

## ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION<sup>1</sup>

J.N. KAZAZIS:

This part of the Conference will be in English, since there is no other way to conduct a discussion among our guest speakers and ourselves. There will also be time left for members of the audience to address questions to the speakers. I would like to read in English the five questions we had posed as the starting-points for this round-table and ask today's speakers to respond to these.

During the 1st International Lexicographical Conference held here in Thessaloniki in 1997, there were four general conclusions. One was that the major lexicographical projects of the past –*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, and *Liddell-Scott-Jones*– have not lost their usefulness today despite criticisms voiced from time to time. Second, for those lexica to continue being useful, they have to be digitized. Third, renewal of the great lexicographical projects like *LSJ*, for example, cannot be accomplished by recompiling them. The only way to renew knowledge in this regard is to have epitomies, concise, middle-sized lexica where from time to time all new knowledge should be incorporated. These too should be digitized so that renewal would be cheap and easily accessible. The fourth result was that we have to find a way for this specialized, sometimes over-specialized, knowledge to go through filters and reach the schools. Otherwise, the philological community is in danger of remaining without an audience, without students, operating in a vacuum. These are the four major points. Today, following our meeting, I realized that all these principles can be easily transferred to apply to the major encyclopedic-lexicographical projects of the sort presented today. *Pauly-Wissowa* should be made available again, I don't know if it can be done in a digitized form but it's still useful. Middle-sized lexica should be created again. And therefore, condensed versions of the major lexica must be prepared. They are inexpensive in printed form, and even more inexpensive in electronic form. They can be continuously updated. We have to do this in order to ensure that we have an audience – to provide them to the schools, the universities and the learned public, everybody who is interested in these matters. And there are many people interested who do not belong to the narrow confines of philology, but to the fields of comparative literature, cultural history, and so forth. So, if we can transfer what holds for

---

<sup>1</sup> The text, based on a transcription of the discussion with which the Conference concluded, is here presented in a slightly abridged and edited format. Portions originally in Greek have been translated.

the language lexicographical projects to the encyclopedias, then we could have more or less the same results.

In order to be able to conduct this discussion, I would like to ask the morning and afternoon speakers to respond to a number of basic questions. *What kind of influence have modern philological trends exercised on the physiognomy of the Encyclopedias of Altertumswissenschaft?* This is the first question.

C.J. CLASSEN:

As regards the influence, first, I think it's pretty obvious that everybody uses *Pauly-Wissowa* provided he knows German and provided he wants some basic information, and second, it's been made obvious and clear from Prof. Käppel's paper that there is a new approach prevailing now and I think he made it very clear that this approach is up to a point complementary. *Der Neue Pauly* is clearly following a new line against the traditional positivistic line. So with *Pauly-Wissowa* you have a useful tool, but this tool is no longer the only answer to the problems of classical scholars today.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Can I ask the second question? Is there a way of transcending this antithesis between the two, the old *Pauly-Wissowa* and the *Neue Pauly*?

C.J. CLASSEN:

Not to me. You can use them together. I presume that Prof. Käppel would agree that he still uses the old *Pauly-Wissowa* and I use the new. I've always used the two and he uses the two, and I think that in the sense that we are aware they are different and that we need both, we are also aware of their limitations.

L. KÄPPEL:

I would like to add another point because we spoke about German lexica in the morning; I would like to ask the participants if anything in a language other than English has a chance of being used worldwide. So, if we want our works to be used, should we all write in English?

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Is this a rhetorical question?

L. KÄPPEL:

Partly, yes. Probably yes. I'm very sure that the German version of the *Neue Pauly* is hardly being used. I spoke to American colleagues who didn't know it existed and they said they never used it. I really would like to know if the English version will be used, if that is the reason people don't use the *Neue*

*Pauly*. So if we are talking about the use of lexica worldwide, we should first discuss the question in which language we write.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

I would like to return to the first question and ask another of the morning speakers to take a position on that.

A. RENGAKOS:

May I address this question of modern contemporary tendencies and the impact on encyclopedias to our two Italian friends of this morning, Marco Fantuzzi and Roberto Pretagostini? Our two colleagues showed that in twenty-years time they had experienced in Italy three wholly different kinds of encyclopedias, I mean ideologically different: *Storia e civiltà*, *Lo spazio*, *I Greci*. I think you are very well placed to answer the question about the impact of contemporary ideas and ideologies on lexica of classical studies.

M. FANTUZZI:

It's not very difficult to answer this question. These three lexica we spoke about in the morning cannot be considered, as we tried to say at the end, real encyclopedias. This was a hyperbolic way of putting it, of trying a definition, but they are monographs, alongside of which are traditionally a lot of encyclopedias. Not only do they not have encyclopedic ambitions; they are also, in some way, complementary to each other. We've tried to show that these three major enterprises-accomplishments and other minor enterprises that took place in the last thirty years really tried to fill the vacuum left by previous work, and by the method of previous work, in order to offer a kind of complementary reading. So we have said, for instance, that at a certain point, at the beginning of the 1990s it was acknowledged that no comparative history of Greek and Latin poetry had been done, and published three luxurious volumes which mainly focused on the comparison between Greek and Latin poetry. This is just one instance. But we tried to show that these three major "encyclopedias" are also complementary to *each other*. They descend from different methods but they may be read as a result, as a series of three monographs that complement each other. It was not a plan from the beginning, of course, it was just the result, maybe a result of the laws of the market or the result of a method which is very complex and challenging.

C.J. CLASSEN:

I wouldn't want to monopolize this discussion about the Italian scene, but I would like to draw attention to two encyclopedias that haven't come into view because they concern Latin authors. But they seem to be representative of the modern tendencies: the encyclopedias on Virgil and on Horace. What you have there is exactly the same basic approach as the *Neue Pauly*, and this

just shows that this is the sort of approach which is absolutely essential today. This is obviously felt independently in different countries against different backgrounds, but it is felt quite clearly.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Would you like to add something to that?

M. FANTUZZI:

As for these two encyclopedias, we were speaking with the other colleagues in the morning about them. They were outside our horizon, because, as the title of our talk clearly stated, we were concerned with Greek culture and literature. But we don't think that the *Encyclopedia Virgiliana* and *Encyclopedia Horatiana* are in contrast with the picture we have tried to outline. They are not at all small *Pauly-Wissowas*. They are very metonymic views of important sections of Greek and Latin literature and culture, but from the very specific point of view of a specific text of a specific author, where the method does not focus its perspective on a specific text or specific author. This gives these major works, which are apparently encyclopedic, a metonymic perspective on the ancient world.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

I suppose what Prof. Classen means is that this is another solution, complementary to the other.

M. FANTUZZI:

Indeed parallel. Once again, in these encyclopedias there is not at all the need or the task of providing standard definitive interpretations of the old Greek and Latin culture. So it's again the problem of the search for the method or, in this case, for specific new methods.

A.J.S. SPAWFORTH:

With something like the *Oxford Classical Dictionary (OCD)*, which is on a very different scale from the encyclopedias currently being discussed, I suppose that the very fact that it still aims to be a one-volume publication with more general readership presented the opportunity to try to combine the demand for factual knowledge with presentation of articles which would show the so-called post-modern approaches. It sounds as if we had rather pretentious aspirations for the dictionary, but that's what I wanted to point out, it's not either-or. It is possible to put both into a single format.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Thank you. Prof. Robling.

F.-H. ROBLING:

I would like to respond to the question of contemporary philological trends and this time, in reference to the Rhetoric dictionary, the concept of which I have presented here. I think that there were two tendencies important for us. The first that should be pointed out is the history of cultural basis of literature and of all works of art. The second is the claim for a comparative perspective on interpretation of works of art and literature. And these two claims are for now the main claims of usage of our *Wörterbuch*, history of contribution of the history of cultivation by language. And that means rhetorical education on the one hand, and on the other, establishing criteria of comparison between the literatures and the arts.

TH. PAPANGHELIS:

I have been attending very closely to what has been said on the divide between traditional approaches and modernist or post-modernist ones, and perhaps before we leave this room we might clear up one thing. I am wondering to what extent, and in what sense, we can speak of complementary readings in this case. I mean, you have the old *Pauly* and you have the *Neue Pauly*, and you use them both because the one is factual, fact-based and positivist, and the other one adopts a different approach, more theory-conscious. I think what we have here is that it all boils down to a question of epistemology, of epistemological difference. If you have, for example, an encyclopedia which gives you reports on the literature accumulated on a certain issue right down to the latest post-structuralist, anti-foundationalist development, you may still have a very positivistic, factual kind of work. It's quite a different thing to have an encyclopedia written by someone who inhabits a certain discourse – that word was pronounced by Prof. Käppel, and it's a very important word. If you talk from *within* a discourse, that means that your presentation of a certain issue is perspectival, it's not just factual or descriptive. Have we solved this problem? Is there a problem like that? Am I dramatizing something that editors do not confront and face? Is there an answer to that?

J.N. KAZAZIS:

I think the question of reconciling the two types of works is essential and I am glad you returned to that. If I may, I would like to add something. This morning we had the printed form of *Pauly-Wissowa* delineated in its ideological presuppositions and what it accomplished by Prof. Classen; after that, we had Prof. Käppel giving us the same picture about the *Neue Pauly*. However, we shouldn't miss one thing: as books, they are different and they will remain different. If we digitize them then we do have a way of reading them together, because then we will be able to isolate every segment of information and check vis-à-vis the old *Pauly* and the *Neue Pauly*. If we break

it down into notions, keywords, etc., then the factual preconception and the discourse analysis of the other approach can be reconciled if we have access to them in digitized form. I think there is a little revolution hidden behind on-line access to such important works. Of course, this does not exactly solve the problem; you have to have criteria for comparison. I agree with Prof. Fantuzzi, you have to have criteria, but at the same time, you now have an opportunity to read a digital text in a way you cannot read a printed text. Quite novel ways of “reading” these texts become possible.

M. FANTUZZI:

One main point which both Prof. Pretagostini and I certainly both believe, and which we have tried to make clear (possibly without success), is that Italian scholarship could afford to do these four, five, or six metonymic re-readings of Greek culture and literature *only* because *Pauly-Wissowa* and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* existed. Prof. Pretagostini at the beginning of his talk pointed out that at the end of the 19th century we had translated the lexicon of Lübker. We’ve translated both the 1st and the 2nd editions of the *OCD* in more recent years. And all classical scholars read or should read *Pauly-Wissowa* for their own work. So, we *presuppose* this dictionary which provides a practical, a solid or more traditional reference point about classical antiquity. We are not alternatives to them; it’s simply that we could afford to do something more in accordance with the cultural environment, which may be peculiar to Italy in the last thirty years.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

I’m sorry that I am doing a lot of speaking myself. I think the language problem is essential and has to be addressed. On the one hand, we have the large-scale operations and projects and on the other hand, we have the middle and small-sized. The *OCD* or the three Italian lexica fall under the second category. Now in an age of over-specialization, it is impossible for anyone in one national language to have a large-scale accomplishment such as the *Pauly-Wissowa*. We all have to work and maybe adopt the solution of linking three or even four languages. But science and scholarship today require international cooperation. This is being done of course as you know with translation. The only solution is to translate, but you can only translate small-scale works. However, you see the Union Académique in Paris has adopted a very wise solution and I don’t see how this has not found any followers in other projects. If we require three or even four languages, then this has to be done. In translating there are problems and they have been discussed; nobody wants to repeat the mistake of the English version of the *Neue Pauly*. I’m sorry for my intervention, but let me proceed to the next question. The next question is *how do we assess the impact of these works upon research in tertiary education, in secondary education, at the school level and even on*

*the broader public?* Are there any studies, are there any empirical observations anybody has on this basic question? We used to see a great number of citations from *Pauly-Wissowa* in the older generation of scholarship; I don't see them any more, at least not to the same extent. It's not because they are antiquated, there is something else happening. Americans aren't monopolizing the scholarship of the present century.

A. RENGAKOS:

What about the *OCD*? What is its impact on the schools? Is there any experience of that?

A.J.S. SPAWFORTH:

Some, to my knowledge. Simon Hornblower may know something else. There is very little empirical evidence for its impact on education, although one suspects that that is where a lot of these sales are taking place, but how to imagine anyone proving it? But in theory it would be possible to investigate the use of the dictionary or the spin off publications by the teachers for A levels, for instance in British schools which require a knowledge of classical antiquity. With the *OCD*, it would be in a way more interesting to do that in America given the volume sales in the States. It would be a huge job. It's hard to imagine anyone actually wanting to do that.

S. HORNBLOWER:

Can I start by saying that our project resembled what Prof. Classen talked about at the beginning of the day, namely a project where the initiative was taken by the publisher. I didn't wake up one morning and say I'd ruin the next six years of my life by editing the *OCD*; I was approached. Now, our work is just about the only work that is being considered today that has entered the general public through book clubs; many academic or semi-academic books are sold through book clubs, such as ancient history book clubs. In America in particular, there's a huge market. When reaching out to these people, we are probably the only reference work that has been doing that – not us personally, but the publisher, who has to make money; they are only interested in money really, even a prestigious press like Oxford University Press. As for schools and universities, as Tony Spawforth said, it's much too early to say as to the effect of what is after all a one-volume book published only a few years ago, but certainly a lot of university students got the terrible job to write their essays. It's the last thing we should have done, to have in a way prostituted all this wonderful talent, people, students, even schoolchildren. Instead of reading the text and looking at the primary evidence, they are going to a work like *OCD* and getting this packaged and ready-made, a use I am not particularly proud of, but I am certain, and I am sure Tony has discovered too, that that's what students do. But it's better than

downloading your essay from the Internet, which is a form of plagiarism. What we wanted and still want is for people to go further, to show curiosity. And that's why we have the system, which, I think, *Neue Pauly* has also used, of putting a little star in front of an entry to say go to this entry, there is an entry under that, instead of q.v., which nobody understands any more. We took that system from the *Oxford Companion to English Literature* and it's intended to encourage curiosity; that's the real test. I don't know how one would go about finding if it worked. If that spreads down to schools, it will make people want to study the ancient world and then the ancient languages to make their own decisions. In a way, they will be able to throw away their copies of the *OCD* and read the text for themselves. That's what we want, what I want, I think, but it's very useful, very stimulating to have world class scholars saying provocative things which hacks with no real competence in the field are not going to be able to do. I think we are probably the only work of reference that's been trying to do that for the general public.

E. MATTHEWS:

I don't think we can find one way, one method of assessing the impact of reference works. For example, with something like the *OCD*, book sales are a true indicator of impact. On the other hand, it's one of the things the editors have to suffer, I think, that it is the kind of work which we are all going to look at to check something we have forgotten, to see what the great scholars think about something, but we are not going to cite it; on the whole, I think it won't go in the footnotes.

S. HORNBLOWER:

I think it's something most scholars won't admit. It's somewhat dishonest of them.

E. MATTHEWS:

That's exactly what I am saying. I'm not justifying it, but I think it's the case; it is used without being cited; citations are one method of assessing a work of reference. I think the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* is perhaps in an unusual position, in that the need for what we provide has been known for over a century. The work available didn't fulfill that need because of the increasing amount of evidence; since we make the evidence available, we make an impact. We do see an impact, for example through our web pages. You can see the impact of the *Lexicon* on research by citations, and by the kind of work that's being done that couldn't have been done if the *Lexicon* were not there. But I would say that we don't normally reach out to schoolchildren, although through the web pages we do get queries from the undergraduate level. And also, as I said in my talk, a lot of Greeks want to know about the ancestry of their names. So, that's a funny mixture; it won't be true of other

projects, but maybe each project would have a different answer to this question of assessing impact. But if you are seeking one measure, be prepared to acknowledge that there may be many.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

The reason why I ask this question is obvious. The editors of Sprachwörterbücher undertook extensive studies in the 1980s to determine their audience and their readership before launching new projects. Obviously, any editor or publisher, before committing money and human resources to an encyclopedic dictionary, would want to have some data on readership and prospective readership. Anyway, here we have a void where some empirical study should be done, maybe on a case-by-case basis.

L. KÄPPEL:

I would like to answer the question for Germany and for the *Neue Pauly*. My impression is that there is a strong impact of the *Neue Pauly* on the university level, because the university libraries have it. And many articles have an impact on the research level. No doubt there will be no impact at all in the secondary school, in the gymnasium, because they simply can't afford to buy the lexicon; it's several thousand euros, they just can't buy it. They won't be able to buy the CD either, because it's some thousand euros, too. So, there is no chance except for some university towns where some pupils go to the seminars and look it up. This would be the exception, the general gymnasium won't have this lexicon in the next ten years or so and the only way to make it accessible to them is a free on-line version, I think. And I would like to ask the question: most of the people who make these lexica don't do this for the money, they are paid by the universities and my question is, why do we not just produce lexica and give them as on-line versions for free? Why do we approach publishers who make a lot of money out of our work and we don't get anything out of it? We could do it on-line and everyone could use it for free.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

This is a good suggestion. As a matter of fact, the Centre for the Greek Language has been providing free access to three huge dictionaries, a medieval one, a Modern Greek one and a Modern Greek-English Dictionary – all of them free of charge. But of course we have public money and we can afford to do that, although for how long I don't know. To what extent it would be right to extend this in the future is an open question, but at least we have great visibility because of this, we have thousands of queries and visitors on-line. We can document this very easily, as Mrs. Matthews said, but obviously this is the solution if scholars undertake to do something like this under the aegis of UNESCO or some similar aegis.

T. KOBUSCH:

I would like to stress what Prof. Käppel said concerning the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*. You can find it everywhere in the libraries, also in the schools (in Germany at least) and I think there is also a very strong impact on the public. I can tell you a particular experience. There was a discussion on German television with the former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and behind him you could see the whole series of the *Historisches Wörterbuch*. It was not at his home but at a public institution, in Bonn or Berlin, I cannot remember. So, there cannot be any doubt that the work is very well known to the public.

A. RENGAKOS:

I think you can see a national leader sitting in front of the *Historisches Wörterbuch* only in Germany. You are a unique case. I cannot imagine our Prime Minister or the Italian one with a dictionary of philosophy framing their personality, so to speak.

L. KÄPPEL:

I can add one instance of Richard von Weizsäcker, the previous Bundespräsident. He had the *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* behind him, when he made a speech on German television.

A. RENGAKOS:

You are definitely a unique case.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

What about the old and venerable *Roscher*, *Pauly-Wissowa*, and others like them? Do you think there is any chance that somebody might undertake an inexpensive solution such as scanning them and producing, not a database, which is structured and requires enormous programming, but a modest product like a data bank, providing of course some indexing and making them again useful? Prof. Classen, do you have an answer to that? Do you see it as feasible? Modern technology gives us solutions that are not very expensive. For example, you can get a book scanner, which is expensive to buy but a very good investment. What it does is give you a digitized form of two pages per exposure. Of course then you have to allocate one person to work for maybe six months to go through these one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty volumes, and then another person doing some indexing, and that's all it takes.

C.J. CLASSEN:

May I point out that in Bavaria for instance, the universities are faced with a 10% cut at the moment? This is a 10% cut in Bavaria, a most conservative and

very rich federal state, and you could not imagine the cuts in other parts of Germany. I don't see anyone prepared to pay anyone even for three months for a job like that, unless you have a foundation.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Private grants, perhaps?

L. KÄPPEL:

I must say I would be skeptical about that too, because as Prof. Classen said, it would cost quite a lot of money and the use would be really restricted. The only use would be to make it accessible to people who don't have access through a university library, but the improvement would be very limited. You just have photographs so to speak, and the great advantage of the computer is that you can make complicated searches, not just looking at pictures of the books. I would be disappointed to have something like that. It wouldn't really improve the use of the material, I think. Those who are really interested in the *Realencyklopädie* go to the university library and look up the books. The real advantage of the digitization of books is to have the databases and to make searches and to surf, so to speak. The other thing would just be a reproduction of what you already have. I would rather try to get people who have projects to start with computer and digitization right from the beginning. This is what the people from the *Neue Pauly* told me that I should stress here, that they started with a computer program right from the beginning. It's very hard to start in the traditional way and switch to the computer thing when you finish your scholarly work. This multiplies the energy required and drains resources; it's much better to start the computer work right from the beginning. This should be stressed, I think.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

There is no doubt about that, but you see you are spoilt by the expensive solution. We are talking now about rescuing something from oblivion, because how many people have access to large libraries nowadays? For example, take the University of Thessaloniki, where there is only one copy of the *Realencyklopädie* in the library. At least if you could have a site where you could go and look it up, that's an alternative, otherwise you bury completely something that is half buried already. This is being pragmatic, if I may say so.

E. MATTHEWS:

It seems to me that the discussion is unnecessarily pessimistic. Money is not flowing around everywhere, but there are foundations, there are public funding bodies that would support digitization precisely for the reasons that you say. I'm thinking of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, which has a Getty grant precisely to digitize the old volumes. It was made by Getty, I think, to

the Union Académique, and through them to a particular project which is carrying out the work. And certainly in the U.K. public funding is available to make things accessible that at the moment are hidden away somewhere. The obvious case is manuscript collections in libraries, but it could apply here, too. The merits would have to be argued for each case and the language might be inhibiting; you wouldn't put money into something that wouldn't be read by a considerable number of people.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Thank you. *The next question is more specialized: how useful are these general and specialized encyclopedias in compiling Sprachwörterbücher?* We already had some examples and we are thankful to the presentations of this afternoon, but maybe somebody has something to add, especially those compiling language dictionaries.

F. MONTANARI:

I think that general encyclopedias or reference books on specialized subjects are very important for compiling language dictionaries because you are always confronted with translation and terminology problems. Reference books need to have the basic information: so general dictionaries are very important to build up a language dictionary. But I would stress another point; that is the necessity of updating the tools. In the use of information technology there is now the possibility of updating reference tools quickly and easily. Compiling a new dictionary will imply a lot of extra-difficulties if your reference tools are not up-to-date and cannot provide you with the correct information. Modern research is going faster than in the past, so the request of updating reference tools is now more stressed. To sum up, I think that, yes, reference tools are important for new dictionaries, but it is also important to keep updating all our reference books.

E. MATTHEWS:

I don't think that keeping something up-to-date is necessarily easy. I think it's very easy to confuse the ease with which you can do it technologically with the work that has to go into forming the judgment that makes the alteration. We may be talking about different kinds of things here. I don't see why something is wrong, just because it doesn't contain something discovered this year. I'd like to know more about what you mean, but having thought about it over the years in the case of the Lexicon, for example, I believe that the actual act of updating would be easy but maintaining the team which would make the judgments that would lead to alterations is a very big matter, not easy at all.

F. MONTANARI:

I am perfectly aware of the difference between research, that is the scholarly work necessary to form a judgement about new evidence, and what can be done thanks to technology. That something is wrong just because it does not contain what has been discovered this year is not absolutely what I mean, but the idea of taking into account the results of the research of the last half century (or perhaps of the last century in some cases) is right, almost trivial, as well as doing it within reasonable time. Of course I do not mean that reference tools must be updated every year, like a train time-table, but scholarly work does produce changes both in historical perspective and in factual knowledge or new evidence. I do not think that everything in the *Pauly-Wissowa* is obsolete, it would be stupid, but it would also be stupid to think that nothing is obsolete. New editions sometimes provide a different text, that is new linguistic evidence, and special studies change the interpretation of a term. An important colleague of us who recently studied the *Historia animalium* by Aristotle told me that there is a lot of changes to be made both in the names and in the identification of animals. So now it is possible that the name of an animal in a dictionary is translated on the basis of an old and wrong interpretation: would it not be better to have it corrected? We cannot ignore the fact that updating is necessary in classical philology as in any other discipline. I do not exactly know which percentage of *LSJ* can be considered obsolete, but I am sure that this percentage exists.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

And now, having talked a great deal about lexicography abroad, I would like to pose the final question, which is chiefly directed at our Greek audience. *What is the future of encyclopedic lexicography in Greece in particular?* It is a very well known fact that in Greece there is no encyclopedia large, small, or even very small, of antiquity. We used to have one in the 19th century by Rangavis; that was the closest to what we are discussing today. After that we had general encyclopedias where of course you can fish for whatever you want, but this is a huge pond and the articles were not always written by the specialized scholars that we see writing for the other encyclopedias. We do have a huge gap in Greek scholarship here, and I would like to ask our Greek colleagues especially what their feelings are about this.

E. VOUTIRAS:

Let us say first of all that this is a question of the public, of the readership, of which public such general works should be addressed to. No publisher would undertake such a project unless they knew they had a public, and the readership in Greece today, even if you take the diaspora into consideration, is far too small to justify such an enterprise. The problem is that in Greece there are people who feel for different reasons, scholarly but also not scholarly, that such undertakings are needed and the problem is that they

usually have to be satisfied with translations; that's the cheapest way of catering to their needs. So this is the situation, I don't see a way out of it, but I don't consider it desperate, either. I think that you have hinted yourself at the only way out of the difficulty, and that is international cooperation. It is needed anyway, and wherever there are such large projects I think that Greek scholars should try to be part of them. I can only give you one example of which I am aware because I am part of it. This is the Greek involvement both with the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)* and with the new undertaking *ThesCRA*, which has quite a large participation from Greek scholars simply because the *LIMC* has a very important and active Greek commission. Now the only difficulty with this (but it is only a matter of national pride, not a matter of scholarship) is that Greek scholars, cannot for obvious reasons, publish in their own language. What they write, they have to translate into one of the four international languages admitted in the project. But, as I said, with internationalization going its own way, this is not such a terrible thing after all, and I wouldn't view it as very negative. And this is also implicitly an answer to the very pessimistic view that in time English is going to be the only language used in classical studies. I don't think this is the case. Part of our richness is that we are aware of the importance of being able to communicate in a different language. By definition we study cultures whose languages are not only foreign but are also dead. So I think we are all very sensitive and very aware to the fact that we have to know foreign languages, and since these are international cooperations anyway, there is a very empirical and heuristic way of solving things. I have to admit that I found myself in surroundings where Americans had to speak German and they acquitted themselves quite well, strange as that may seem to some. So, I don't think these are major difficulties because these encyclopedias actually respond to practical needs. Their positivism is not a theoretical positivism, it is a very practical one, and if they respond to those needs they will be used. That's my feeling. They don't have to be national enterprises as they used to be, and I think we'll all gain from that.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

This is very well taken. Thank you so much. Prof. Christidis.

A-F. CHRISTIDIS:

I just wanted to add a small point concerning the issue you raised. One shouldn't forget that the notion of "classical" isn't the same all over Europe, which is an important point to take under consideration. Talking about Greece, the Modern Greek identity has been shaped with a particular relationship to the classical, so it is our duty to my mind (and we've done it to a certain extent, at least in certain institutions) to produce works, encyclopedias or whatever, that somehow deal with the notion of the

classical within the modern Greek context. We owe this to our people and it is not necessarily *a priori* limited or doomed to failure in terms of international recognition attempts. As you well know, we've done something along these lines at the Centre for the Greek Language, a history of the Greek language done in Greek. We did it the same way the Italians did *I Greci*, with international cooperation, and now it is being translated into English because Cambridge University Press got interested. So, let us not surrender so easily to a sort of realism that says that if you want to be in the market you have to be English-speaking; O.K., that's the easiest way. Let us see the possibility of a further or another route that may be more difficult, but still, we owe it to our particular traditions and our particular problems. This is not nationalism, it is the awareness that Europe is still composed of national entities, and we have to do something about it.

J.N. KAZAZIS:

Thank you for the optimism, which is well considered from one who has already passed the test. Of course, I would not be so presumptuous as to try to summarize things. For my part, I was impressed by one or two things, and I will conclude with them. First, the production of new knowledge is being facilitated by and to the extent that we digitize the huge reference works that we have been studying here today. The second thing is that philology needs, and this is a vital need, to be surrounded by big undertakings like the *Wörterbuch der Philosophie* or *Rhetorik*, because otherwise philology would tend to be fossilized and move in a vacuum. I think that in order for philology to be defined and constantly re-defined, to be cultivated and promoted and reach society in the end, for which we all work, it has to be in the mainstream of philosophy and whatever else has been discussed here. In other words, it is not only *Pauly-Wissowa* or any *Pauly-Wissowa* that we need. We need the other big cognate enterprises, and we need to find a way to place them in a constructive dialogue, with the facts or the discourses of our discipline. Philology needs to be constantly cross-fertilized. Of course, here again the digitized form is privileged for this kind of reading and re-reading and constructive thinking.

It is my duty now and my privilege to thank all of you, the contributors to the success of this tiring but, I think, productive day. My first thanks go to Prof. Rengakos, my co-organizer, who did a great deal from behind the scenes towards the success of this Conference. I also want to thank our staff, Katerina Plastara, Evina Sistikou and all the other people from the Centre for the Greek Language. Of course we have also to thank the members of the Centre's Board of Directors, who did their best to facilitate this event, and the Greek Ministry of Culture, which funded today's event. Above all, we have to thank our dear colleagues, all of you who participated in an active way,

coming from near and afar. We have to thank people who decided to place their personal and individual research second to the huge collective enterprises which most of you have been leading. I want to congratulate you because this is an act of courage. Undertakings of this kind put the public good before your own personal research, and we are all in debt to the huge works of reference you are producing, and wish you the best. I thank you once again on behalf of the Centre for the Greek Language because the success of this day is due to you and the important contributions you made. Thank you once again and thanks to our audience, who have been very faithful with us today.

C.J. CLASSEN:

May I have your attention for a second or two, Prof. Kazazis and Prof. Rengakos? I wish to say a few words. Obviously at the end of such a Conference it is our pleasure to express our gratitude as guests. This has been a wonderful Conference I think, of truly European nature, and this is exactly what classicists should have organized. The language was English. The program, I have a suspicion, was organized by someone with some sort of Teutonic background, starting at 9.00 in the morning and finishing at 9.30 in the evening. The hospitality, the generous spirit, that was obviously Greek. We've had discussions, possibly disagreements, always in a way that was only possible because you welcomed us last night in the kindest fashion; we enjoyed eating and drinking together last night. This is always a good start for any Conference, so we were well prepared this morning and I think we've discussed everything in the most pleasant fashion, no disagreement really, not really expressed anyway, and what I think is always very important on such occasions is that you meet old friends and make new ones. So this is not just an occasion lasting from 9.00 in the morning to 9.30 in the evening, I think it will last for some considerable time. I must add that I wasn't terribly clear when I arrived what this was going to be about; now I've been made aware of a number of problems which I think we are all well advised to think about very carefully. So, within these twelve and a half hours –the program was strictly adhered to– in this comparatively short period of time we've been made aware of a considerable number of problems. We may not all think they can be solved in the same way, but to stop while one is working and think about what one is doing is always very helpful, very important. I think I speak on behalf of all of us present here in saying we are most grateful to you and to all the people you've mentioned. If I now start with all the protectors, the benefactors, the staff, etc., it would take a long time. May I ask you to pass on our gratitude to all concerned and please accept the expression of our deep gratitude for all you've done to organize this Conference, carry it out, and bring it to a successful completion. Thank you very much indeed.