The lexicon I am going to discuss is an encyclopaedia with an old and venerable name: *Der Neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike*. I will first offer some basic data about the project, before turning to the conception of the lexicon, a description of the execution of this concept, a comparison with the lexicon's forerunners, and finally, the transformation of the material into electronic databases.

In 1991, Prof. Hubert Cancik from Tübingen and the publishing house J.B. Metzler in Stuttgart, which had already initiated the publication of Pauly-Wissowa's *Realenzyclopädie* (see the contribution by C.J. Classen in this volume), started the project of a new “Lexicon of the Ancient World” in the tradition of Pauly-Wissowa. Five years later, in 1996, the first volume appeared. From that time onwards, 3 volumes came out every year, and the work, planned to contain 15 volumes, is now finished with 18 volumes in all plus one volume of indices and references which appeared on December 9, 2003. The material is presented in two units, which are relatively independent from each other. The first unit comprises the articles dealing with antiquity itself in the first thirteen volumes, the second one –in the last 5 volumes, beginning with a new alphabetical series– presents articles dealing with the reception of ancient culture from antiquity to the present. Whereas the articles in the first part take the form of more or less traditional lexicon entries on ancient issues, the second part, lemmatized and arranged in alphabetical order, is designed as a collection of essays on various topics related to the classical tradition in general or to the history of classical scholarship in particular.

How was the actual writing of the articles organised? The diagram shows the basic structure of the system. In accordance with the twofold nature of the lexicon, there were two groups of executive editors with two editorial centres: Tübingen for the antiquity
section and Giessen for the tradition section. The executive editors selected and instructed “subject editors” –33 altogether– who worked out lists of lemmata, selected authors for the articles, collected the articles, revised them (if necessary), and sent them to the editorial staff, who worked on formal editing, made drawings, had articles written in foreign languages translated into German, and produced a computer file of each volume using the computer program “Tustep”. A professional computer firm called “pagina” then transformed this into a file, which was able to work with a printer, and produced a CD version which presents the material in a fully digital format. So, as one can see, both the scholarly and the technical sides were extremely important and interacted very intensively. This was one of the reasons why it was possible to produce a comprehensive lexicon of over 10,000 large two-column pages simultaneously in both printed and electronic form within 7 years (1996-2003).

Concluding this short introduction to the external data of the Neue Pauly, I should mention that the entire encyclopaedia is being translated into English and published under the title Brill’s New Pauly. The first three volumes have now come out. This translation project, however, completely lacks the close co-operation between the scholars who write and revise the articles (authors and subject editors) on the one hand, and the editorial staff producing the version that is finally published on the other. The two groups are completely disconnected. The translators translate the German articles into English without any contact with subject editors or the authors. Even articles originally written in English are translated back from the German without any participation by the authors. One can imagine the problems that arise from this procedure. For this and numerous other reasons I will ignore the English translation in my discussion of the Neue Pauly completely. Instead, I will concentrate on the complete published form of the German original.

The first question I would like to address is the concept the chief editors pursued to justify such a large and expensive project, especially since a German lexicon fulfilling all the requirements of classicists already existed. Der kleine Pauly (‘the small Pauly’) was published in five volumes, totalling around 4,000 two-column pages, between 1964 and 1975, and a paperback edition was published in 1979.

So what is the new approach? In a so-called Encheiridion, published in 1993, the editors described the project and argued for the necessity of a new encyclopaedia. First of all, they said, there was strong pressure to communicate the enormous progress that all disciplines
of classical scholarship (Altertumswissenschaften) have made since the World War II. Secondly, there was a strong awareness that the classical tradition was extremely threatened at the end of the second millennium. So there had to be –for both internal scholarly reasons and for external, “political” reasons, so to speak– a modern presentation of classical scholarship. “Modern” means both representing the present state of classical scholarship and promoting a picture of classical scholarship to the public appropriate to the cultural discourse of the beginning of the third millennium. In order to achieve this aim, the editors made the following changes in comparison with Der kleine Pauly:

- The time limit was pushed from about 500 to about 800 AD.
- The ancient Near East was given considerable space.
- Byzantine studies are now included.
- Visual and material sources are given the same weight as texts.
- History of economy, everyday life, and social history have been strengthened.
- Reception phenomena and the history of scholarship are included.

The editors maintain that Greek and Roman culture of the Bronze and Iron Age, with all its features, still remains at the centre of their presentation of the classical world. This culture, however, is situated, as they say, in a cultural and topographical context –la Mediterranée– which has to be defined and evaluated in a completely new way.

To the 19th-century editors of the Realencyclopädie, it was clear what “classical” antiquity meant. “Humanism” was a fresh and appealing movement, and “Altertumswissenschaft”, with its positivistic optimism, flourished. The expansion of education was deeply rooted in Greek and Roman antiquity. Today, however, it is much less clear what “classical”, “humanistic”, and even “antiquity” itself mean. Therefore, the editors considered it necessary to tear down the traditional boundaries that were a product of 19th-century German neo-humanistic ideology.

So in the Neue Pauly, the cultural space of the Mediterranean as a whole is treated as the historical place of classical antiquity. Mediterranean culture emerges as a –and now I have to quote the German– “spätorientalische Randkultur”, a marginal late Oriental culture. The Aegean, near-eastern culture of the 2nd millennium BC is presented as the historical cradle of Greek culture. Homer is not treated as the prime revelation of the Greek genius, but as a product of the old cultures of the Near East. So in comparison with the
Realencyclopädie and Der kleine Pauly, the number of articles on the ancient Near East is considerably enlarged.

There has also been a decisive change in the definition of the end of antiquity. In the Neue Pauly the line is drawn at 800 AD, because at that time the separation of Byzantine, Germanic and Islamic cultures from the common Mediterranean culture was definitely settled.

So the Neue Pauly broadens the view of antiquity in two respects: in time and in space. Classical antiquity is presented in the context of what went before and what came after the “classical” period, and also as a process of intercultural exchange between Greek and Roman culture on the one hand, and other ancient cultures on the other. In this way the arrogance of Graeco- and Romano-centrism, which characterized 19th century German scholarship, will not be a feature of the Neue Pauly. Africa and Asia are treated equally with Europe.

Another expansion is made in respect of the material presented. Literature and the visual arts, which according to the editors were privileged in the old concept, should be reduced to the status of the other cultural features like religion, law, economy, etc.

The last field of innovation is the large number of new methods: cultural anthropology, psychology, history of perceptions, history of the body, social history of ideologies, of stereotypes, of images of the other, the reinvention of everyday life, etc. You can easily see that this is a kind of post-modern, anti-humanistic, anti-classicistic concept, which tries to avoid Euro-centricity and classicism as well as pure positivism: interpretation of the material in light of state-of-the-art methodology is the call of editors to their authors.

This sounds very ambitious and of course many authors followed the concept, especially in the fields of ancient religion, social history, and economic history. New lemmata were introduced, especially in the fields of Oriental Studies (Babylon, Nineveh), History of Civilisation, etc. Also, many abstract concepts were introduced as lemmata: Viehwirtschaft (‘economy of cattle breeding’), Wahrnehmungstheorie (‘theory of perception’), Wahrheit (‘truth’), Wahlen (‘elections’), Welt (‘world’), etc. Such very general concepts are naturally bound to contain the new view of the ancient world the editors claim to present. But of course it will be hard to look them up in a lexicon, especially if your German is not very good. If you use a lexicon to find specific information you do not have, you will miss these interpretative articles completely, at least in the printed version.
The second innovation is the section on the reception of classical antiquity and the history of scholarship, where the classical impact in the following fields is presented: linguistics, religion, music, art and architecture, sciences, philosophy, literature, political theory and politics, medicine, legal history, the ancient orient, and education. In addition to these fields, special topics in classical scholarship such as the “Homeric question” or the Boeckh-Hermann controversy, as well as the development of classical studies in different countries, are presented. This leads to a list of lemmata that seems somewhat arbitrary, and you have to browse through the volumes in the hope of finding something interesting.

The *Neue Pauly* is the first encyclopaedia of its kind that presents the “Classical Tradition” –or at least, important parts of it– as a whole in lemmatized form. This integration of reception phenomena into the corpus of *Realia*, i.e., the corpus of concrete material that classical scholarship deals with, is driven by a noteworthy conviction on the editors’ part. Culture, they say, is the situation of its texts, *texts* here signifying the post-modern word for music, spoken words, writing, art, gestures, ritual and drama. Therefore the “Sitz im Leben”, the “situation in life”, which gives importance to the role of the viewer, the user, the reader, their horizon of expectation, is important, not only for the original time of production and reception, but also for the situations of re-vitalisation, re-invention and re-performance by later generations.

An important part of the history of reception is the history of scholarship. The relevant articles examine the conditions, which lead to the emergence and formation of new scholarly interests and new methods, or the renaissance of older concepts. Also, the history of the various classical disciplines, and genres of publication like the commentary, footnote, and index, are presented. The process of formation of the classical sub-disciplines and their development are treated, as is the development of classical scholarship in general.

In the view of the editors, the exploration of the history of scholarship also sheds light on the present state of scholarship and makes it understandable as a product of historical developments, insofar as the history of scholarship leads to self-criticism and reminds today’s scholars of the limitations and mistakes of previous times.

So what is new in the *Neue Pauly*? Its concept fits perfectly in the cultural discourses of our time. It seeks to deconstruct the narrow, euro-centric, text-based, normative and classicistic form of “Altershmskunde” of the past. The aim is a broad, multicultural,
radically historicizing approach, a presentation based on a variety of completely different kinds of sources, worked out through many methods and methodologies.

Whereas the old *Realencyclopaedie* and the *Kleine Pauly* tried to present the facts and data of the Ancient World reliably in the framework of the historical-critical methods of traditional German “Altertumskunde”, the *Neue Pauly* claims to present the phenomenon that we are used to calling “classical antiquity” as a cultural discourse proceeding through the centuries from the 2nd millennium BC to the present day.

That is roughly the concept of the *Neue Pauly* as it is briefly sketched in the *Encheiridion* and in the foreword to the first volume. The problem of such a concept is obvious: how can you represent the data, the facts, the features of a certain culture, when you dissolve these data, facts and features into discourses? Whether you share the attitude underlying the concept or not, in a lexicon there is always the problem of fixing what does not need to be fixed. Although everything is somehow interrelated with everything else, you have to separate the discourses into lemmata, which suggests the representation of notions and things as substantial entities. But then you lose exactly what you wanted to gain.

How did the authors and subject-editors deal with this problem? Many of them just forgot about the theory and wrote what had to be written in the light of recent scholarship, when they planned their articles. I don't want to talk about these articles: they are traditionally fashioned, some are extremely good, some are bad; most of them are solid and informative, with updated information and bibliography. The really interesting articles are those which explain lemmata not found in the *Realencyclopaedie*: Near Eastern, Northern European or Egyptian towns, persons, gods and literature; abstract concepts like “world”, “theory of perception”, Christian issues like “heresy”, and so on. All these abstract notions representing parts of cultural discourses are small essays on the topic; as I said earlier, you will not look them up – rather, you will chance upon them while browsing.

This may be considered a serious criticism of the work as a whole and its concept. I said “may be”, because I think the criticism applies only to the printed version and the pre-post-modern traditional user, who is focused on isolated notions, facts and data, which they wish to substantiate by reading one continuous text. The reader, or I should say, user of the CD will be working quite differently: they will jump in at one point and be able to
switch to articles whose very existence they would not have dreamt of. For in the computerised form the user is not restricted to the lemmata when searching the lexicon.

In its electronic form, the entire lexicon is at the user’s disposal and its whole corpus can be searched. Names, places, words, dates, etc. can be looked up. The following indices can be used:

- **Stichwörter (‘lemmata’):** all lemmata of the lexicon
- **Antike (‘antiquity’):** lemmata of the first part (antiquity)
- **Rezeption (‘reception’):** lemmata of the second part (classical tradition)
- **Personen (‘persons’):** the articles are classified as real/fictional and male/female
- **Abbildungen (‘illustrations’):** maps, plans of cities, etc., stems, pictures
- **Verfasser (‘authors’):** a list of articles by each author can be produced
- **Bibliography (‘bibliography’):** names and words in the bibliographies
- **Geography (‘geography’):** mountains; rivers, lakes, seas; lands, provinces, places; peoples
- **Regionen (‘regions’):** seven major regions
- **Kulturen (‘cultures’):** Greek, Roman, other cultures
- **Fachgebiete (‘subjects’):** 51 subjects
- **Themen (‘themes’):** nine fields
- **Volltextindex (‘full text search’):** all the words of the lexicon can be searched

This equipment makes the *Neue Pauly* a modern lexicon of classical antiquity and the classical tradition that will serve classicists and others interested in classical antiquity and its reception in a truly comprehensive way. It combines modern technology and a (post-)modern concept of classical scholarship.
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