

THE *LEXIKON ZUR BYZANTINISCHEN GRÄZITÄT*

ERICH TRAPP

Rheinische-Freidrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

More than thirty years ago, when I first began to collect new and extremely rare words from Byzantine texts, I was fortunately still unaware of the immensity of the labour on which I was embarking. I might otherwise have renounced all interest in lexicography. When I first began to read manuscripts for use in the series of portraits of the Paleologues I was preparing, I had not yet thought of undertaking a systematic lexicographical study. This idea did not enter my mind until 1974, the date at which the pre-history of my dictionary came to an end, one might say, and its history began. It was then that I decided to make a collection of lexicographical material from the ninth to the fifteenth century, thus continuing the *Patristic Dictionary* of Lampe and bridging the gap left uncovered by the dictionary of Kriaras, omitting, of course, popular texts from the last centuries of Byzantium. However, certain fundamental changes occurred in the course of my work. I list below the key points in the progress of work on the dictionary:

1. Having card-indexed the relevant material from *The Patrology* of Migne, starting with volume 100 and reaching volume 140 (Nikitas Choniatis), using of course the most recent and complete editions of the relevant texts, I decided not to proceed in the same way. Since I had realized the enormous extent of the design I had undertaken, I decided in 1981 to take into account late Byzantine texts only when they were provided with useful indices.
2. The years 1982 and 1985-86 were of crucial importance, for at these times I was fortunate enough to have qualified colleagues, volunteers initially, later properly remunerated.
3. 1985 saw the publication of a paper with all the entries we had collected thus far under the letter "H". Their number today has risen from three hundred to more than five hundred, an increase of some 70%.
4. Thanks to the support of various institutions –Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Österreichischer Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften– I was able to expand further the scope of the indexing to include many early Byzantine words as well as a fair number from the later Byzantine period.

5. In the course of my work I became more and more aware that of the main dictionaries, that of Lampe is very far from complete, while *Liddell & Scott* now needs to be supplemented with the aid of the American *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, just as the Spanish team under Mr. Adrados are doing for their *Diccionario Griego-Español*.
6. Of major significance was the lexicographical symposium held in Vienna in 1989, which provided an opportunity for the discussion of many lexicographical problems: words of Latin derivation in legal texts, newly discovered omissions in the *Patristic Dictionary* of Lampe, the value of papyri in medieval Greek lexicography, the lexicological wealth of Theodoros Stouditis, medical terminology, Byzantine lexicographers, the lexicography and criticism of texts, composite words, etc.

After this long process of preparation, I undertook some years ago to publish the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität (LBG)*, despite my feeling that it would be impossible to avoid some omissions and errors. I was convinced that this great wealth of words, largely unknown until then, must be published for the sake of the advancement of scholarship. Permit me at this point to give you some statistical information about the collection: to date some 60,000 words have been collected from a total of roughly 2,000 texts of some 160,000 pages, only a third of which –perhaps even fewer– are provided with a useful index. All the remaining texts had to be read in full by me or my colleagues.

As far as the lexicographical methods we adopted are concerned, I shall first describe the indexing stage. The following classes of words had to be garnered from the texts:

1. all those medieval words which either do not appear at all in the dictionaries of *Liddell & Scott* (or its supplement) or of *Lampe*, or are mentioned in only one source, or are known only by the evidence of a later text. No account was taken, however, of words invented by the grammarians to prove their alleged etymologies,
2. words with new meanings; I should stress that in this area all we could hope to do was lay the foundations for future research,
3. useful variant readings from the critical apparatus of the editions,
4. foreign words in Hellenicized form, but not simple transliterations,
5. adjectival, adverbial and verbal derivatives of proper nouns, unless already to be found in *Pape & Benseler (Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen)*,
6. only in very rare cases did we accept words formed by linking two separate words (e.g. *εξότου*) which are frequently found in documents and in some more recent editions of literary texts. This problem of medieval Greek spelling must be solved by others at some future date.

An index was thus compiled of all the words of interest from the texts; this now had to be checked and supplemented during preparation of each of the eight volumes, with the aid of the following works:

1. the large dictionaries: *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Stephanus-Hase Dindorf), Du Cange, Sophocles.
2. smaller collections, mainly of words not collected in the main dictionaries (Koumanoudes, Pezopoulos, Mandelaras, Detorakes, etc.) or appearing in special glossaries (Caracausi, Tougard, Renault, etc.).
3. unpublished supplementary material for the *TGL*, collected in the last century by Emmanuel Miller, recorded in his index file and in his personal notes on his own copy of the *TGL* (*cod. Par. Suppl. Gr.* 1203-11 and 1214-18).
4. the CD ROM of the American *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the most important aid of all, which enables us now to fill in nearly all the gaps in the Greek dictionaries of Liddell & Scott and Lampe, up to the sixth century and even later.

Having been by this process increased by some 20%, the collection of words was checked against dictionaries of later Greek (Kriaras, Somavera, Stamatakos, Andriotis, Dimitrakos, dialect dictionaries), and selected works on terminology (e.g. Koukoules 1948-1957). The purpose of this comparison was twofold: on the one hand to enhance understanding of the meaning of a word, on the other to demonstrate its currency.

We now come to the stage in which the words are prepared as lemmata in the dictionary:

1. At least three quarters of the references, some of which first have to be updated to accord with recently issued editions, need to be checked in order to verify the meaning of the relevant words.
2. The references are arranged semantically and chronologically, as far as this is possible.
3. Sometimes collocations are supplied, e.g. an adjective is added, in the case of a noun.
4. In some cases it is not possible to supply a precise translation, but only a paraphrase of the meaning.
5. References to texts are usually given in abbreviated form, with the exception of brief texts of limited use for the purposes of the dictionary; in such cases the title is cited, or the editor, or both.
6. There are usually no more than two references to any text.
7. If a word was common throughout the Byzantine period, references are made only to the earlier instances of its use.

8. The etymology is stated only if a word is of foreign provenance or if, although part of the popular language, it is indisputably related to a learned Greek form. It goes without saying that the thousands of transparently formed compound words require no explanation of their constituent parts.
9. In the case of terms for concrete objects (Realia) and the terms from the various branches of learning (botany, law, astrology, etc.), the user is referred to specialist studies in order to simplify the form of the entry.
10. Reference is sometimes made to manuscripts, especially in the case of the material gathered by Miller, from texts which as yet remain unpublished. Although it is, naturally, impossible to verify these entries, it is my belief that there are cases when they deserve to be included, when they appear plausible in their linguistic formation.
11. On occasion corrections are suggested, or readings of the manuscripts are preferred which the editors rejected in their critical apparatus.
12. Obviously corrupt forms are not accepted; these come mainly from outdated editions containing misreadings.
13. At the end of each entry, the user will find as many references as possible to other dictionaries and, more rarely, to relevant studies. My main objective is to follow the excellent example of Kriaras in demonstrating the longevity of a word, through the ancient, medieval and modern form of the language, as well as in the dialects.

It is worth emphasizing the enormous benefit derived from the use of the computer. The proofs for words beginning with “H” were prepared by the traditional method. This would be unthinkable today. The assistance of the computer has become indispensable, not only in making frequent additions to the lexicographic material from new texts, at least in those sections currently under preparation, but also in performing the previously laborious changes in references to accord with new editions of familiar texts, and in carrying out comparisons with the aforementioned dictionaries or lexicographic collections. However, the most important contribution made by the computer is the opportunity it offers to compare our own collection methodically with the word table on the CD ROM of the American *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. I ought to mention another CD, the *PHI*, which contains inscriptions and papyri but does not appear to be of much use to us for a number of reasons: firstly, almost all the new and rare words in these texts are to be found, with an adequate number of textual citations, either in *Liddell-Scott* or in the new supplement by Glare; secondly, there is no alphabetical index to facilitate the location of words of interest; finally, only a few collections of Byzantine documents have been taken into account in preparing the CD.

To sum up, all the additions, changes and final composition of the entries (orthography, etymology, translation, semantic and chronological arrangement of the references, addition of the bibliography) require electronic processing. Moreover, in the distant future, when the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* has been completed, use of computer technology will facilitate the preparation of the supplement. Nevertheless, before I finish extolling the advantages of the computer, and especially the virtues of the *TLG* CD ROM, I should like as well to mention some of the drawbacks of the latter. Quite clearly this CD edition only provides the text of the relevant edition for each reference; manuscript variations and critical notes have not been taken into account. Hence the use of the printed texts will still be necessary in the future, in order for the lexicographer to uncover errors, misreadings, editorial speculation, as well as valuable lexicological material arising from *variae lectiones* of the critical apparatus.

Were I to be asked what the use of the *Lexikon* will be, my answer would be in two parts: the first negative, but the second positive. What can it not hope to be? I would not presume to compare it as an aid with *Liddell Scott* on ancient Greek or Kriaras on the popular Greek of the Middle Ages; nor must I venture to compare it with the even more comprehensive *Diccionario Griego-Español* or the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*. We should rather attempt to judge the *Lexikon* by the standards of the long tradition and gradual improvement of dictionaries of ancient Greek (Stephanus-Passow-Hase-Dindorf, etc.), remembering that the readers of classical authors far outnumber those of Byzantine texts. It is immediately obvious, in my view, that because Byzantine philology is still at a relatively early stage of development, several generations must pass before Byzantine Greek has its own dictionary comparable to *Liddell-Scott*. Moreover, preparation of such a work will not encounter only the problem of the repeated reading of the same texts. Often the critical basis of the editions available is not of sufficient authority to guarantee the credibility of each new and problematic word.

Let us now turn to the anticipated benefits from the *Lexikon*. It is our hope that the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* will be:

1. a new and vital tool in the interpretation of many texts from the 4th to the 15th century,
2. a foundation on which future critical studies can build,
3. a new and much more reliable basis for the history of Greek words from antiquity up until more modern times, including the words of the dialects,
4. a work useful for students of old Slavic philology, because of the many translations from Byzantine texts and the loan formation of compound words, principally in the hagiological writings,
5. a useful aid in related fields of study, such as classical philology, theology, linguistics, medieval history, papyrology, the study of eastern peoples, etc.

It remains for me to speak of the progress made and the prospects of completing the work, which is a matter of importance since, as we all know, a dictionary is of no use to the public until it has reached its final letter. If we assume on the one hand that the structure and scale of the dictionary will remain virtually unchanged, and on the other that there will be no new editions of Byzantine texts requiring greater attention than they have been given to date, then the progress of the dictionary will depend entirely on the financial support provided by the institutions of learning I mentioned earlier. If funding remains at current levels, I would hope to see half the work complete in four years time (in time for the next conference on Byzantine studies in Paris in 2001). The remaining four sections (Λ-Ω) should appear over the following ten years, the whole dictionary being completed by the year 2011. The finished work will comprise some 1,800 pages, in two volumes, with at least 70,000 entries.

Finally, may I be permitted to address an appeal to all fellow scholars of Greek. I should be very grateful to receive critical notes or suggestions concerning unknown editions of Byzantine texts or writers of valuable linguistic studies. For my part, I shall be happy to supply information on the as yet unpublished section of our dictionary.

Translation CHRIS MARKHAM

References

- ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΗΣ, F. 1948-1957. *Βυζαντινών Βίος και Πολιτισμός*, vol. I-VI. Athens: Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes.