

A Nominally New Dictionary of Ancient Greek: *GI*, *GE*, *GD* and LSJ⁹

S. Douglas Olson

University of Minnesota - Bilkent University
sdolson@umn.edu
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0253-990X>

Un nuevo diccionario de griego antiguo solo de nombre: *GI*, *GE*, *GD* y LSJ⁹

This article is a close examination of portions of Franco Montanari's new series of Greek dictionaries (*GI*, *GE* and *GD*), with particular attention to a number of lemmata beginning with *alpha* and *mu* in the recent German-language edition. A general consideration of lexicographic best practices is offered in that light. Contrasts are drawn throughout between LSJ⁹ and Montanari in regard to the handling and checking of primary references, the choice of lemmata and the organization of entries, and the relationship between the two works is traced via study of a group of individual lemmata beginning with *alpha*. The article concludes with a detailed analysis of the handling of ἀλαός, ἀλαόω and μάκελλον and cognates in LSJ⁹ and Montanari, with alternative suggestions for how the material might be most effectively organized, presented and understood.

Keywords: lexicography; dictionary; definitions; citation practices; Liddell–Scott–Jones.

Este artículo es un examen detallado de secciones de la nueva serie de diccionarios griegos de Franco Montanari (*GI*, *GE* y *GD*), con especial atención a una serie de lemas que comienzan con *alfa* y *mi* en la reciente edición en alemán. A la luz de ello, se ofrece una consideración general de las mejores prácticas lexicográficas. Se establecen contrastes entre LSJ⁹ y Montanari en lo que respecta al manejo y la verificación de las referencias primarias, la elección de los lemas y la organización de las entradas, y la relación entre los dos trabajos se rastrea a través del estudio de un grupo de lemas individuales que comienzan con *alfa*. El artículo concluye con un análisis detallado del manejo de ἀλαός, ἀλαόω y μάκελλον y términos emparentados en LSJ⁹ y Montanari, con sugerencias alternativas sobre cómo el material podría organizarse, presentarse y entenderse de manera más eficiente.

Palabras clave: lexicografía; diccionario; definiciones; modos de citar; Liddell–Scott–Jones.

Citation / Cómo citar este artículo: Olson, S. Douglas (2025) «A Nominally New Dictionary of Ancient Greek: *GI*, *GE*, *GD* and LSJ⁹», *Emerita* 93 (1), 1375. <https://doi.org/10.3989/emerita.2025.1375>

Received: 19/03/2025; *Accepted:* 20/05/2025; *Published:* 21/08/2025

1. Introduction

Sometime in the mid-1830s, two recent Oxford graduates, Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, were commissioned by the university press to produce a Greek-English lexicon based on Franz Passow's slightly earlier Greek-German *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (4th ed. 1830). The new *Lexicon* was improved and expanded over the course of the next two generations, and gradually evolved into a complex, multi-layered text. By the time Liddell died in 1898, an eighth edition was in print. Henry Stuart Jones produced the ninth in 1925-1940, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie «and the cooperation of many scholars»; a 1968 *Supplement* by E. A. Barber, incorporating Linear B evidence, was put through the Press by M. L. West after Barber's death, but was left stranded at the end due to OUP's unwillingness to reset the entire text in order to accommodate it; and the 1996 *Revised Supplement* by Peter Glare and Anne Thompson eventually replaced it there. There appears to be no thought of a tenth edition¹.

Experienced users of LSJ⁹ are aware of its significance and utility, but also of its deficiencies. The *Lexicon* is a necessary first stop for serious work on ancient Greek texts of every type and period, and serves as a basic point of intellectual reference and authority: «see LSJ s. u.» is accordingly a standard closing comment for philological notes of every sort. At the same time, the *Lexicon*'s etymologies are often primitive, mistaken or missing altogether; references are routinely out of date due to the appearance of fresh editions of primary texts; Victorian glosses sometimes make no sense in contemporary English; much new epigraphic and papyrological material remains unaccounted for; and the organization of individual lemmata can be obscure or eccentric. Scholars whose primary working language is German have the option of using Wilhelm Gemoll, *Griechisch-Deutsches Schul- und Handwörterbuch*, which first appeared 1908 and is now in its tenth edition². As the title alone makes clear, however, Gemoll's *Handwörterbuch* aims at a less-advanced primary audience than LSJ⁹ does. German-speakers—like native speakers of many other less privileged languages—therefore routinely find themselves working with the old *Lexicon*, and thus in English, at the moment serious philological research begins.

An authoritative, comprehensive new Greek dictionary, in particular one in a different but still widely-read modern language, would thus be desirable on many counts. The project nonetheless poses enormous challenges. The corpus is enormous and ill-defined. At least some account must clearly be taken of Mycenaean, and perhaps of PIE roots. How late coverage ought to extend is less obvious, given that Greek has a continuous history of use and development down to the present day. Among other fundamental decisions, Liddell, Scott and their successors chose to largely ignore early Christian texts, and show little interest in Byzantine literature generally. Instead, the *Lexicon* assumes an audience primarily concerned with archaic through Roman-era material, particularly Attic literary texts, rendering the amount of primary material it attempts to digest far more manageable than would otherwise have been the case.

Lemmatization raises cognate issues. Place-names and adjectives derived from them are only very selectively included in LSJ⁹. Personal names are even less common, presumably

¹ For the history of LSJ, see Stray, Clarke and Katz (eds.) (2019), with my review at *Gnomon* 94 (2022), pp. 596-601, from which portions of this opening paragraph are adapted. Thanks are due Benjamin W. Millis, who helped me work through some of the many complicated issues this article raised. I would also like to express my gratitude to two anonymous referees for their corrections and suggestions.

² Gemoll (2006).

because there are so many of them, and often so many different individuals, both historical and fictional, who bear them; in addition, the basic denotative significance of names is obvious, even if they can generally be etymologized, and choosing to include such items would seemingly oblige the editor to also produce a mini-biography of every person or entity, real or unreal, cited, a task that goes well beyond the standard remit of a dictionary. Even extreme rarities, if attested in a reputable source (e. g. *hapax legomena* in Hesychius), require notice, if only because they or a cognate may surface someday in another text. Obscure words or forms emended into something more recognizable in modern editions represent a more marginal case, along with variant manuscript readings and conjectures printed in the past and thus arguably part of the scholarly tradition, even if editors no longer accept them³. Finally, judgments must be made about the assumed competence of the reader. *LSJ*⁹ tends to combine masculine and feminine forms of words for occupations within a single lemma, for example, and does not give Doric forms a separate entry, in the belief that users can work such matters out for themselves. It likewise declines to lemmatize irregular principle parts of verbs, oblique forms of pronouns and the like, judging such items too elementary to deserve notice.

Most challenging in practical terms is the sheer amount of effort production of a genuinely new Greek dictionary would require, and the standard such work would have to meet to yield a product acceptable as a replacement for the *Lexicon*. *LSJ*⁹ is an enormously powerful research tool, whose authority rests on its wide range of learning and the generally high quality of its references and analyses. For all its merits, however, it is also the dated product of over a century of gradual, haphazard accretion and unsystematic reworking, and is marked by errors, lacunae and occasional disorder of every sort. The research it contains and the erudition it represents might easily provide the basis for an improved 21st-century successor. But production of that successor would require careful, well-organized rethinking of every individual lemma the predecessor text contains; engaged and competent checking and reconsideration of the primary information it presents and of how its conclusions are organized and presented; and enormous scholarly rigor and care. Accuracy is expected in philological research of every sort: references should be correct, quoted words rendered precisely, translations accurate, and proofreading scrupulous. These standards are rightly set even higher for standard reference works, because everything else we do relies fundamentally upon them. Put another way, if one decides to produce a new dictionary of ancient Greek to supplant *LSJ*⁹, one ought to either do the work properly—which is very difficult and likely to take many years, and probably decades or generations—or not undertake it at all.

GD, the work primarily under discussion here⁴, is a German translation of the second edition of Franco Montanari's *GI — Vocabolario della Lingua Greca*, produced with occasional reference to corrections in the third. A sister volume, *GE — The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, translated by a team led by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder under the auspices of the Center for Hellenic Studies and the supervision of Gregory Nagy and Leonard Mueller, was published in 2015⁵. The team responsible for the German version of

³ For brief discussion of the general issue, see Housman (1931, pp. lv-lvi), also commenting in passing on «the disadvantage of employing [academic] slave-labour» in dictionary projects.

⁴ Franco Montanari (ed.), *GD. Wörterbuch Altgriechisch-Deutsch* (trans. Michael Meier-Brügger and Paul Dräger: De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston, 2023).

⁵ As I have pointed out in a series of long articles (Olson 2022a, 2022b, 2022c, 2023a, 2023b, 2023c, 2024), the Nagy-Mueller team of translators was unable to handle much of the Greek quoted in the dictionary and frequently failed to consult the original sources, producing mistranslations throughout *GE*'s notes. The same articles catalogue hundreds of errors and misunderstandings similar to those discussed below chargeable not to the translators but to Montanari. The German translation by Meier-

the dictionary was led by Michael Meier-Brügger (a distinguished Swiss linguist and Indo-Europeanist best known for his leadership of the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*) and Paul Dräger (whose wide-ranging publications on ancient literature include important work on Argonautic myths). Substantial support for the translation project seems to have been provided by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. In general, the focus of what follows is on the underlying philological work the dictionary in all three forms represents, rather than on the specifically German version of it. I accordingly refer throughout primarily to Montanari and his decisions and judgments, with tacit reference to Meier-Brügger-Dräger only when issues arise involving the Italian-German translation, the typesetting of the current volume, and the like. Specific comments are restricted to portions of *alpha*, *mu* and the prefatory material, but are based on hundreds of hours of work with both the English- and the German-language versions of the dictionary. Any criticisms or concerns expressed about individual lemmata or restricted sections of *GD* can thus be taken to be intended as exemplary and to apply *mutatis mutandis* to the effort as a whole. I begin in Sections 2-3 with small-scale issues of organization, utility and accuracy. Sections 4-5 move on to larger questions concerning the research concept of the project, the production of individual entries, and what might have been done instead, had the work been approached with different values, motivations and concerns. Section 6 offers brief overall evaluative comments.

2. Basic structural issues

Scholarly dictionaries exist to be not just consulted but cited. LSJ⁹ features an omnipresent architecture that makes economical reference to a specific, limited sense of a word possible (e. g. s. u. ὑπερβάλλω A.II.2.b), and the same is true of e. g. the partially complete *Diccionario Griego-Español* and most modern scholarly dictionaries. Montanari has omitted this basic organizational feature, and instead offers at most a few general numerical divisions, within which his notes generally descend into a mass of formally undistinguished sub-senses and nuances. This makes *GD* difficult to use as a standard scholarly reference work. But there are other formal problems with the style in which the material is organized and presented as well.

Dictionaries of the scale of LSJ⁹ and *GD* inevitably rely on abbreviated references. Ideally, many of these will be transparent, although in practice even experienced readers will sometimes be forced to turn to an initial list to understand who or what is being cited. LSJ⁹, while admittedly handling fewer authors than Montanari, is clear and economical in this regard, relying on a system of shortened names combined with geographic and generic modifiers, with older authors and those cited more frequently given shorter, often unmodified identifiers. Thus «Alc.» is the Lesbian lyric poet Alcaeus, «Alc.Com.» the

Brügger-Dräger is much better, although there are occasional problems stemming mostly from a failure to recognize the context from which quotations have been drawn. Thus e. g. s. u. ἄγριος A., *Pr.* 175-176 ἐξ ἀγρίων / δεσμῶν has been misunderstood as a reference to «Beziehungen» rather than to actual physical «bonds»; s. u. ἀγχόνη E., *Hel.* 200-201 ἐν ἀγχόναις / θάνατον ἔλαβεν (referring to Leda) is translated «er fand den Tod in der Schlinge»; s. u. μαιῆτις Nonn., *D.* III 380-381 ἤγαγε κούρην / εἰς δόμον Ἠλέκτρης μαιῆτιον («she brought the girl to Electra's house, which would serve as her nurse») is translated «sie führte das Mädchen zur Amme ins Haus der Elektra»; ἀγχίθυρος in Theocritus is glossed «nah, von der Tür», the sense actually being «nah an der Tür» (with similar issues arising with a number of other ἀγχί-compounds); and most μαζ- compounds have been misunderstood as referring to «Gerstenbrot» or «Brot» rather than to unbaked barley-cake. Middle-passive forms are repeatedly identified simply as middle (e. g. s. u. ἀγωνίζομαι, ἀδικέω). Page 120 (in the middle of s. u. ἀνά) is left almost entirely blank, suggesting that no one looked systematically through the final proofs before the book was printed.

homonymous Athenian comic poet, and «Alc.Mess.» the Messenian epigrammatic poet, while «Alex.Aet.» is the elegiac poet Alexander Aetolus, «Alex.Aphr.» the philosopher Alexander Aphrodisiensis, «Alex.Polyh.» the historian Alexander Polyhistor, and so forth. Montanari has opted instead for abbreviated names accompanied by superscript numbers: «Alc.», «Alc.¹» and «Alc.²», and «Al.» through «Al.¹⁰». The difficulty with this approach for even an advanced professional user is that while «Alex.Aet.» and «Alex.Polyh.» are easily distinguished after checking the list of authors and works once at most, «Al.³» and «Al.⁵» are likely to remain eternally opaque⁶.

More troubling for anyone attempting to use the Montanari dictionary as a basic philological tool, the editor routinely offers inadequate citations—«Hsch.»⁷ (for «Hesychius») s. u. ἀγρολέτειρα, for example, rather than «Hsch. α 818», without which additional information the reference is worthless, or «Phot. Lex.» (for «Photius' *Lexicon*») s. u. μαδαγένειος, rather than «Phot. μ 16»—or outdated ones—e. g. citing the *Synagoge* B not from Cunningham (2003) but from Bekker's *Anecdota* (1814) s. u. ἀδιάβατος, where the reference should be to *Synag.* B α 358; or Stephanus of Byzantium not from Billerbeck (2008-2017) but from Meineke (1849) s. u. ἀγρίτης, where the reference should be to St.Byz. α 49; or Philod. *Mus.* from Klemke's 1884 Teubner s. u. ἀγροικεύομαι rather than from Delattre's 2007 Budé (which unfortunately offers ἀγροικ[ιζ]όμεθα in place of Klemke's ἀ[γρ]οικ[ευ]όμεθα, which *GD* takes to be the reading in the text). References to inscriptions have similarly been taken over unchanged from LSJ⁹ again and again rather than being updated to more modern and authoritative editions of the texts (e. g. s. u. μαθετάς the early 19th-century reference to Dittenberger, *Sylb.* 721.7 has not been replaced by *Inscriptiones Creticae* I viii.12.7 = *Inscriptiones de Délos* 1512.7). Lexical items preserved in fragmentary authors, meanwhile, are routinely cited only from the source that preserves the material, misrepresenting the date and thus the significance of the use of the word. S. u. ἀγγίαλος, for example, Montanari cites Galen XIV.42.5 K. (given as only «Gal. 14.42»), although the word there is actually from a long elegiac poem on antidotes for snakebite by Andromachus the Elder that Galen quotes, while s. u. μαγφδία he cites Athenaeus of Naucratis (late 2nd century CE), failing to note that Athenaeus is quoting Aristoxenus (fr. 110 Wehrli) half a millenium earlier. These are matters of basic philological craftsmanship, but are consistently neglected here.

Cognate issues, only partially touched on above, arise with the sources on which *GD* appears to rely. One major function of initial lists of abbreviations of authors and works is to allow readers to follow up on references offered in the glosses, by identifying the specific editions to which the compiler of the lexicon refers and thus treats as authoritative. In the case of the fragmentary comic poets, for example, the standard modern edition is that of Kassel-Austin, while for the individual Aristophanic comedies one might choose to cite e. g. either Wilson's 2007 OCT or the various OUP critical editions. Montanari offers instead complex catalogues of primarily 19th- and 20th-century editions of the texts in question, even

⁶ Abbreviations for individual works are also routinely clumsier than necessary. There is no obvious reason, for example, why Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* should be abbreviated «HA.» rather than «*HA*», or why Euripides *Iphigenia in Aulis* should be «*IA*.» rather than «*IA*». (If one is going to insist on including the period, surely *Iphigenia in Tauris* ought to be «*IT*.» rather than «*IT*».) Nor is it apparent why Aeschylus should not be «Aesch.», or even simply «A.», as in LSJ⁹, rather than the ugly and extended «Aeschl.». The new French-language *Bailly 2020 Hugo Chávez* more sensibly opts instead for a system modified from LSJ.

⁷ Here, as elsewhere, I have altered *GD*'s formatting and abbreviations slightly to bring them into line with LSJ⁹ and the policies of this journal.

when those editions are superceded. In the case of the comic poets, for example, he routinely references not just Kassel-Austin but also Kock, Demianczuk and Austin's *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in papyris reperta*, while for Aristophanes he not only mentions Hall and Geldart (1906-1907) but actually gives their edition—generally regarded as forgettable at best—pride of place in his list. Likewise for fragmentary historians, Montanari in his list of authors and works regularly points the reader not just to Jacoby but to Müller's long outdated *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*. More significant and troubling, Montanari's lists repeatedly omit fundamental modern critical editions. Carey's Lysias is missing, for example, as are Arnott's Alexis, Page's Rufinus, and Bernabé's Orpheus. The same is true in the case of e. g. individual comedies and tragedies. For Euripides, Montanari lists a handful of Teubners but seems unaware of the existence of e. g. Barrett's *Hippolytus*, Willink's *Orestes*, Bond's *Heracles* or Liapis' *Rhesus*; for Aeschylus, he fails to mention Fraenkel's *Agamemnon* or Garvey's *Choephoroi*; for Sophocles, he ignores Finglass' *Ajax*, *Oedipus the King* and *Electra*; for Aristophanes, he does not acknowledge even Dover's *Clouds* and *Frogs*. None of this inspires confidence that the texts cited throughout are the ones a 21st-century scholar would normally choose to rely upon⁸.

3. *Matters of fact and lemmatization*

The issues discussed in Section 2 have to do with the small-scale structure, planning and resources of the dictionary. More disturbing, because more philologically pernicious, are the frequent miscitations of primary authorities, misrepresentations of fact, and careless errors of other sorts in *GD*'s entries. Some of these are clumsy transpositions of numbers and the like which could have been eliminated, had anyone taken the time to go through the entries line by line and verify the references. Thus for example s. u. ἀγρίοσκορδον, the standard *CMG* edition of Paul of Aegina's works is in two volumes (IX.1-2), and the proper citation is not «260.25» but «II.260.25»; s. u. ἄγρωστις read not «Trag. 416b» but «Trag. 416b.2»; s. u. ἀγρώσωρ read not «Nic. *Al.* 31, 32» but «Nic. *Al.* 473»; s. u. ἀγχιβαθής read not «Aristotle *Pr.* 953a2» but «[Arist.] *Pr.* 935a2»; s. u. ἀγοραῖος read not «Pl. *Prt.* 374c» but «Pl. *Prt.* 347c»; s. u. ἄγχι, read not at «Pi. *N.* 6.19» but «Pi. *N.* 6.9»; s. u. ἀγωνία read not «Hdt. 2.19.4» but «Hdt. 2.91.4»; s. u. μακαρίζω read not «Democritus B 302» but «Democritus B

⁸ There are other difficulties with the initial list of authors and editions as well. The amount and character of information provided about authors, first of all, is inconsistent. Individual *FGrHist* numbers, for example, are supplied for fragmentary historians, but *TrGF* numbers are omitted for fragmentary tragic poets; some authors get a genre designator (e. g. Sextus Iulius Africanus is described as a *Geschichtsschreiber*), but others are identified only by name (e. g. Agaklytos); the fragments of Matro are said to be found in *SH* 534-540, but those of Arcestratus are merely described as available in *SH*; the *Apocalypse of Daniel* (*ApocDan.*) is located at p. 115 Klostermann rather than pp. 115-20 Klostermann, but the *First Apocalypse of John* (*ApocJo.* 1) gets inclusive numbers («pp. 70-93 Tischendorf»). Nor has basic bibliographic fact-checking been done: e. g. Apsines is cited from G. A. Kenney (read «Kennedy»); the *scholia* to *Wasps* are said to have been edited by W. J. W. Kaster (read «Koster»); Arcestratus of Gela is called an «epischer Dichter» rather than an epic parodist, and is said to be available in an edition by «S. Douglas–A. Sens»; and Schweighäuser is made the editor of the epitome of Athenaeus rather than of the complete text. The general impression created is thus of carelessness and haste. In the German edition in particular, the list is laid out in a sprawling and confused fashion that makes individual entries difficult to read or consult, and proofreading has been poor throughout. The list of Homeric hymns, for example, includes «5 = εις Ἀφροδίτην 6 = εις Ἀφροδίτην 8 = εις Ἄρεα» (*sic*); Apollonius of Pergamon (*Ap.*¹³) appears as Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ἰεργαμηνός (*sic*); the text of Poseidippos of Pella (*Posidip.*¹) is traced to «*p* Mil. Vogl.» (read «*PMil. Vogl.*»); and the entry for Empedocles is badly mis-set.

302.46», although this is not Democritus in any case but a late authority making reference to him, which is presumably why *LSJ*⁹ declines to cite the passage.

Other superficially similar errors and peculiarities have more unfortunate and telling origins. S. u. ἀγορανόμος, for example, «Aristoph(anes) *Ach.* 723, al., *Lys.* 16, 22» represents a careless cribbing of *LSJ*⁹'s «Ar. *Ach.* 723, al., *Lys.* 22.16», referring not to the *Lysistrata* but to Lysias: whoever produced the note failed to consult the text of Aristophanes, and no one in either the original Italian production team or the German translation group thought to verify the reference, which anyone who knows the play must immediately recognize is wrong. S. u. ἀγρωστήρ, «Soph. *Ichn.* 39» (thus *LSJ*⁹) is cited seemingly in reference to Wilamowitz' ἀγρωστή[ρων], although consultation of Radt's edition of the fragments would have shown that Vollgraff conjectured ἀγρώστη[ς] instead, meaning that the word should not have been lemmatized thus without notice that this is a restoration of an otherwise unknown form; the proper modern reference would be in any case to «S. fr. 314.39». So too s. u. μακαρίζω, *LSJ*⁹'s «Id(em) *D.* 1.15», referring to a work by Philodemus, the author cited just before this, has been converted to «Demosth(enes) 1.15», Montanari having misunderstood a citation in the older authority and borrowed it without verifying that his nominal correction of his lexicographic source was correct. S. u. ἀγριμαῖος, -α, -ον, *LSJ*⁹ fails to offer a primary reference for the basic sense of the adjective («wild»), and *GD* accordingly fails to do so as well, the editor not having taken time to track down e. g. Ath. 12.549f. Likewise the adjective μαζινός is a *hapax* at Hsch. μ 46 μαζινός βοῦς· ὁ ἐξ ἀλφίτων, but is lemmatized under μαζεινός, Montanari having opted to mechanically repeat the lemma in *LSJ*⁹ rather than consulting the lexicographer himself to verify what he actually offers.

The references in *GD* are thus consistently unreliable. This is in part because they have not been checked, in part because they have been taken over from *LSJ*⁹ without the necessary improvements to the *Lexicon*'s outdated citations being undertaken, but also in part because they are the results of mechanical borrowing with no reference to the original authority (and see Sections 4 and 5 for cognate problems on a larger scale). On other elementary levels as well, poor philological decisions have been made, Greek has been mishandled, citations have been mangled, and standard philological due diligence is absent. Such problems can be found in virtually every column of *GD*. The following is a small set of diverse examples:

1. Montanari lemmatizes Ἀγραυλίδες in reference to the superscript variant Ἀγραυλίσιν in L at E. Ion 23 for Ἀγλαυρίσιν (< Ἀγλαυρίδες), but without identifying this as a v.l. or even citing the other form, despite the fact that the inscriptional evidence appears to support it (Gibert ad loc.).

2. S. u. μαζονόμος, *LSJ*⁹ identifies the word as masculine at *POxy.* XII 1449.58, 60 (213-217 CE). Montanari has abbreviated the list of citations in the *Lexicon* to «*POxy.* 1449.58», but in fact the papyrus has ἐν ἱερῷ μαζονόμ(ι) χα() α (with the gender of the word indeterminable) in that line, and μ[α]ζονόμος χα() α (explicitly masculine) only in 60. It is thus clear that he has failed to check the papyrus and has thus eliminated the wrong reference. *ID* 1442.B.20 (146/5-145/4 BCE), by contrast, has μαζονόμον κατεαγός (neuter), while *I.Didyma* 19.50 (288/7 BCE) offers μαζονόμον χρυσοῦν. Montanari ignores the inscriptional material, however, and offers a reference to Horace *Sat.* 2.8.86-7 *mazonomo pueri magno discerpta ferentes / membra gruis*, where the gender might be either masculine or neuter, and which thus again shows nothing.

3. Ἄγριος is identified as «ein Kentaur», with reference to «*Il.* 14.117 etc.». The Homeric passage cited to demonstrate this, however, is the Greek hero Diomedes' account of his

ancestry, which does not include non-human creatures. Montanari appears instead to be offering a garbled reference to Apollodorus 2.5.4, where Agrios is the name of a centaur with whom Heracles fought.

4. S. u. ἀγρίῳ, aorist passive ἡγριώθησαν at Plu. *Per.* 34.5 is identified as active.

5. Ἀγρίππειον is glossed «Monument des Agrippa», with reference to Jos. *BJ* 1.402. The text in question says the following: (of Herod) τό γε μὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασίλειον κατὰ τὴν ἄνω δειμάμενος πόλιν δύο τοὺς μεγίστους καὶ περικαλλεστάτους οἴκους, οἷς οὐδὲ ναὸς πη συνεκρίνετο, προσηγόρευσεν ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων τὸν μὲν Καισάρειον, τὸν δὲ Ἀγρίππειον («He also built himself a palace in the Upper City and referred to the two largest and most attractive apartments, to which not even the Temple was comparable, as the Caesareum on the one hand, and the Agrippium, on the other, by reference to his friends»). This is at best very far from what Montanari's gloss suggests.

6. ἀγρίππιος is a freshly minted ghost word, the proverb cited from Zenobius actually being ἀκαρπότερος ἀγρίππου («bearing less fruit than a wild olive», < ἄγριππος, as in LSJ⁹).

7. As *Lfgre* s. u. (p. 104) points out, ἄγχι in conjunction with the dative, as at *Il.* V 570 Ἀντίλοχος δὲ μάλ' ἄγχι παράστατο ποιμένι λαῶν and XX 283 ταρβήσας ὃ οἱ ἄγχι πάγη βέλος, is not prepositional, as *GD* s. u. maintains, but adverbial. These are thus actually something approaching a dative of interest («Antilochus stood nearby to assist the shepherd of the people») and a dative of disadvantage («frightened because the missile was planted close by in a way that endangered him»), respectively.

8. Ἀγχιάλος is not the «Anführer der Lapithen», who are led by Polypoetes and Leonteus (*Il.* II 738-747), but an otherwise unknown victim of Hector (*Il.* V 608-609).

9. At *Od.* V 35 = XIX 279, ἀγχιθεοί does not mean «einem Gott ähnlich» but «closely connected to the gods»⁹, while at Luc., *Syr.D.* 31 οὐ μέντοι πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ οἱ μάλιστα ἀγχιθεοί τέ εἰσιν the adjective is not substantive but attributive, despite the implication of LSJ⁹ s. u. ἀγχιθεός, from which Montanari has taken over the interpretation.

10. At Ptol., *Geog.* VI 7.10, Μάδα is said to be a κώμη («village»), but is identified by *GD* as a «Fluss in Arabien».

11. Despite *GD* s. u. μαζηρός, Poll. X 84 does not specify that the πίνακες μαζηροί mentioned in the *Dēmioprata* are «um Fladen zu kneten». In fact, Poll. VI 87 (μαζονόμια δὲ κοῖλοι μεγάλοι πίνακες, ἐφ' ὧν μαῖζαι διενέμοντο) suggests that they are just as likely platters used to serve barley-cakes; cf. Harmodius of Lepreum, *FGrH* 319 F 1 *ap.* Ath. IV 149a ἐπὶ χαλκῶν κανῶν τῶν παρά τισι καλουμένων μαζονόμων, ἀπὸ τῆς χρείας εἰληφότων τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν.

12. Μαιονίς is attested already at Plu. *Mor.* 988b, well before Nonnus.

13. Singular Μαιώτης is well-attested in inscriptions (e. g. *IG* II² 9252.2), and there is accordingly no reason to have broken with LSJ⁹ to lemmatize the word in the plural.

Although Montanari's dictionary contains disturbing quantities of such errors, they are all in one sense trivial and could be eliminated in a future edition, if someone with adequate philological skills, a broad knowledge of Greek literature and a large amount of time worked systematically through every lemma, checking and correcting references, weeding out misunderstandings, verifying first uses of words, searching corpora of inscriptions and papyri and adding updated references to them, and the like (but see Section 6). A similar approach

⁹ Cf. *DGE* s. u. «que está cerca de los dioses, en estrecha relación con ellos»; Cunliffe s. u. «in close intercourse with the gods».

could help make something of the numerous lemmata that consist of individual names (very few them included in *LSJ*⁹). The conventional use of capital letters with proper nouns in modern editions of ancient texts means that such terms are automatically marked as designating a god, person, place or the like. To have any value for the user of a dictionary, therefore, such lemmata need to be accompanied by further information: for an historical person, e. g. date, city or nationality, offspring or parents, offices held or accomplishments, prosopographical reference numbers; for a literary figure, e. g. the work or works in which they appear, and a brief synopsis of their story. What Montanari consistently offers is instead «ein Mann» (e. g. s. u. Μέλας) or «eine Frau» (e. g. s. u. Ἀγριππίνα¹⁰) or on occasion «ein Römer» (e. g. s. u. Ἀγρίππας), «ein Dichter» (e. g. s. u. Μαΐκιος) or the like. This has no point, and the problem is compounded by the fact that *GD* is inconsistent about the names it harvests from primary texts. Thus e. g. the centaur Ἄγριος at Apollodorus 2.5.4 is lemmatized [see above], but his partner Ἄγχιος is not, while the Persian cavalry commander Μαδάτας mentioned at X., *Cyr.* 5.3.41 is included—and glossed «ein Mann»—but Ἀνδαμύας at 5.3.38 is not). The dictionary likewise fails even to distinguish between real, mythological and fictional persons and omits helpful information already present in *LSJ*⁹ (e. g. s. u. Ἄγλαυρος, where the *Lexicon* offers «daughter of Cecrops, worshipped on the Acropolis in Athens», but Montanari has only «eine Frau (Hdt. 8.53.1)»), and the editor has simultaneously often chosen badly among the primary references to the person in question available (e. g. s. u. Μακάριος, a Spartan commander killed in combat in Acarnania and mentioned only twice, at Th. III 100.2 [a circumstantial description of his nationality and role in the action] and III 109.1 [a bare notice of his death], for whom Montanari—again glossing «ein Mann»—cites only the second, far less revealing reference; and s. u. Μαθουσαλά—also «ein Mann»—for whom the reader is referred to «VT. Gen. 5.21, *al. etc.*» [sic] rather than to *Gen.* 5:27, which offers the most significant bit of information about him, that he supposedly lived for 969 years).

None of these entries in their current form serve any purpose beyond expanding the number of lemmata in Montanari's dictionary. If someone were willing to invest the necessary effort, they could be expanded into mini-biographies; the various homonyms could be distinguished and given individual identifiers; and the hunt for names could be expanded to epigraphic sources, where thousands are available. The obvious alternative to this massive, largely unrewarding task would be to remove all this material, which in its current condition is of no use, and concentrate lexicographic attention on other, more obviously pressing matters. Opinions may differ as to which if any of e. g. με, μ'¹¹ and ἐμέ (< ἐγώ), μαθήσομαι and μαθών (< μανθάνω), μαγείρισσα (feminine equivalent of μάγειρος), μαίνομαι (mid.-pass. < μαίνω) and μᾶλλον (Doric of μῆλον) require a separate lemma. *LSJ*⁹ has almost none of these items, and a case could be made that information of this sort is better collected in an elementary textbook or a grammar, and that including it in a nominally comprehensive, high-level research lexicon represents a misconception of the purpose of such works. The space saved might profitably be used to incorporate some of the many words Montanari has failed to include in his dictionary, despite their presence in *LSJ*⁹'s revised supplement (e. g. μαγαρεύς, μαγδάλλει, μαγειρηία, μαγείριος, μάγιστερ, μαγιστράτη, μαγίστρατος, μαγουσαῖος, μαθκων/μαθκωνον, Μαιμακτήρια, μαῖοι, Μαιουμάρχης, Μαιουμᾶς, Μαιουμίζω, μάκαμον, Μακεδονιαρχέω, Μακεδονιάρχης, Μακεδονιάρχισσα, μάκριον, μακρόχειρον, μάλημπος, μαμυλίων), in Hesychius (e. g. μαγγάνα, μαγγανία, μάγδωλος (masc.), μαγέτας, μάγης (shield), μαζάκις, μαζάρυγξ, μαίθη), or in other sources (e. g. μαγιστήριον, μαγκιπατίων,

¹⁰ Better Ἀγριππεῖνα, the form in which the name normally appears in inscriptions.

¹¹ Inexplicably offered as μμ' in the German version of the dictionary.

μαγκίπιον 2, 3, μαιοῦρος, μαίωρ/μαῖορ, μανδατάριος, μανδήλη, all collected from readily available sources by E. Dickey in her *Latin loanwords in ancient Greek* (2023). Additional space thus saved might also be converted into etymological references, where possible, to Linear B material—certainly the most significant new element in our understanding of the Greek language since the time of Liddell, Scott and Jones, but systematically ignored in *GD* and the Italian model on which it is based¹².

4. *The content of the notes and the construction of the dictionary*

The issues with Montanari's dictionary discussed up to this point can be described as systematic but correctable: even if insufficient scholarly care, energy and discrimination has been applied to the project up to this point, most of these deficiencies could be improved through the investment of more resources and expertise. The matters discussed in Sections 4 and 5 are of a different character and not so open to amendment. They also require some further initial discussion to place the problem in context.

Individual words are tricky, multivalent things, especially from a translation perspective. A single lexical marker can refer to a variety of diverse objects or actions, because these are all separate derivations from a single (sometimes similarly diverse) root, or because a number of extended meanings have developed over time, or because different communities applied a common formation strategy to meet different needs in separate historical, social and geographic settings. In other cases, a word may have a clear and seemingly coherent field of meaning but one that maps problematically onto the resources available to translate it into another language. For example, English-speakers might call a proposition or a place to stand «secure» but a person with the same general characteristics «reliable», while Greek would happily refer to both as ἀσφαλής. Any dictionary intended to manage the interface between ancient Greek and the modern language must find a way to work around this peculiarity, as well as around the fact that ἀσφαλής has a basic, literal sense «not prone to/productive of stumbling» that its seeming English equivalents do not share but that shapes its much more common extended senses.

Attempts to define the meaning of individual words in one language by offering equivalents (or coordinated sets of rough equivalents) in another, and to organize those supposed equivalents in a clear, comprehensible, hierarchical manner, are thus inevitably awkward, artificial, and to some extent arbitrary. Among other things, this exposes the general folly of attempting to translate a bilingual dictionary such as *GI* directly from one target language to another: divisions of meaning that make simple, obvious sense in one receiving language (such as that between «secure» and «reliable» in English in triangulation with the original Greek ἀσφαλής), are unlikely to do so in another receiving language or to survive a second translation into it, particularly when the second receiving language is distant from the first in historical linguistic terms. But the fundamental point in any case is that definition structures of this sort represent creative acts of intellectual architecture and are not natural products of the structure of the translated vocabulary.

Similar considerations apply to the collections of original material on which definitions are based. Some Greek words are poorly attested, in which case we are thrown back on

¹² This material has now been made far more accessible as a result of the publication of Piquero Rodríguez (2019), which is lemmatized alphabetically, avoiding the difficulties that result from use of the Linear B syllabary.

various forms of guesswork to divine their meaning, while simultaneously being forced to acknowledge that the evidence that survives may be eccentric. But most words are used too many times for every instance to be catalogued and taken into explicit account in a general treatment of the language. Lexicographers are accordingly forced to pick the specific evidence to which they refer, even while allowing their readers to assume that they have taken more information into account in the course of their deliberations. These citations serve in the first instance to buttress claims about the shades of meaning of the items in question, and must therefore be carefully chosen, analyzed and translated. But lexicographers' citations of primary texts serve to tacitly convey other information as well, including about the authors and genres in which the word appears, and the historical question of when and where it is first attested. These expectations have to some extent been naturalized for Hellenists, both because they are fundamental to the organization of the entries in *LSJ*⁹ and because adherence to them conveys important information in a compact manner. If a word is first attested in Homer but the earliest text it is cited from in a nominally comprehensive dictionary is Sophocles, the misleading implication is that it is not known before the middle of the 5th century. If a word is widely attested in both poetry and prose but is cited only from poetry, the misleading implication is that it is exclusively poetic. If an unusual sense of a word or a construction involving it is not cited before the Roman period, the implication (true or not) is that this is the first evidence we have of it. *LSJ*⁹'s entries appear to make a concerted effort to take such considerations into account.

Creating a lexicon thus requires first establishing a canon—which texts are to be cited and in what order of preference?—and surveying and «slipping» its contents in one way or another. It also requires developing a consistent, synthetic strategy for constructing the notes to be developed on the basis of this work, and especially for ordering them when a word has multiple meanings (or must be assigned multiple meanings in order to make its sense clear in another language). Should these meanings be stacked or numbered by date of attestation? by frequency of use? by concrete before extended meaning, or transitive before intransitive? by reference where possible to the order of definitions in cognate or root forms? or by formal distinction between active and middle/middle-passive forms of verbs? Should rare, late or *hapax* uses of a word be clumped in omnibus categories or be given their own entries equivalent on a formal level to those devoted to much more common senses? And how is auxiliary material of all sorts—notes on fixed expressions involving a word, colloquial pairings with particular prepositions, seemingly odd but standard combinations of verbs and adjectives, adverbial uses, and the like—to be handled, if at all? Above all else, from a strictly practical point of view, the process of creating a new lexicon requires clear, careful thinking about how to take advantage of older work while bringing something new and contemporary to the table. Lexicography has always had a cumulative element, in large part because the task is enormous and there seems no point in throwing away good work that has already been done. But fresh information about individual lexical items constantly becomes available, not only through the discovery and publication of new texts, inscriptions and papyri, but also today through the appearance of electronic search engines such as the *TLG*, which open up the entire corpus of Greek literature to systematic exploration in a way impossible only a generation ago. At the same time, the definitions put forward in *LSJ*⁹ are often awkward and ill-structured (see the detailed discussion below), and tend to imagine the world using language and social and political constructions that are now a century old and more. A new lexicon can—and must—attempt to do better. Among such improvements

might be a more consistent system for organizing entries and for deciding what belongs in them and in what order.

What follows are brief analytical studies of a handful of individual lemmata beginning in *alpha* in LSJ⁹ and *GD*. The entries all occupy approximately half a column of text in the latter, but were otherwise chosen at random. Detailed analysis of many other portions of the dictionary makes it clear that the general character of the results would have been no different, had a different set of lemmata from elsewhere in the alphabet been chosen. The words in question have some degree of complexity in terms of meaning and are used by a variety of authors, but pose no fundamental difficulties. What emerges from these studies is that many of Montanari's entries are little more than crudely adapted versions of material and organizational structures taken over from LSJ⁹. At the same time, his wholesale borrowing and reworking has introduced obscurities and misunderstandings of a sort already noted on a smaller scale in Section 3, while retaining peculiarities that a systematic rethinking of the content and organization of the entries would have eliminated. Section 5 offers a different sort of analysis, examining how LSJ⁹ and Montanari handle two small sets of obscure cognates and illustrating in a more constructive fashion how the new dictionary fails to rise to the challenges the older one's deficiencies and the primary material itself present, while offering examples of what might have been done instead.

1. The root sense of ἄγριος is «associated with the ἄγρός» (as opposed to the places where men live) and thus «wild, untamed, undomesticated». The third term in LSJ⁹'s initial gloss «*living in the fields, wild, savage*» is accordingly an extended sense of the word¹³ and is to be kept separate from the other two. LSJ⁹ s. u. I «*wild*» begins «of animals, opp. τιθασός, ἥμερος», and refers in order to (1) animals, flies (apparently intended to be understood as a subset of animals), «men, *living in a wild state*»; (2) trees and vines, although with a seemingly extraneous reference at the end to honey gathered from wild sources (*sc.* rather than from bees kept in a hive); and (3) country («*wild, uncultivated*). S. u. II begins «mostly of men, beasts, etc.» and includes (1) a «moral sense» of the word, i.e. an openly condemnatory one, as meaning «*savage, fierce*»; (2) a use «of temper» (once again condemnatory, and not easily distinguished from II.1), as meaning «*wild, fierce*», «*cruel*», and substantively «*savageness*», «*harsh (measures)*»; and (3) a hostile but morally neutral use («*cruel, harsh*», «*wild, stormy*», «*violent*») in reference to objects and circumstances¹⁴. S. u. III offers a small set of examples of the adverb ἀγρίως¹⁵.

Montanari begins by echoing LSJ⁹'s initial definitions («*ländlich, wild*»), but then confounds them as the lead gloss in his s. u. A, misleadingly implying that these are equivalent terms that all apply to the section that follows (~ LSJ⁹ s. u. I). He then repeats the *Lexicon*'s «of animals, opp. τιθασός, ἥμερος» («von Tieren (im Ggs. zu τιθασός, ἥμερος)»), followed by «von Menschen in wildem Zustand» (again more or less direct from the *Lexicon*); «von Bäumen und Früchten» (with the same extraneous reference at the end to honey);¹⁶ «von Regionen»; and «vom Haarwuchs» (Ach.Tat. III 12.1, where the word refers to κόμη and

¹³ Contrast French *sauvage*, Spanish *salvaje*. The hostile sense of the word is established in English already in the 15th century, meaning that this is not simply a post-Victorian (and thus post-LSJ) development.

¹⁴ Note already Hes., *Fr.* 302.16 ἄγρια φάρμακα; A., *Supp.* 35-36 ἀγρίας / ἄλός.

¹⁵ This is an example of LSJ⁹'s general willingness to use numbered entries at various points within its notes not to offer a meaning for a word, but to make another sort of point about usage (also e. g. s. u. ἄσπις A.3, discussed below).

¹⁶ Note also e. g. Ar., *Th.* 456 ἀγρίοισι τοῖς λαχάνοις; *Pl.* 298 λάχανά τ' ἄγρια.

the sense is «unkempt»). Of the 13 passages cited, 8 already appear in *LSJ*⁹ s. u. I, all in the same order, the most significant addition besides Ach. Tat. III 12.1 being three references in Hippocrates to wild gourds and the like. S. u. B «fig. *wild, gewalttätig, grausam*», Montanari offers three sub-categories, «von Pers.», «von Gefühlen», and «von Sachen». 13 of the 16 passages cited are drawn from *LSJ*⁹ s. u. II, all but one of them in the same order. S. u. C offers three examples of the adverb; the first of these (but also the earliest attestation) is already in *LSJ*⁹ s. u. III.

The point-by-point organization of this entry in *GD* is thus drawn direct from *LSJ*⁹, and the overwhelming majority of its references to primary texts have been serially excerpted from there. Specific language has also been borrowed from the *LSJ*⁹ entry (e. g. «of animals, opp. *τιθασός ἡμερος*»); some of its most obvious eccentricities have been retained (honey treated in a section devoted to plants); and its most significant point—that «*living in the fields, wild*» is not the same as «*savage*» in the sense «violent, cruel»—has been confused by running the two definitions together under *a*. That this systematic duplication is not a natural and necessary result of the lexicographic enterprise is apparent from comparison with the corresponding entry in the *DGE*, the basic structure of which again reflects that of *LSJ*⁹ s. u., but only 5 of whose 23 references under the initial definition «*que vive en los campos, en estado natural, salvaje*», for example, are also found there. This pattern—wholesale borrowing of the *Lexicon*'s references to primary texts, with little or nothing added; a general dependence on *LSJ*⁹'s definitions and organizational structure, even when the material has been superficially rearranged; and a striking contrast with the *DGE* entries, making it clear that the similarities in question have nothing to do with the underlying character of the lexical item in question—is apparent throughout the lemmata examined here.

2. ἀλέξω is epic vocabulary and relatively rare outside Homer. It is attested a few times in lyric, iambic and elegiac poetry (e. g. Archil., fr. 128.2; Thgn. 13; Pi., *O.* 10.105; 13.9; *N.* 4.60) and twice in Sophocles (*OT* 171, 539), but is used by no other Attic author except the notoriously tone-deaf Xenophon (e. g. *An.* VII 7.3). Herodotus has it a number of times (e. g. VII 225.3), Hippocrates once (*Salubr.* 1), suggesting that it is Ionic, although it also appears in a document in Doric at Th. V 77.6. Unsurprisingly, a number of Hellenistic and Roman-era dactylic hexameter poets pick it up (e. g. Nic., *Th.* 395; Opp., *H.* 4.413). *LSJ*⁹ s. u. devotes its initial section to the various forms of the word, but lemmatizes aorist ἀλαλκεῖν separately. S. u. 1 «*ward off, turn aside*» is concerned primarily with the various cases and combinations of cases the verb takes, and is divided into separate sections for active and middle. S. u. 2 «*recompense, requite*» (middle) cites only one passage, X., *An.* I 9.11.

Montanari treats ἀλέξω and ἀλαλκεῖν in a single lemma, but organizes the entry in the same way as *LSJ*⁹ s. u. ἀλέξω: (1) «*fernhalten, zurückstossen, beschützen, verteidigen*»; (2a) (mid.) «*fernhalten oder von sich wegstossen, sich verteidigen gegen*», (b.) «*vergelt*». Of the 19 passages cited, 15 are already in *LSJ*⁹, including X., *An.* 1.9.11 as the sole reference in s. u. 2.b. At the end of s. u. 1, *Il.* I 590 ἤδη γάρ με καὶ ἄλλοτ' ἀλεξέμεναι μεμαῶτα is identified (following *LSJ*⁹ s. u. 1, which has the passage in the same position in the note) as an absolute use of the verb, but in fact σε (with reference to Hera) is to be supplied, as the translation itself shows («dich zu verteidigen»). The *GD* entry is thus almost entirely derived from the *Lexicon*.

3. ἀποτρέπω is a very common word, attested already seven times in Homer (and in «*tmesis*» at Hes., *Sc.* 455-456), as well as in Aeschylus (e. g. *Th.* 1060), Pindar (*N.* 4.69) and Bacchylides (11.27). By the end of the 5th century, however, it is treated as primarily prosaic:

Euripides has it only twice (*Or.* 410; *IA* 336), Sophocles and Aristophanes not at all, but Herodotus, Thucydides, Hippocrates, Xenophon and the orators many times. Its meaning is straightforward: «turn away, turn back, avert, divert». LSJ⁹ s. u. suggests five separate meanings in the active and six in the middle and/or passive. There is little substantial difference among most of these, and the majority of the *Lexicon*'s energy goes into offering slightly varying English equivalents of the word and to cataloguing cases and constructions—most of them easily understood without a gloss—with which it can be used. The middle and the active are treated in separate sections, but the majority of the uses of the verb in the middle (as s. u. II.1-4, for which see more below) are no different from those given for the active, except that the verb is intransitive, i.e. what is «turned away» from something is also the subject. S. u. I.1 «turn away from» (with reference to e. g. *Il.* XII 249 τιν' ἄλλον ... ἀποτρέψεις πολέμοιο) and I.2 «c. acc. pers. only, turn away or back» (with reference to e. g. *Il.* XV 276 πάντας ἀπέτραπε καὶ μεμαῶτας) appear to largely overlap, except that the examples collected in I.1 specifically describe what the object is diverted from. S. u. I.3 «c. acc. rei, turn back again», citing Pi., *N.* 4.69-70 ἀπότρεπε / αὐτίς Εὐρώπην ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός, is merely another example of the same sense, the idea «again» coming from αὐτίς rather than the verb. S. u. I.4 «turn aside, avert» (with reference to e. g. Hes., *Sc.* 455-456 ἀπὸ δὲ ... / ἔγχεος ὀρμὴν ἔτραπε) is no different from s. u. I.2, except that objects rather than persons are in question. Nor is s. u. I.5 «turn from others against one» (with reference e. g. to a v.l. at S., *Tr.* 1013-14 ἐπὶ τῷδε ... / ... οὐκ ἔγχεος τις ... ἀποτρέψει) any different, although in this case a specific indication is added as to where the individual or object in question is turned away to. The various alleged senses of the middle and/or passive of the verb catalogued under s. u. II.1-6 («turn from, desist from, c. part.», «turn away, turn a deaf ear», «c. acc. rei, turn away from, shrink from», «turn back, return», «beat off, repulse», the last two with only one example apiece) are no more convincingly distinguished. The lemma is thus over-complex and could easily be shortened and clarified.

Montanari rearranges the *Lexicon*'s entry but largely retains its overall approach to the word, including by separating the active from the middle-passive, on the ground that the latter is occasionally transitive. The secondary character of the analysis is particularly clear in his decision to retain LSJ⁹ s. u. I.3 (citing Pi., *N.* 4.69) as a supposedly distinct meaning of the verb.¹⁷ 23 of Montanari's 27 primary references are drawn from LSJ⁹ s. u. Of the four references added, two are from the *Septuagint*, one from the *New Testament*, and one from Achilles Tatius; of these, 3 *Maccabees* 1.23 ὑπὸ τε τῶν γεραιῶν καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀποτραπέντες has been misunderstood (offered as an example of the sense «er lässt ab = ist abgelenkt, abgebracht», whereas the text actually says «after being turned back by the council-members and the elders»). So too A., *Th.* 1060-1061 κάποτρέπομαι / δεῖμα πολιτῶν is offered as an example of the middle + accusative meaning «von sich abwenden, zurückstossen». But this is instead an internal accusative, and the phrase means ~ «I shrink in terror of the citizens» (cf. *DGE* s. u. B.2 «me asusto por miedo a los ciudadanos»)¹⁸.

4. ἀριθμός is a relatively common noun, attested repeatedly in Homer and subsequently in all genres and periods, as the passages cited in the *Lexicon* s. u. show. LSJ⁹ s. u. I.1 offers an initial definition «number» supported by a number of references to archaic and classical

¹⁷ LSJ⁹ s. u. I.2 and the references collected there, however, are pointedly ignored in favor of LSJ⁹ s. u. I.1.

¹⁸ LSJ⁹ s. u. II.3 glosses «turn away from, shrink from».

texts illustrating how the word is used with indications of specific quantity (e. g. ἀριθμῶ παῦρα; ἐν ἀριθμῷ; ἀριθμὸν ἕξ; ἐς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τρισχίλια) and how it is set in contrast to measures of size, etc. S. u. I.2-6 record what are presented as other closely related concrete uses of ἀριθμός: «*amount, sum*», «*abs., in certain numbers*» (meaning «in a fixed number, with the number specified»), «*item or term in a series*» (as in «the second *arithmos* in a list», where colloquial English would say «number two»), «*number, account, as a mark of station, worth, rank*» (as «in the *arithmos* of men» = «among men»), and «*mere number, quantity, opp. quality*» (as in «he's a number», for which colloquial English would say «he's a nothing, he's a zero»). S. u. II and s. u. III offer the more abstract «*numbering, counting*» and «*the science of numbers, arithmetic*», respectively; these might better have been treated as a single sense of the word. Ten rarer, generally late and often technical uses of the word (e. g. grammatical «*number*», «*unit of troops, = Lat. numerus*») follow (s. u. IV-XIII); some of these too might easily have been included under s. u. I. The fact that the word sometimes appears in the form ἄριθρος is left unnoted, although the lexicon is aware of the issue (see s. u. ἀριθρέω, ἀριθρός).

Montanari s. u. abandons any sort of formal organization for the note and instead simply offers a long list of individual meanings for the word, beginning with «*Zahl, Menge*» and referencing *Od.* IV 451, *Philol.* 44 B 4 D.-K. (an addition to the citations in *LSJ*⁹, with the word used in a Pythagorean sense of a fundamental organizing principle of the universe¹⁹; late 5th century), and *Hdt.* I 14.1. *LSJ*⁹ s. u. I.1's collection of archaic and classical instances of ἀριθμός is replaced, however, by three passages from the *Septuagint* and one from the *New Testament*, offering instances of the word in a sense ~ «*counting*» (= *LSJ*⁹ s. u. II, where an example of this meaning is identified already in Pindar); in apposition to a number (as already a number of times in Herodotus, including at I 14.1 ἀριθμὸν ἕξ, and before that at *Hes.*, fr. 278.3 μύριοι εἰσιν ἀριθμόν); and in the sense «*a few*» in two odd, isolated passages in the *Septuagint*, ἡμέρας ἀριθμῷ at LXX, *Nu.* 9.20 (rendering Hebrew מִיָּמֵי מִסְפָּר) and ἄνδρας ἀριθμῷ at LXX, *Ez.* 12.16 (rendering Hebrew אֲנָשִׁים מִסְפָּר), perhaps to be explained as Semiticisms. The principle of organization of what follows is unclear, and there is no reference to the meanings of the word noted in *LSJ*⁹ s. u. I.3 («*abs., in certain numbers*»; attested already in Herodotus and Thucydides) or I.5 («*number, account, as a mark of station, worth, rank*»; attested already in Homer). *LSJ*⁹ s. u. VII, IX-X are likewise ignored, but notice is taken of the use of Ἀριθμοί as the Greek name for the biblical *Book of Numbers* (although without making the point that the sense of the word there is «*Censuses*»), which is omitted in the *Lexicon*.

23 of the 35 passages cited by Montanari are from *LSJ*⁹; the majority of the additions are Biblical texts. The process of epitomization has removed the *Lexicon*'s earliest reference to ἀριθμός in the sense «*numbering, counting*» (*Pi.*, *N.* 2.23; note also *O.* 2.98) and has simultaneously stripped out all attestations of the word in Pindar, Hippocrates and comedy, making the use of it appear considerably more restricted than it is. Among resources unavailable when *LSJ*⁹ was compiled, but which might have been added as a basic matter of updating, there are no references to inscriptional material (e. g. *IG* I³ 352.33; 353.56; both from the 420s BCE). Nor are any papyri cited, although the word is common there in various senses (e. g. *BGU* I 93.4 ἱματίων ἀριθμῷ ὀκτώ; III 836.4 στρατιώτας ἐκ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἀρ[ι]θμοῦ).

¹⁹ Oddly, this Pythagorean sense of ἀριθμός is not taken up anywhere in what follows in Montanari's entry.

5. ἄσπις is an extraordinarily common word: Homer alone uses it almost 100 times. LSJ⁹ s. u. A.1 provides a basic gloss («*shield*»); a further definition via contrast («opp. Thracian πέλιτη and Persian γέρρον»); and some typical phrases involving the word (ἄσπιδά ῥῖψαι, ἄσπιδά ἀποβαλεῖν and ἄσπιδά λαβεῖν)²⁰, including metaphors (e. g. ἄσπις τοῦ βίου). S. u. A.2 notes the collective use of ἄσπις to mean «*body of men-at-arms*», i.e. «hoplite force». S. u. A.3 is not a definition but a usage note (a collection of «military phrases»). S. u. A.4 notes a one-off, high-style metaphorical use of the word in comedy (τῶν Θηρικλείων εὐκύκλωτον ἄσπιδά, «a perfectly round shield of the Thericlean type», Thericlean-ware being a well-known type of symposium pottery, and what is referred to being a drinking bowl; = Aristopho fr. 13.2) that might better have been included under s. u. A.1. S. u. A.5 refers to an inscription from Epidaurus that seemingly uses the word to refer to a shield-like boss or knocker-plate on a door (cited as *IG* 4.1484.79, now *IG* IV².1 102.79; not picked up in the *Supplement*). S. u. II.1 is «*asp, Egyptian cobra*», while s. u. II.2 cites a Greco-Egyptian inscription in which the ἄσπις in question adorns a royal device of some sort (*OGI* 90A.43; 196 BCE)²¹. The *Supplement* adds a Roman-era use of *Aspis* as the name of a festival of Hera in Argos (e. g. *I.Napoli* 50 and 51).

Montanari places the material in LSJ⁹ s. u. ἄσπις A.1 in its own s. u. A «*Schild*», and that in LSJ⁹ s. u. A.2 in its own s. u. B «*milit. Abteilung, die mit Schild bewaffnet ist*» (with a supposed extended meaning «*Reihe Soldaten*»), and divides the material in LSJ⁹ s. u. A.3 between the two. But «rank of soldiers» is an extended sense of Montanari's s. u. A rather than of his s. u. B, and most of the other uses of ἄσπις collected in *GD* s. u. B (e. g. παρ' ἄσπιδά meaning «von der Schildseite», i.e. on the left) also belong under its s. u. A. 19 of the 23 passages from ancient texts cited by Montanari are from LSJ⁹. Of the four additions, *Il.* II 389 is given in place of a number of other references to Homer from the beginning of LSJ⁹ s. u. A.1, but does not alter or clarify the sense; *Plu., Arist.* 21.2 and *Hld.* II 24.2 are offered as examples of the meaning «*Infanterie*», but this sense (= LSJ⁹ s. u. A.2) has already been given above as «*milit. Abteilung, die mit Schild bewaffnet ist*», citing passages from the *Lexicon* dating half a millennium earlier; and *Men., Asp.* 72-3 ἔχων τὴν ἄσπιδά / ἔκειτο has been substituted for [*Men.*] fr. 702 Kock (a *sententia* only very dubiously assigned to the poet) for the meaning «*Viper*», despite the fact that it actually means «shield» there. *OGI* 90A.43 is ignored, as is the use of the word as the name of the festival in Argos.

6. αὐτοκράτωρ is Athenian political vocabulary, first attested in mid-5th-century inscriptions (*IG* I³ 21.84 (of the Council; 450/49 BCE); 46.13 (of an oikist; ca. 445 BCE); 52.9 (of the Council; 434/3 BCE)) and Aristophanes (*Pax* 359; *Au.* 1595; *Lys.* 1010), but otherwise confined in the classical period to Attic prose (~ 60 examples). The word is notably absent from the Ionic prose of Herodotus. LSJ⁹ implicitly suggests that its political sense is secondary by beginning with s. u. I.1 «of persons or states, *free, independent* ... of a youth *that has come of age*» (in individual passages from Thucydides and Xenophon, respectively), and then offering «of ambassadors and commissioners, *possessing full powers, plenipotentiary*» and «of rulers, *absolute*» as s. u. I.2 and

²⁰ ἄραι ἄσπιδά («to hoist a shield») is inappropriately included here, there being no reason to believe that this was a fixed expression. Both *DGE* and the *Dictionary* nonetheless pick up and repeat the idea.

²¹ One of a number of humorous Ionicisms that repurpose an existing Greek word to describe something odd encountered in Egypt, here in reference to the way a cobra's neck flares out when it prepares to strike. Cf. κροκόδιλος, «wall-lizard», repurposed as «crocodile»; πυραμίς, «cake», repurposed as «pyramid»; etc.

I.3. But s. u. I.3 includes references to generals and archons, and there seems to be no firm ground for the distinctions among s. u. I.1-3. In reference to political and military figures or institutions, the word means «possessing full independent power, exercising unsupervised power», so that it eventually comes to be applied to the Roman emperor. By extension, it can be used of anyone or anything that is independent and master of himself or itself (cf. s. u. I.4, of the reasoning faculty in a purple passage of Thucydides). LSJ⁹ s. u. II is not so much a separate definition of the word as a collection of passages in which it takes a genitive of the sphere in which this plenipotentiary power is exercised (thus «possessing full independent power over ...») or an infinitive of the specific power in question (thus «possessing full independent power to ...»).

Montanari begins s. u. αὐτοκράτωρ with a general gloss «*der die volle Macht hat, frei, unabhängig*» and then discards the various distinctions attempted in LSJ⁹ s. u. I.1-4, instead simply offering the texts it cites and corresponding glosses in something approximating the authors' historical order. LSJ⁹ s. u. II is converted into a pair of closing sub-entries «mit Gen.» and «mit Inf.», while the extended sense of the word (of reasoning and thought) is reserved for the end of the entry. All 14 of Montanari's references to primary texts come from LSJ⁹; the abbreviation of the material collected there has omitted the passages from Aristophanes (two of which are cited in LSJ⁹ s. u.), which antedate Thucydides and Lysias by at least 15 years. Montanari also fails to pick up the inscriptions, which push the attestations of αὐτοκράτωρ back another generation and establish the register to which it belongs.

The material examined above offers no evidence that the entries in *GD* are consistently supported by detailed philological research of the sort discussed at the beginning of this section as fundamental to credible modern lexicographic work. In this case, this type of research would need to include basic searches to determine whether the range of authorities cited by LSJ⁹ for individual words is representative of the actual distribution, and efforts to identify earlier uses in inscriptions and papyri in particular. Instead, Montanari consistently does little more than take over and abbreviate citations already found in LSJ⁹, occasionally adding material that is in many cases eccentric and unhelpful, mishandled in one way or another, or unrevealing. In addition, he has often carried out the process of abbreviating references in a way that distorts the impression created by the range of material cited, by omitting initial attestations of words, narrowing the range of authors and genres cited, and eliding crucial examples. At the same time—and only partially as a consequence—his definitions of words and the way he organizes them are routinely dependent on LSJ⁹, and when he reorders the material, he does so on the basis of no clear principle or set of principles. How this procedure deserves to be characterized is unclear, although scholars today are generally taught to prominently identify text and ideas appropriated or adapted from existing scholarship in order to avoid the impression of attempting to take credit for the work of others. In any case, Montanari's description of his dictionary e. g. in the Preface to *GE* as «completely new» is misleading at best. In fact, this is a derivative product that simultaneously fails to do most of the basic philological work that was incumbent upon it.

5. Constructive studies of two sets of cognates

In what follows, I examine two small sets of cognates, one beginning in *alpha*, the other in *mu*, and how they are handled by LSJ⁹ and in *GD*. In both cases, the *Lexicon*'s handling of the words seems patently deficient today, but Montanari for his part has confused matters as much as he has clarified them.

1. ἀλάω is a regular *omicron*-contract verb, rare and exclusively poetic. Homer uses it twice; two late authors (Nonnus of Panopolis in the 5th century CE, and Julianus of Egypt in the 6th) pick it up from him; and various lexicographers and the like discuss it with reference to Homer. LSJ⁹ offers a very brief entry, treating the fact that the verb is a contract and the etymology as too obvious to require notice:

ἀλᾶόω, blind, ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλαῶσαι blind him of his eye, Od. 1.69, 9.516 : c. acc., AP 7.601 (Jul.)

The entry ignores the uses of the word in Nonnus, and creates the false impression that Homer does not give the verb a direct object, as he does²².

Montanari drops the second Homeric passage and, having seemingly failed to check the original text or search the distribution of the word, is misled by LSJ⁹ into representing the construction in Julianus as innovative. He likewise continues to ignore Nonnus, who has reworked specifically the Homeric passage that Montanari drops from the catalogue of references in his source, but that is for that reason arguably the more important of the two:

ἀλᾶόω, kontr. [ἀλάος] blenden, blind machen: ὀφθαλμοῦ (Odysseus den Kyklopen) auf einem Auge Od. 1.69, al.; τινα j-n Iul.Aeg. (AP 7.601.5)

He then appends identifications of four forms of the verb:

poet. Aor. 3 sg. ἀλάωσε | Inf. ἀλαῶσαι | Ptz. ἀλάωσας || Inf. Aor. Pass. ἀλαωθῆναι
Eustath. 1641.60.

That this is a contract verb is obvious, and whether the etymology is needed can be described as an open question of lexicographic policy. «(Odysseus den Kyklopen)», however, is certainly extraneous, since who blinded whom makes no difference to the meaning of the word. What would have been more useful is direct quotation of the Homeric text (thus «ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν» rather than bare «ὀφθαλμοῦ»), perhaps accompanied by a translation. «poet.» in the second half of the note is correct but inadequate, since the verb is in fact exclusively epic. As for the specific forms Montanari identifies, ἀλάωσεν would better have been given earlier (as noted), which would avoid the need to identify the form in the final section of the note. The aorist active infinitive ἀλαῶσαι, meanwhile, is not attested outside of the lexicographers, despite LSJ⁹'s implication that it is part of the Homeric text; the aorist active participle ἀλάωσας is found only in handful of very late sources; and the aorist passive infinitive ἀλαωθῆναι is attested only in Eustathius (although at p. 1641.61 of the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, not p. 1641.60, as Montanari asserts). None of these forms thus required notice, particularly since the formations are regular. If including them was judged necessary, Eustathius' present active infinitive ἀλαοῦν (p. 1585.64) should have been included as well.

GD's treatment of ἀλάω is thus fundamentally dependent on LSJ⁹ but also less helpful than its source, and might be described as a careless mix of misleading claims, bad information, and facts that are true but of no use to the reader. A bit of basic philological research, a more effective organization, and a different sense of what information is worth communicating might have yielded e. g. the following:

²² Od. I 69 ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν, IX 515-916 μ(ε) ... / ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν.

ἄλᾰός blind, render blind [epic for common τυφλόω; factitive < ἄλαός (q.v.)]
 ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἄλᾰωσεν «whom he blinded of his eye» Od. 1.69 ~ 9.516; picked up
 at Nonn. D. 29.81; Ev. 12.157; Jul.Aeg. AP 7.601.5. [Cf. Philox.Gr. fr. 639** κατὰ
 στέρησιν τοῦ λάειν, ὃ ἐστι βλέπειν; Hsch. α 2763 παρὰ τὸ ἄλᾰσθαι κατὰ τὴν πορείαν.]

Montanari's handling of the adjective ἄλαός, from which ἄλαόω is derived, is similarly problematic. The word is rare and almost exclusively poetic: the *Odyssey* has it three times and tragedy uses it only in lyric, as LSJ⁹ notes. The *Lexicon* divides the word into two basic senses, the former more complex and better attested than the latter. Although ἄλαός is normally two-termination, the *Lexicon* also implicitly notes that the word may be three-termination in a problematic passage of Hippocrates:

ἄλᾰός [ἄλ], -ον, I. not seeing, blind (Cypr. for τυφλός, AB 1095²³), Od. 8.195 (not in Il., Trag. only in lyr.); τὸ φωτῶν ἄ. γένος A. Pr. 549, ἄλαοί, opp. δεδορκότες, the dead, Id. Eu. 322; of eyes, S. OC 149, 244, E. Ph. 1531; ἔλκος ἄ. blinding wound, i.e. blindness, S. Ant. 974; ἐπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἄ. νέφος A.R. 2.259. II. invisible, imperceptible φθίσις ἀλαή prob. I. in Hp. Loc.Hom. 10 (codd. ἄλλη, Gal. ἀλαΐα). (If from ἄ- priv., λάω A (q.v.), the accent is exceptional, but cf. Hdn.Gr. 1.112) [ἄλᾰος Od. I.c., etc.; but μάντιος ἀλαοῦ init. vers. Od. 10.493, 12.267]

Montanari offers the same passage from Homer; expands the quotation from *Eumenides* by a word; and splits the complicated LSJ⁹ s. u. I into two separate glosses. He also updates the *Lexicon*'s attempts at etymologizing; removes its metrical notes; and expresses caution about two of its interpretations:

ἄλᾰός -ον [vgl. lat. luscus?]²⁴ a. j-d, der nicht sieht, blind Od. 8.195, al., Aesch. Pr. 549 etc. | von den Augen Soph. OC 149 Eur. Ph. 1531 | ἄλαοῖσι καὶ δεδορκόσιν ποινᾶν Strafe für die, die blind sind (= tot) und für die, die sehen (= leben) Aesch. Eum. 322 (and. die mit erblindeten Augen und die mit sehenden Augen) b. blind machend Soph. Ant. 974 (Wunde) ἀλαὸν νέφος blendende Wolke Ap. 2.259 (and. düster, dunkel) c. unsichtbar, nicht wahrnehmbar²⁵: φθίσις ἀλαή unsichtbare Schwindsucht Hp. LocHom. 10 (korr.: -αΐα Gal.) · f. -αή Hp. I.c.

LSJ⁹'s point in noting the restriction of ἄλαός to lyric in tragedy is that the word must have been regarded as particularly elevated. This is also apparent not only from its absence from prose but from the fact that in the Hellenistic period, in addition to Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus has it twice (*Lau.Pall.* 98, 118) and Timo of Phlius once (*SH* 795.3; see below), while Lucian later uses it in what is seemingly supposed to be an oracle (*Alex.* 47), and [Oppian] employs it twice in the *Cynegetica* (II 613, 629). This is thus fundamental information about the word, although Montanari has removed it, and a lack of awareness of

²³ The reference is to a set of supposed dialectal glosses in Vaticanus Urbinas 157. The notice Κυπρίων ἄλαος τυφλός (*sic*) appears at the bottom of the left-hand column of f. 276^v.

²⁴ The source of the proposed etymology is unclear. Neither R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2010) s. u. ἄλαός nor A. Ernout and A. Meillet (eds.), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴ (Paris, 1985) s. u. *luscus*, -a, -um appears to regard it as a possibility.

²⁵ The colon is extraneous but also appears in the English version.

issues of stylistic level is in fact typical of the entries in his dictionary as a whole. The same is true of the excision of LSJ⁹'s brief discussion of the metrical anomalies (both *alphas* scanned long rather than short) at *Od.* X 493 ~ XII 267. The addition of *ποιάν* to the quotation from *A. Eu.* 322 (actually 322-3), on the other hand, makes no contribution to explicating the sense of the passage, which might have been better clarified by reference to other instances in which forms of *δέρκομαι* are used to mean «alive, living» (LSJ⁹ s. u. I.1, citing e. g. *Il.* I 88 ζῶντος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο). More significant, *ἀλαός* at *A., Pr.* 549 is figurative (the human race is blind in the sense «unforeseeing of their fate, confused»), meaning that the reference should not have been run together with the one that precedes it in LSJ⁹. Finally, the adjective also has three terminations in *Timo* (ἡ δ' ἀλαὴ περὶ πάντα κυλίνδεται), suggesting that Montanari has not gone beyond consulting and reworking LSJ⁹ in his study of the word.

GD s. u. *ἀλαός* thus makes a few basic, mechanical improvements to the material already found in LSJ⁹. But Montanari simultaneously misunderstands the significance of some of what the *Lexicon* has to offer and, by failing to engage in independent work on the lexical item in question, perpetuates his source's misunderstandings and misrepresentations. A more careful treatment of the word might read e. g.:

ἀλαός, -ον, but also -ός, -ή, -όν (*Timo* SH 495.3; fort. *Hp. Loc.Hom.* 10 [codd. φθίσις ἄλλη, *Gal.* XIX.74.2 K. ἀλαία φθίσις]) [poetic for common τυφλός; restricted in tragedy to lyric] 1. unable to see, blind, of a person *Od.* 8.195, 10.493, 12.267; *S. OC* 1449; of an eye *E. Ph.* 1531 (with reference to the person to whom it belongs); *S. OC* 150; figurative, of those who lack understanding [*A.*] *PV* 549; of the dead, as opposed to οἱ δεδορκότες (lit. 'those who see', i.e. who are alive; cf. LSJ⁹ s. u. *δέρκομαι* I.1). 2. blinding, causing an inability to see, of a wound *S. Ant.* 974, of a cloud *A.R.* 2.259. 3. unseen, invisible, *πολλὰ δ' ἀλά' ἔφανε* «he made apparent many things that are unseen» *A. Ch.* 815 (*ἀλά'* Hermann; *ἀλλὰ* cod.), of a consumptive disease *Hp. Loc. Hom.* 10 (text uncertain; see above) [etymology obscure; explained at e. g. *Philox.Gr.* fr. 428* as < α-privative + *λάω*] [*ἀλά-* at *Od.* 10.493 ~ 12.267]

2. Similar issues arise in the second half of the alphabet *s.vv.* *μάκελλον* and cognates. The oldest attestation of *μάκελλον* (as neuter) is in *IG* IV²,1 102 (temple-construction accounts from Epidaurus dating to the first half of the 4th century BCE). It appears four times there, in lines 107 *μ[ακ]έλλω ἐργασίας* «for work on the *makellon*», 296 *παρδείχματος μακέλλο* «for a model of the *makellon*», 298 *σιδάρο ποι τὸ μάκελλον* «for iron for the *makellon*», 301 *δακτυλίων καὶ ἐπιούρων ἐς τὸ μάκελλον* «for rings and pins for the *makellon*». Only the first of these is noted in LSJ⁹, which follows *Hsch.* μ 113 *μάκελλα· φράγματα, δρύφακτοι*, μ 115 *μάκελος· δρύφακτος*, taking the sense of the term to be «*enclosure*», i.e. an area fenced off by a barrier constructed in this case at least partially of iron. This does not mean that every *μάκελλον* must have been made all or even partially of metal, and *Hesychius'* gloss *δρύφακτοι/δρύφακτος* (the first element of which seems to be < *δρῦς/δόρυ*) rather implies construction out of wood. The cognate adjective *μακελλωτός*, -ή, -όν appears a few hundred years later at *IDélos* 442 B 238 (2nd c. BCE) in reference to doors (*θύρας μακελλωτάς*). LSJ⁹ s. u. takes it to mean «*latticed*», i.e. constructed of strips of wood, which seems to be a guess based again on *Hesychius'* glosses. A more obvious sense would be «associated with a *makellon*» (i.e. providing a way to enter or exit it) or «constructed in the style of a *makellon*»

(whatever that might be). Varro, *LL* 5.146 knows both the noun (which he identifies as Laconian and says refers to a vegetable market) and the adjective (which he calls Ionian, glossing μακελλωτάς *hortorum* as *ostia hortorum*), and appears to believe that both were well established in various Greek dialects before his own time (late 2nd/1st century BCE)²⁶.

μάκελλον has no obvious etymology in Greek. Stowasser²⁷, tentatively followed by Beekes and thus Montanari, suggested a connection with Hebrew *mikla* or *mikla'ah* («enclosure»), from a root that means «restrain, enclose». If so, there must have been something distinctive about the type of structure or its construction style to make the word worth borrowing, given that Greek already had αὐλή available to refer to an object of this sort. The most recent studies of Semitic loan-words into Greek ignore the suggestion²⁸, tacitly rejecting it, and it is easier to believe that this is instead a bit of ill-attested substrate vocabulary (i.e. «pre-Greek»).

In the Roman period, both neuter μάκελλον and masculine μάκελλος (esp. Plu., *Mor.* 277d διὰ τί τὰ κρεοπώλια ‘μάκελλα’ καὶ ‘μακέλλους’ καλοῦσι; «Why do they refer to the meat-markets as *makella* or *makelloi*?»²⁹; also masculine at *IG* V.2 268.45 (Mantineia; 10 BC-10 CE); *IGBulg* V 5569.4 (177-180 CE)) are used to mean «marketplace» (D.C. LXI 18.3 τὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν ὄψων, τὸ μάκελλον ὠνομασμένον) and especially «meat-market» (e. g. NT *1Cor.* 10:25 πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἐσθίετε, «Eat everything sold in the *makellon/makellos*!», with particular reference to meat). μάκελλον/μάκελλος appears to have passed into Latin as *macellum* at any rate already by the late 3rd century BCE (e. g. Plaut. *Aul.* 2.8.3 *venio ad macellum, rogitō pisces*, «I go to the *macellum* and ask for fish»). Martial 10.96.9 (1st c. CE), by contrast, has it as masculine *macellus*. A man who sold food in the market was accordingly a *macellarius*, a term that was adopted back into Greek as μακελλάριος (e. g. Aesop. *fab.* 99; *IG* II² 13468.3 [Athens; 5th/6th c. CE]; *Et.Gud.* s. u.), sometimes shortened to μακελλάρις (e. g. *IGBulg* IV 1922.9 [Serdica; late]; 2214.16 [Pautalia; late]).

LSJ⁹ offers the following, treating the older, neuter form of the word («enclosure») as separate from the later, masculine form («market») and adding the terms μακελλάριος, ὁ for «market-vendor/butcher» and diminutive μακελλάριον, τό as appendices to the second gloss:

μάκελλον, τό, I enclosure, *IG* 4²(1) 102, 107, al. (Epid., iv B.C.) :— also μάκελλος, ὁ Sch. Ar. Eq. 137; μάκελος, ὁ, and pl. μακέλα, μάκελλα Hsch. II μάκελλος, ὁ, = Lat. *macellum*, market, *IG* 5(2).268.45 (Mantineia, i B.C.), 5(1).149 (Sparta) 1 Ep.Cor. 10.25, D.C. 61.18, PLond.ined. 2487.43 (iv A.D.) :—hence μακελλάριος, ὁ, = Lat. *macellarius*, Aesop. 134; = *laniator*, *lanio*, Gloss. : neut. -άριον, τό, POxy. 1000 (vi A.D.)

What LSJ⁹ cites as *POxy.* 1000 is today *PTurner* 50 (ca. 572 CE), the relevant portion of which reads εἰς διόρθωσι(ν) τοῦ λέβυτος τοῦ γεουχικ(οῦ) μακελλαρι(ίου). Although the final word is ambiguous, it is in fact most easily restored as a form of μακελλάριον («for the repair of the basin associated with the *makellarion* belonging to the landowner»). In addition, the *Lexicon* offers as separate lemmata:

²⁶ *ea loca etiam nunc Lacedaemonii vocant μάκελλον, sed Iones ostia hortorum μακελλωτάς* [my accent] *hortorum, et castelli μάκελλα*.

²⁷ Stowasser (1891, pp. 1-6).

²⁸ Most recently Rosół (2013).

²⁹ Thus the Teubner edition, following family Φ; see below.

μακελλεῖον, τό, = Ianatorium, Gloss.³⁰

μακελλίτης, = corpodicina (sic), ib.

μακελλωτός, -ή, -όν, latticed, θύραι Inscr.Délos 442 B 238 (ii B.C.)

The *Supplement* adds further information s. u. μακελλάριος: «add ‘BASP 12.153 (?iii AD; sp. μακελάρειως), SEG 29.327³¹ (Corinth, v/vi AD)’», and s. u. μάκελλον II: «after ‘Aesop. 134’ insert ‘SEG 29.327 (Corinth, v/vi AD)’». As Scaliger saw, *corpodicina* in the second entry ought probably to be corrected to *corporicida*, making μακελλίτης another ill-attested word for «butcher»³².

Montanari converts LSJ⁹ s. u. μάκελλον into three separate notes, dividing the first into two parts and dropping most of the epigraphic evidence, as well as the reference to the London papyrus (known today as *PLond.* VI 1914.43 (335 CE)):

μάκελλον -ου, τό [hebr. miklā?] a. Schlachthaus, Lebensmittelmarkt³³, Fleischmarkt NT. Cor. 1.10.25; τὰ κρεοπώλια ‘μάκελλα’ καὶ ‘μακέλλους’ καλοῦσι die Fleischmärkte nennen sie Schlachthaus und Schlachthäuser Plut. Aet. Gr. 277d || übertr. Markt DCass. 61.18.3 b. Einfriedung Hsch. IG 4².1 102.107 (IV^a)

μάκελλος -ου, ὁ [μάκελλον] Umfriedung Sch. Aristoph. Eq. 137c

μακελλάριος -ου, ὁ [μάκελλος] Metzger Aesop. 99

The only significant addition of evidence in Montanari’s notes is the reference to Plu., *Mor.* 277d, which is however cited with no acknowledgement that it offers clear, specific evidence that in the Roman period masculine μάκελλος was used alongside neuter μάκελλον to mean «market» or «meat-market». The Roman-era inscriptions cited in LSJ⁹ to make the same point are excluded, and the only evidence offered for the masculine is the *scholion* on Aristophanes, although the gloss there misses the point of the Greek and thus the intended sense³⁴. *POxy.* 1000 = *PTurner* 50 is similarly ignored, along with the lemma it supports. Perhaps most important, Montanari’s note turns the evidence for μάκελλον/μάκελλος, and thus the history of the word, on its head, by implying that the fundamental sense was «slaughterhouse» *vel sim.*, which was later extended to «market»³⁵. The oldest attested sense («enclosed area»), on the other hand, is treated as marginal and thus placed second, with

³⁰ A reference to G. Loewe, G. Goetz and F. Schoell, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1888-1924), vol. VII, p. 575, where the Latin gloss means «butcher’s stall». «ib.» in the next lemma in LSJ⁹ refers to the same source.

³¹ Now IG IV².3 1468.1 (6th century CE).

³² See Redard (1949, p. 117).

³³ Thus Meier-Brügger-Dräger, improving on Montanari’s «*macelleria*» by misrepresenting it.

³⁴ «The Athenian κύκλος, like the μάκελλος, gets its name from its form» (better identified as Σ^{VEΓΘΜ} Ar. Eq. 137). Montanari seems to take this to mean that a μάκελλος is a «circle». But what the *scholion* is saying is that κύκλος (prop. «circle») comes to mean «(section of the) marketplace» on the same sort of logic that μάκελλος (prop. «enclosed area») does.

³⁵ Cf. already Stowasser (1891, p. 1): «in der gesammten alten Literatur bedeutet das Wort *macellum* niemals ein Schlachthaus, ja nicht einmal eine Fleischbank allein, sondern es ist geradezu der Markt, die Centralmarkthalle».

Hesychius (5th century CE) cited before *IG* IV²,1 102 (almost a millennium earlier). And the most important lines of the inscription (298 and 301)—since they offer information about the material a μάκελλον was made of—are ignored, presumably because they are not cited in *LSJ*⁹ and no effort was made to check the original text itself.

Montanari drops the *Lexicon*'s μακελλίτης and ignores the new information in the *Supplement*, but includes as additional separate lemmata:

μακελλεῖον -ου, ὁ [μάκελλος] *Metzgerei* MacMgn. *Apocr.* 3.42 (p. 147.19) (v.l. -λιον)

μακελλεύω [μάκελλος] *eine Metzgerei haben* MacMgn. *Apocr.* 3.42 (p. 145.4)

μακέλλη -ης, ἡ a. ion. für μάκελλα b. *Plut. Aet. Gr.* 277d, s. μάκελλον

μακελλικός -ή -όν [μάκελλον] *des Metzgers* [Athanas.] *Quaest.* 94.3

μακελλωτός -ή -όν [μάκελλον] *mit Gitter, von Toren* *IDélos* 442 B 238 (II^a)

Of these, μακελλεύω and μακελλικός, -ή, -όν are not included in *LSJ*⁹. As routinely elsewhere, however, Montanari's handling of the words themselves and the sources for them is confused. The derivation of a number of the items from μάκελλος rather than from μάκελλον appears to be a careless mistake. In the first entry, the *Atheniensis* has μακελλίω—not a variant reading, as Montanari would have it—Blondel in his 1876 edition emended to μακελλεῖω, and Volp (see below) follows Goulet in printing μακέλλω, and in both this and the second entry the text should have been cited not from Blondel but from Volp's edition of 2013 (included in Montanari's list of Authors and Works, and thus known to him, but ignored). μακέλλιον/μακελλεῖον would in any case better have been cited from Aesop (*fab.* 28; 33) than from Macarius Magnes (4th century CE), and μακελλεύω must mean something more like «to work as a butcher» than «to have a butcher's shop»³⁶. In the third entry, μακέλλη for μάκελλα («mattock») is not Ionic but Attic (*A.*, *Ag.* 526; *S.*, fr. 727; *Ar.*, *Au.* 1240, the only attestations of the word in the classical period, after μάκελλα at *Il.* XXI 259 and μακέλη at *Hes.*, *Op.* 470), and the reference to *Plu.*, *Mor.* 277d for μακέλλη represents an eccentric decision to refer momentarily to the Paris Didot edition of 1868, which follows family Π and prints feminine μακέλλας, even though Montanari has just above followed the Teubner and accepted masculine μακέλλους in the same passage. The reference in the fourth lemma, finally, is correct, but the Index of Authors and Works provides no way to locate the passage, which is at Migne, *PG* 28, p. 656.29³⁷.

Montanari thus makes some minor improvements on the *LSJ*⁹ entries for μάκελλον and its cognates and adds two lemmata. But his overall handling of the words represents a substantial philological step backwards, in that he obscures the origin of the central term, its historical development and its relationship to Latin *macellum/macellus*; omits crucial evidence, including new material already cited in the *LSJ*⁹ *Supplement*; and garbles much of the information he does offer, or renders its inaccessible. More carefully and comprehensively treated, the notes for this small set of cognate words might have been presented e. g. as follows:

³⁶ The Italian original reads «tenere un banco di macellaio».

³⁷ The text dates to the 7th or 8th century CE. Information about the location of most of pseudo-Athanasius' other works is similarly omitted. This is in fact his Question 94; the source of the specific designation «94.3» is unclear.

μακελλάριον, τό [μάκελλον II] *butcher's shop* PTurner 50.1 (ca. 572 CE) εἰς διόρθωσι(ν) τοῦ λέβυτος τοῦ γεουχικ(οῦ) μακελλαρ(ίου)

μακελλάριος, ὁ [μάκελλον II] *butcher* Aesop. *fab.* 99; *BASP* 12.153 (?3rd CE; spelled μακελάρειως), *IG* II² 13468.3 (Athens, 5th/6th CE); *IG* IV².3 1468.1 (6th century CE); later in contracted form μακελλάρις e. g. *IGBulg* IV 1922.9; 2214.16 (both late)

μακελίτης, ὁ [μάκελλον II] = *corporicida* (Scaliger, *corpodicina* cod.), i.e. *butcher*, *Corp.Gl.Lat.* VII.575

μάκελλον, τό [no etymology; see Varro, *LL* 5.146] I. *enclosure*, *IG* IV².1 102.107, 296, 298 σιδάρο ποῖ τό μάκελλον «for iron for the *makellon*», 301 δακτύλιων καὶ ἐπιούρων ἐς τό μάκελλον «for rings and pins for the *makellon*» (Epidauros, 4th BCE), Hsch. μ 113 μάκελλα· φράγματα, δρύφακτοι «*makella*: fences, partitions» II. later, along with μάκελλος, ὁ, in the extended sense *market*, *marketplace*, sometimes with particular reference to a meat-market: Plu., *Mor.* 277d διὰ τί τὰ κρεοπώλια ‘μάκελλα’ καὶ ‘μακέλλους’ καλοῦσι; «Why do they refer to the meat-markets as *makella* or *makelloi*?»; NT *1Cor.* 10:25 πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἐσθίετε «Eat everything sold in the *makellon*/*makellos*!» (with particular reference to meat); *IG* V,2 268.45 (Mantineia, 10 BCE-10 CE; masc.); *IGBulg* V 5569.4 (177-180 CE; masc.); D.C. 61.18.3 τὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν ὄψων, τὸ μάκελλον ὠνομασμένον «the market for dainties, known as the *makellon*»; *SEG* XXIX 327 (Corinth, 5th/6th CE); cf. Lat. *macellum* (e. g. Plaut., *Aul.* 2.8.3 *venio ad macellum, rogito pisces* «I go to the *macellum* and ask for fish») or *macellus* (Mart. 10.96.9)

μακελλεύω [μάκελλον II] *work as a butcher* Macar.M., *Apocr.* 3.42.1 Volp

μακελλικός, -ή, -όν [μάκελλον II] *belonging to a butcher* [Athanas.] *Quaest.* 94 κύων μακελλικός a butcher's dog

μακέλλιον, τό [dimin. < μάκελλον II] or μακελλεῖον, τό *market*, *meat-market* Aesop. *fab.* 28; 33

μακελλωτός, -ή, -όν [μάκελλον I] *suitable for or in the style of a μάκελλον* (q.v.) *IDélos* 442 B 238 (2nd BCE; of doors), *Iones ostia hortorum (vocant)* μακελλωτάς *hortorum* Varro, *LL* 5.14

6. Conclusions

As the examples offered in Sections 2 and 3 of this review make clear—countless more instances of similar phenomena could have been cited—errors of fact and interpretation, and failures to perform basic philological stewardship functions such as updating references to appropriate modern editions, are ubiquitous in *GD*. Most of these problems could be corrected via the investment of a large amount of scholarly time, effort and genuine, high-level professional expertise to check every reference and verify every assertion about the sense of a word or phrase in its original context. This would be expensive, but should have

been done as part of the original creation and publication process of the dictionary. Efforts to translate the work into further languages—a methodologically dubious undertaking in any case—would have to be suspended in the meantime, and scholars would need to be made aware that the work in its current state is not reliable for serious academic purposes.

But small-scale, isolated missteps are not the real issue with *GD* and its sister volumes. As Sections 4 and 5 demonstrate, the fundamental problem is instead that the editor has declined to do the slow, painstaking, careful research required to create enduring philological value in a project of this sort. Producing the set of proposed notes on ἀλαόω, ἀλαός and μάκελλον and cognates offered in Section 5 took about three days, required numerous drafts, and involved consultation with colleagues and some small alterations on the basis of referees' comments. Those entries are imperfect and provisional. But this figure gives some sense of the amount of work that would be needed to produce a genuinely authoritative new Greek dictionary containing tens of thousands of such lemmata, or to rebuild Montanari's dictionary in the way it should have been built in the first place. Both options amount to the same thing, which is starting the project over again.

That the *GD*'s glosses are in German will make it attractive to readers whose needs are too advanced for Gemoll, but who find LSJ⁹'s English difficult to navigate. This strikes me as likely to be a very small group, and even they should be cautioned that Montanari's claims about the usage, sources and complexities of ancient Greek vocabulary cannot be assumed to be correct, and that little of what is correct in his dictionary is likely to be original. Institutional libraries should be advised against buying this volume or shelving and treating it as a standard reference tool. Students should be introduced to it only as a cautionary tale about precisely how *not* to undertake an important but difficult and demanding philological task.

Declaration of competing interest

The author of this article declares that he has no financial, professional or personal conflicts of interest that could have inappropriately influenced this work.

Authorship contribution statement

S. Douglas Olson: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing—original draft and Writing—review & editing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dickey, E. (2023) *Latin Loanwords in Ancient Greek. A Lexicon and Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gemoll, W. (2006) *Griechisch-Deutsches Schul- und Handwörterbuch* von Wilhelm Gemoll, durchgesehen and erweitert von K. Vretska, Munich: Freytag.
- Housman, A. E. (ed.) (1969) *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, New York: Greenwood.
- Montanari, F. et al. (1995) *GI. Vocabolario Della Lingua Greca*, Torino: Loescher.
- Montanari, F. et al. (2015) *GE. The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Montanari, F. et al. (2023) *GD. Wörterbuch Altgriechisch–Deutsch*, Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter.
- Olson, S. D. (2022a) «Philological notes on the letter *rho* in a new Greek-English dictionary», *Mnemosyne* 75, pp. 383-404.
- Olson, S. D. (2022b) «Philological notes on the letter *zêta* in a new Greek-English dictionary», *Glotta* 98, pp. 202-224.
- Olson, S. D. (2022c) «Philological notes on the letter *gamma* in a new Greek-English dictionary», *Museum Helveticum* 79, pp. 302-321.

- Olson, S. D. (2023a) «Philological Notes on the Letter *Psi* in a New Greek-English Dictionary», *Rheinisches Museum* 166, pp. 321-347.
- Olson, S. D. (2023b) «Philological Notes on the Letter *lambda* in a New Greek-English Dictionary. I. λαβάργυρος – λάσθη», *Hyperboreus* 29, pp. 143-166.
- Olson, S. D. (2023c) «Philological Notes on the Letter *lambda* in a New Greek-English Dictionary. II. λασιόκνημος – λημψαπόδοσις», pp. 299-325.
- Olson, S. D. (2024) «Philological Notes on the Letter *lambda* in a New Greek-English Dictionary. III. ληναῖος – λόγος», *Hyperboreus* 30, pp. 286-309.
- Piquero Rodríguez, J. (2019) *El léxico del griego micénico: index Graecitatis. Étude et mise à jour de la bibliographie*, Paris: A.D.R.A.
- Redard, G. (1949) *Les noms grecs en -της, -τις*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Rosół, R. (2013) *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*, Frankfurt am Main: PL Academic Research.
- Stowasser, J. M. (1891) *Eine zweite Reihe dunkle Wörter*, Vienna: Tempsky.
- Stray, C., Clarke, M. and Katz, J. T. (eds.) (2019) *Liddell & Scott. The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.