύχης, without comment; LSJ state *s.v.* “so prob. E. *Fr.* 697 (cod. ἀρκτήρια).” Inspection of Nauck *TGF*² *ad loc.* will show that both ἀλκτήρια and τύχης have been questioned. Nauck omits to indicate that the manuscript reading is ἀρκτ-, not ἀλκτ- (compare Pfeiffer on Callim. fr.346). The text is not secure; here the *DGE* represents a step backward from LSJ.

As we have seen, the editors of the *DGE* pride themselves on the amount of new material included, and they have some right to do so.

¹² My sums are not wrong: the *DGE* lists ἀλκιδών as a separate entry; in LSJ the form is incorporated into the entry for ἀλκύνω of which it is a by-form.

It would however be a mistake to conclude that they have caught in their nets all the passages which merit citation in a lexicon of such proportions, for such is far from the case. In illustration thereof I offer the following specimens *exempli gratia*. ἄβρα, ἥ ('favorite slave'): add Ezek. *Exag.* 19 (pl.). ἀγαπάω, B.II.1.c. part. ('be contented'): for this construction LSJ cited Pl. *Resp.* 475B, Isoc. 12.8, Antiphanes 169; for some reason the *DGE* has omitted and replaced them with Pl. *Resp.* 473B, Dem. 55.19, Pl. *Phdr.* 247D, thereby removing an instance from comedy and from Isocrates; add also Isaeus 8.43. ἀγκαλίζω: the middle (the usual form) occurs in tragedy, Moschio *TrGF* I 97F9.3, especially interesting since hitherto only one classical occurrence of the verb has been cited (Semon. 7.77 = 8.77 Adrados). Similarly, the corresponding noun ἀγκάλισμα, cited from Timotheus, Lycophron, and later authors, has now turned up in *TrGF* II 679.11 (from a satyr play?).¹³ LSJ *s.v.* ἄγκος state "Trag. only E. *Ba.* 1051"; the *DGE* cites the passage without the observation. See now *TrGF* II 445a (satyr play?) and 679.40 (not certainly tragic). Other omissions from tragedy include ἀγνώμων (Aristarch. *TrGF* I 14F3), ἀγριόω (Moschio, 97F6.28), ἀγύμναστος (*TrGF* II 323), ἀγχόνη (Neophron, I 15F3.2), ἄδοξος (II 423), ἀεικῆς (Critias, I 43F7.11), ἄελπτος (Ion, I 19F50; II 682.11), ἀθύρω (Pompeius Macer, I 180F1.4), ἀθῶος (II 625.28), ἀκίνητος (II 361), ἀλίσστος (Eur. fr.1123; *TrGF* II 654.7). From other genres I note ἀγκιστρεία, for which LSJ cited one example from Plato and the *DGE* a second from Aelian; add Aristaenetus 1.17 (metaphorical). For the idiom ἄγεσθαι γυναῖκα = 'take to oneself a wife' neither LSJ nor the *DGE* provides any documentation from Attic prose; see Lys. 1.6. For Ἰαδρυάς ('hamadryad'), to the two examples in LSJ the *DGE* adds one from Nonnus (24.97); actually Nonnus seems to affect the word: 2.92; 22.14, 91; 24.26. For ἀκροσφαλῆς used in literary criticism add 'Longinus' 22.4. For αἶθνηγμα in a neo-Platonic work see Iambl. *Protr.* 5. αἰτιατός as a technical philosophical term is common in Proclus; neither LSJ nor the *DGE* adduce him. See *e.g.* *Inst.* 11, 28, 98. The participial form ἀκέων is cited by the *DGE* from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; in early epic it also occurs at *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 194 (ἀκέουσα). Like LSJ, the *DGE* cites the idiom ἀλίσκεσθαι εἰς πολεμίους ('fall into the hands of the enemy', 'be captured' by them) from Plato and an inscription from Amorgos; the orator Isaeus also used the expression (6.1).¹⁴

¹³ Kannicht/Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta II Fragmenta Adespota*, was published in 1980, presumably too late for the first fascicule of the *DGE*.

¹⁴ The material in this section has been taken from my *Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones*. Second Series

The editors of the *DGE* have been assiduous in taking advantage of the results of research in Greek lexicography and it is therefore good to be able to report that such research continues. Thus, to give a few examples, Papademetriou published “Notes on the Vocabulary of Secundus Taciturnus” in *Glotta* 56 (1978) 73–87. He there pointed out, among other things, that the entry *ἄθαλασσία* in LSJ, cited from *Secund. Sent.* 16, is a ghost word; the correct text is *ἄθάλασσος*, the adjective. The *DGE*, whether dependent upon Papademetriou or not I cannot say, has rightly removed the entry. Liana Lupaş published a paper “Greek Lexicographical Notes” in the Rumanian journal *Studii Clasice* 19 (1980) 85–89. She has useful comments on the tragic word *ἀδάματος*, which apparently has in every instance been corrupted to *ἀδάμαστος* or *ἀδάμαντος*; metre guarantees it in most cases. LSJ indicate this, but unclearly and giving Elmsley credit for all the corrections. For more accurate assignments of conjectures see Lupaş. The *DGE* gives no indication at all that *ἀδάματος* lacks ms. authority. Again, the *DGE* s.v. *ἄκλαντος/ἄκλανστος* cites no examples from prose. Lupaş notes, “The word occurs at least once in Prose, see *Luc. Cat.* 5.” For medical Greek, Richard Durling has published several papers: “Lexicographical Notes on Galen’s Pharmacological Writings” in *Glotta* 57 (1979) 218–22 and “Lexicographical Notes on Galen’s Writings (Part II)” in *Glotta* 59 (1981) 108–16. LSJ cite examples of the adverb *ἄκραιφνῶς* (s.v. *ἄκραιφνής* I) from Philo and Heliodorus; these are omitted in the *DGE*, which adds an example from Pollux. Durling adduces *ἀκφραιφνῶς* from the physician Heras *apud* Gal. XIII 765.14 in the sense ‘completely’ (*Glotta* 57 220), and to the two examples of *ἀγκύλη* in the technical medical sense of ‘joint bent and stiffened by disease’ which the *DGE* has taken over from LSJ (s.v. I.3) he adds four from four separate physicians, all quoted by Galen (*Glotta* 57 221). The technical term *ἀγκτηριάζω* = ‘bind with an *ἀγκτήρ*’ (“instrument for closing wounds,” LSJ) is represented in LSJ and the *DGE* by one example from Crito *apud* Gal. XIII 878; Durling adds two more from Archigenes *apud* Gal. XII 577.7, 661.16 (*Glotta* 57 222). For additional examples of *ἀγριοῦμαι*, *ἀκρισία*, *ἀκρωμία*, all in technical medical senses, see Durling’s references in *Glotta* 59 108. Valuable though these contributions be, far more important is the long-term project, *A Dictionary*

(*Hypomnemata* 74 [1982]), which see for further details. I may note that in the eighty-eight entries corresponding to the material covered in the *DGE* fascicule I, there are approximately sixty citations not to be found in the *DGE*. In fairness let me add that my *Supplement* appeared too late for the *DGE* to use.

of *Ancient Medical Greek*, which this same scholar has announced. For legal terminology, Ivars Avotins is studying Greek words and expressions in the *Digest*, *Code*, and *Novels*.¹⁵ One paper is forthcoming in *Glotta*, and another, more ambitious, study is in preparation. For the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* at Irvine see n.16 *infra*.

Lexicography is more than mechanical cataloguing; the authentic lexicographer is no mere compiler. He must possess substantial gifts both innate and acquired: considerable learning, thorough familiarity with the language and literature in question, and a very sober judgment. For, in the last analysis, the proper task of the lexicographer is not to collect (a preliminary, albeit necessary, process), but to interpret and illustrate.¹⁶ Fine specimens of the art can appear where least expected. J. D. Beazley provided an excellent example in his paper, "The Rosi Krater" in *JHS* 67 (1947) 1–9, in which he discusses a bell-krater of the late fifth-century B.C. (New York 12.229.14) which represents a mythological scene and has inscribed on it *ἀθανασία* (personified). Beazley writes (7), "As to the word *ἀθανασία*, it cannot have occurred in epic, since it will not fit into hexameter verse. It may have occurred in lyric . . . In extant literature it is not found until the fourth century (Isocrates, Plato, Antiphanes). The New York vase is therefore our oldest authority for the word *ἀθανασία*; unless, as we hope, we are right in our restoration of the fragmentary inscription on the Rosi vase, which is older still, and would take the word back to the middle of the fifth century."¹⁷ *ἀθανασία* is an important concept in Greek thought; one will search in vain for the oldest extant example(s) of it in LSJ or the *DGE*.

There are, it need hardly be said, entries where the *DGE* has improved faulty interpretations in LSJ. That *ἀγχόνη* can mean 'rope for hanging' as well as the *act* of hanging had been forgotten by LSJ⁹; in the *DGE* this meaning is restored, possibly on the basis of Eduard

¹⁵ Professor Avotins writes (*per litteras*) "As far as I could tell from such a small sample, [the *DGE*'s] treatment of the Greek legal vocabulary is on much the same level as that of LSJ. In other words, no one on their staff seems to be reading the legal sources afresh."

¹⁶ It is for this reason that the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* at Irvine will not be considered here; strictly speaking, that project, whatever its merits, is not lexicography at all. The collection of a data bank can be a very useful service, but that service consists in providing the raw materials for others to interpret. That the Director of the *TLG* is a Latinist rather than a Hellenist (to judge from his publications) is thus not necessarily an anomaly; managerial skills would seem to be more important than Greek scholarship for an enterprise of this sort. For the relationship of the *TLG* to the *DGE* see *DGE* x, xviii–xix, xxv, xlvi.

¹⁷ I owe my knowledge of this paper to Emily Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley 1979) 241 n.30.

Fraenkel's note *ad* Aesch. *Ag.* 1008ff; compare also my volume (*supra* n.14) *s.v.* ἀγχόνη. The meaning of γυναικὸς αἰχμὰ in Aesch. *Ag.* 483 is tentatively given by LSJ (*s.v.* αἰχμή III), following a long tradition, as “woman's *temper.*” Fraenkel refuted this notion in his comment *ad loc.* and the *DGE* now has it correct (*s.v.* αἰχμή II.4: “*imperio, dominación*”). For the adjective ἄκρος LSJ recognize a separate meaning ‘inmost’, only of μυελός in Eur. *Hipp.* 255 (*s.v.* I.3). W. S. Barrett in his note *ad loc.* exploded this notion (“ἄκρος in its literal use always of a surface or extremity; it is absurd to allege, as L.S.i.3, that we have here a unique ‘inmost’, the exact opposite of the normal meaning”). The *DGE* here perpetuates the error, it too recognizing a unique sense (*s.v.* ἄκρος IV: “*hondo, íntimo μέλος E. Hipp. 255*”).

LSJ *s.v.* ἀγών III.6.b has the following entry: “of speakers, *vehemence, power*, Longin. 15.1, *cf.* 26.3.” Shackleton Bailey, “L.S.J. and Cicero's Letters” in *CQ* n.s. 12 (1962) 159, called attention to *Att.* 1.16.8, *nam cetera non possunt habere eandem neque vim neque venustatem remoto illo studio quem ἀγῶνα vos [sc. Athenienses] appellatis*. “This passage,” he remarks, “which LSJ do not notice, illuminates two which they do, Longin. 15.1 ὄγκου καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ ἀγῶνος and 26.3 ἐμπαθέστερόν τε αὐτὸν ἅμα καὶ προσεκτικώτερον καὶ ἀγῶνος ἔμπλεων ἀποτελέσεις, where ‘excitement’ would come nearer than ‘vehemence, power.’” In the *Supplement* of 1968, LSJ, presumably on the basis of Shackleton Bailey's comments, add “after ‘*power*’, insert *élan*, Cic. *Att.* 1.16.8.” (In his own translation *Letters to Atticus* Shackleton Bailey neatly renders the passage “which you folks call *le feu de l'action*.”) Coming to the *DGE s.v.* ἀγών V.2, we find the following: “*combatividad* de un orador, Longin. 15.1; *fuerza oratoria* Cic. *Att.* 16.8.” Neither LSJ nor the *DGE* has interpreted satisfactorily. LSJ, as we saw, begin their entry by stating explicitly “of speakers”; the *DGE* echoes this in both its definitions. The usage may be reasonably described as oratorical in a wide sense, but in Longinus 26.3—which has disappeared from the *DGE*—ἀγών is used of the *hearer*, not the *speaker*. The author is giving advice on how to make the ἀκροατὴν ἀγῶνος ἔμπλεων, that is to say, an active participant in the contest, as it were. This extension of the term so as to include audience as well as orator ought to have been indicated. As for the definitions given in the *DGE* for the two passages there cited, had I to choose, I would have reversed them. After all, Cicero is explicit; he tells us what he means by ἀγών, namely *studium contentionis*, and that is ‘*combatividad* de un orador’ rather than the more

general rendering ‘*fuera oratoria*’, which might pass muster for Longin. 15.1.¹⁸

Earlier lexica, special concordances, *indices verborum*, all these are legitimate tools for the lexicographer, but they are no substitute for a careful rereading of the texts themselves, for lexicographical purposes, by scholars with enough Greek and command of the subject matter to make an independent and informed determination of the precise meaning of a word in a given passage. In some specialized areas this task is still a major desideratum. Legal Greek and medical Greek have been mentioned above; the technical language of Greek literary and rhetorical theory, as found in the scholia and elsewhere, is another field in which much remains to be done.

The Christian entries are not always handled satisfactorily; I confine myself to a few illustrations. “ἀαρῶν ἀρῶνα *Dial. Tim. et Aquil.* 77 re. [indecl.] hebr. ’arom esto es arca Epiph. Const. Mens. M.43. 244 C.” The entry is an abridgement of the corresponding entry in G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Two forms of the word are cited, both as indeclinable. It is impossible to tell from this entry which form occurred in which work. Conclude that ἀαρῶν is to be found in the *Dial. Tim. et Aquil.* and ἀρῶνα in Epiphanius because the forms and works are given in that sequence (first form corresponding to first work, second to second), and you would be wrong. Here are the two passages. (1) *Dial. Tim. et Aquil.*: διὸ οὐτε ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ ἀρῶνα, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ τῆς διαθήκης. (2) Epiph.: διὸ δὴ ἐν τῷ ἀαρῶν <οὐκ> ἀνετέθησαν, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτῷ. Obviously there is some relationship between the two (not apparent even in Lampe, who quotes only Epiphanius *in extenso*). The editor of the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (Oxford 1898), F. C. Conybeare, was aware of the similarities and concluded that both derived from a common source (xxv–xxvi). This is a very pertinent piece of information; one source would have one form. In the Migne volume of Epiphanius Ἄαρῶν (*sic*, with capital initial letter) is indeed printed, but with the note “Ἄαρῶν. Leg. Ἄρῶν, Hebraice . . . arcam significat. Quam vocem hic opinor alteri substituendam.” Confusion with the familiar proper name Ἄαρῶν, brother of Moses, could easily have deceived a Greek scribe into writing αα- for α- in the foreign word, and comparison with the *Dial. Tim. et Aquil.* suggests that such

¹⁸ On this use of ἀρῶν see further D. A. Russell in his edition of Longinus (Oxford 1964) *ad* 15.1 with references there given; he appositely translates “the sense of contest.”

indeed happened. Moreover, it is certain that there is a small lacuna immediately after this word in Epiphanius; a negative has dropped out, as scholars have rightly seen. I add that the negative is confirmed not only by the parallel passage in the *Dial. Tim. et Aquil.* but also by the Syriac version of Epiphanius' work, which has preserved the negative.¹⁹ Now if the letters *ουκ* have fallen out, possibly another letter fell out with them and *ἄρων* here was inflected after all: *ἐν τῷ ἄρων<ι οὐκ>*. Omission of uncial *iota* after uncial *nu* is easy and *ἄρωνα* in the corresponding passage certainly looks like an inflected form; perhaps it too should be corrected to the dative *ἄρωνι* (compare below). My ignorance of Hebrew forces me to speculate no further. What is clear is that the *DGE* has published a very imperfect entry. The next entry is the proper name *Ἀρων*, *ὁ*, which is stated to be indeclinable. That is the general practice, but there are exceptions and the reader ought to have been so informed. *Ἀρων*, *-ῶνος*, *-ῶνι*, *-ῶνα* occurs; see, for example, Josephus *AJ* 3.190, 208, 307; 4.15, 18, 21; 6.89; 8.228; 10.65; 20.225, 229.

“*ἄβελτερία*, *-ας*, ἡ *tb. ἀβελτηρία* Chrys. M.59.749 1. *simpleza* . . . Pl. *Smp.* 198d . . . D.19.98 . . . Arist. *Pol.* 1315a3 . . . Phld. *Lib.* p.41 . . . Porph. *Marc.* 1. 2. *simpleza culpable, depravación* del hombre después de la caída, Chrys. M.59.749.” It seems gratuitous to recognize a distinct and specialized meaning for this one passage (a meaning taken over from Lampe: “*ἄβελτηρία*, ἡ, *depravity*; of man after Fall, ‡Chrys. *pasch.* 7 (8.278c)” (= *PG* 59.749). Here is the Greek: *μη γὰρ ὄρα αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀβελτηρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρώτην φαντάζου κατάστασιν. καὶ γὰρ κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐποίησε.* The reference is to man’s present ‘folly’, as contrasted with his original state; no new meaning need be invented. Note also that Lampe by his symbol ‡ clearly indicated that the work in question is not by John Chrysostom but spurious; the *DGE* fails to do so. Finally, it is misleading to cite the orthography *ἄβελτηρία* only from ‘Chrysostom’. (Lampe, incidentally, in his *Addenda et Corrigenda* had second thoughts: “add ‘(f.l. for *ἄβελτερία*).’” This less correct spelling is not uncommon in the manuscripts and occurs as a variant, for example at Pl. *Symp.* 198D and Arist. *Pol.* 1315a3; some editors have even preferred this spelling. Compare Stephanus s.v. *ἄβελτερία*, also Bonitz *Index Aristotelicus* s.v.

“*ἄγκιστρος*, *ου*, ἡ *anzuelo* Gr. Nyss. M.44.265 C.” That no Greek ever said ἡ *ἄγκιστρος* for τὸ *ἄγκιστρον* I am not prepared to maintain. That Gregory of Nyssa, elegant Atticist that he was, wrote such

¹⁹ See Epiphanius' *Treatise on Weights and Measures*. The Syriac Version, ed. James Elmer Dean (Chicago 1935) 20.

a barbarism I cannot believe. Nor do we have any evidence that he ever did. For this work is spurious, and Lampe, unlike the *DGE*, noted it as such. Not even Lampe mentions that in this very passage there is a variant τὰ ἄγκιστρα for αἱ ἄγκιστραι and that in the next sentence τὰ ἄγκιστρα appears without variant. The most recent editor, H. Hörner, prints the neuter form in both places.²⁰

One may be of two minds concerning the inclusion of clearly corrupt words; on occasion the form, or place of occurrence, is of sufficient interest to justify an entry. LSJ admitted such words with discretion; the *DGE* sows with the whole sack. “†ἄγχος· προσφάτως, ἔγγυς, ἦ πνῖγμα. ἦ πλησίον. ἦ δόρυ Hsch.” Latte *ad loc.*: “confunduntur εναγχος, αγχοσ(ε), εγχος, αγχονη.” A substantial number of new entries in the *DGE* consist of nothing but corrupt lemmata from Hesychius and comparable sources. Even if one defend on principle entries of this sort, and a case can be made for them, the treatment is not always adequate. “ἀηγύβερον· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκούσατε, Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἢ λέξις sin dudo error o texto corrompido, Zonar. 95.24 C.” In addition to ‘Zonaras’ (on whom see *infra*) the *Suda* should have been quoted, both for a probably more accurate form of the word and for a fuller explanation: Ἄειγυβένς· τουτέστιν ἀκούσατε Ῥωμαϊστί. τὸ αἰεὶ σημαίνει ἀκούσατε, τὸ δὲ βένς πάντες. Adler *ad loc.* comments “cf. Rom. lex. ms. Vatic. 867,” to which I do not have access; for variant readings see Adler’s apparatus criticus. Note also Du Cange’s *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* (Lyon 1688): “ἄειγυβύς, Codex Bib. MS. Suidae ex Bibl. Reg. ἀειγυβένς, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν, ἀκούσατε, Ῥωμαϊστί. τὸ αἰεὶ σημαίνει ἀκούσατε, ὕβενς, διαλαλία καὶ πᾶν. alius Cod. MS. τὸ αἰεὶ σημαίνει ἀκούσατε, τὸ δὲ βένς, πάντες, Quid haec sibi velint non plane percipio.” Whether Du Cange’s form in -βενς (for -βενς) is a genuine variant or rather a misreading of the codices on his part I cannot say; Adler does not mention this orthography. What is clear is that the entry in the lexicon of 1688 is superior to that of the lexicon published but three years ago. There is worse. It is my duty, perforce, to state that some of the collaborators at the *DGE* know insufficient Greek for their chosen task. This becomes most apparent where they are least able to draw upon the knowledge of earlier scholars. J. A. Cramer published in his *Anecd. Par.* IV (Oxford 1841) 83–162 an alphabetical lexicon preserved in *Paris.gr.* 2669, a late ms., (“vergente . . . decimo quinto saeculo scriptus est”). Whether this is the work of Zonaras or not Cramer leaves an open question; the *DGE* quotes it regularly as the product

²⁰ *Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Supplementum* (Leiden 1972) p.17.5, 8.

of that author, with no hint of the complexities involved in the attribution of such mediaeval lexica. Cramer, as was his custom, seems to have printed the manuscript with a minimum of editorial correction; there is no apparatus criticus and errors abound. The readers at the *DGE* are largely unaware of this. I offer some specimen entries from the *DGE*, with comments.

“ἀαχῶρα· τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ τῷ γενεῖῳ πίτυρα Zonar. 122.2 C.” The first sighting of the form ἀαχῶρα ought to have put one on the *qui vive*; it simply does not look like a Greek word. The definition tells us precisely what was intended, a word for ‘dandruff’. See LSJ *s.v.* πίτυρον 2: “*bran-like eruption on the skin, esp. the head, scurf, dandruff.*” There is such a word, ἄχωρ, -ορος, ὁ (also accented ἄχώρ, -ῶρος), defined in LSJ as “*scurf, dandruff.*” It is found already in Aristophanes and is common in medical writings. Read therefore ἀχῶρα, the accusative singular, which was misunderstood as a neuter plural by the compiler, whence the plural in the definition τὰ . . . πίτυρα. If any doubt this, see Hesychius *s.v.* ἀχῶρα: τὸν ἀχῶρα. εἴρηται δὲ τὸ πιτυρῶδες <τῆς> κεφαλῆς. (The text is partially restored, but the sense is not affected. See the editions of Schmidt and Latte.) Delete the entry ἀαχῶρα from the *DGE*.

“ἀγγυῖσας· ἀντὶ τοῦ καταπαλαίσας Zonar. 91.23 C.” Another word of rather curious appearance. The definition καταπαλαίσας tells us not only that a wrestling term was intended, but that the lemma probably referred originally to a specific passage from the literature. Otherwise why cite the aorist participle rather than some form of the present? There is such a verb and such a passage, perhaps even two. LSJ *s.v.* ἀγκυρίζω: “in wrestling, *hook* with the leg, *trip*, διαλαβῶν ἀγκυρίσας *Ag. Eq.* 262; ἀγκυρίσας ἔρρηξεν *Eup.* 262.” (For Eupolis see Kock *ad loc.*) The *Suda* A 261–62 Adler may be cited for good measure: Ἀγκυρίσας, ἀντὶ τοῦ καταπαλαίσας. Delete the entry ἀγγυῖσας from the *DGE*.

“ἀγλαόδημος· λαμπρός, τετιμημένος Zonar. 87.15 C.” Either the entry or the definition is faulty, for -δημος has not been taken into account. ἀγλαόδημος, while possible, does not occur elsewhere; correct it to agree with the definition by writing ἀγλαότιμος. Compare the *Suda* A 266 Adler: Ἀγλαότιμον: λαμπρόν, τετιμημένον. In *Fr. Lex.* II (see *DGE* xci for this work) 143 it is the definition that has suffered corruption: ἀγλαότιμον· λαμπ<ρόν, τετι>μημένον (corrected editor). Delete the entry ἀγλαόδημος from the *DGE*.

“ἀθή· σκληρόν, ἀδάμαστον, ἀνδρῶδες Zonar. 97.1 C.” ἀθή would be an extraordinary adjective, if it existed. Again the definitions come to our aid. That which is ἀνδρῶδες, ‘manly’, is—*not* womanly. Take

the initial *alpha* as privative and *-θη* suggests at once the root *θηλ-*. *ἄθή* is a mutilated neuter form of *ἄθήλυντος* or *ἄθηλυσ*. Photius and the *Suda* decide the question; both have the following entry: *ἄθήλυντον· ἀδάμαστον, σκληρόν*. Delete the entry *ἄθή* from the *DGE*.

“*αἴγαρος· ζῶον, καὶ αἴγαστρος* Zonar. 98.19 C.” There is no *ζῶον* called *αἴγαρος*; correct to *αἴγα<γ>ρος*, ‘wild goat’. For this term see the *DGE* s.v. and compare Hsch. s.vv. *ἄγριον αἴγα· αἴγαγρον* and *αἴγαγρον· αἴγα ἄγριον*. (For *αἴγαστρος* see Stephanus’ *Thesaurus* s.v. *αἴγαρος*.) Delete the entry *αἴγαρος* from the *DGE*.

“*ἀκτάλη· ἡ παραθαλασσία* en una inscripción, Zonar. 105.31 C., cf. 32 C.” Here is the inscription as printed by Cramer (105.32): *δῶρα παρ’ ἀκτάλη σοι τάδ’ ἐπ’ ὠφελείης*. Clearly it is a verse and clearly it is corrupt. *ἀκτάλη* is a ghost word; a comparison with Hesychius *ἀκταῖον· παραθαλασσίον* would suffice to point us in the right direction, but the *Suda* A 1032 Adler explains all: *Ἀκταίη· ἡ παραθαλασσία. ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασι· δῶρα παρ’ ἀκταίης σοι τάδ’ ἐπωφελίης* (*Anth.Pal.* 6.33.2, where some modern editors prefer to print *παρακταίης coniunctim*).²¹ Delete the entry *ἀκτάλη* from the *DGE*.

The first fascicule of the *DGE* is thus a flawed performance, and we shall not pretend that it is otherwise. However, this initial volume covers but half the first letter of the Greek alphabet; let us remember that the *DGE* is a huge project which, it is to be hoped, will continue to produce further volumes for many years. *ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἔργου μέγιστον*, says Plato. Professor Adrados and his fellow workers have laid down systematic foundations for the creation of a major new Greek lexicon, not an easy task under the best of circumstances and particularly difficult in these times. What remains for them to do will be long and arduous, but it can be done, especially with the full cooperation of the scholarly world. Word processing and computer print-outs would seem to be essential in order to permit constant correction of errors and insertion of new materials as the work proceeds. If scholars with special expertise in the various subject areas of the Greek language will take upon themselves the burden of rereading their texts with one eye on LSJ and the *DGE* and publish the results in the journals in timely fashion, the quality of the *DGE* can be significantly improved. The editors have already demonstrated that they will use such material gratefully. On this continent the scholars of Canada and the United States should urge the American Philological Association to demonstrate its support in a tangible way. There

²¹ See Gow/Page, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip II* (Cambridge 1968) 313, on Maccius 6.2.

are precedents. To assume at this stage a superior stance before the *DGE* and confine oneself to a mean employment of adverse criticism may tempt some. Let me not be reckoned among their number. *For their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA
January, 1983