

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



LATIN LOANWORDS IN GREEK

N. Gonis

The Classical Review / Volume 53 / Issue 01 / April 2003, pp 93 - 94
DOI: 10.1093/cr/53.1.93, Published online: 12 April 2006

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0300057X

How to cite this article:

N. Gonis (2003). LATIN LOANWORDS IN GREEK. The Classical Review, 53, pp 93-94 doi:10.1093/cr/53.1.93

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LATIN LOANWORDS IN GREEK

I.-M. CERVENKA-EHRENSTRASSER, J. DIETHART (edd.): *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in den griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens, mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen. Faszikel II (Beta-Delta)*. (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer XXVII/2.) Pp. 142. Purkersdorf: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 3-85119-279-6.

The second fascicle (β - δ) of a lexicon of Latin loanwords in Greek documentary texts from Egypt comes four years after the first (reviewed in *CR* 48 [1998], 217-18). A third fascicle (ϵ - κ) is promised, but, as I am told, the funding for the project has run out. The *Lexikon* has been a standard work of reference for the last few years; it would be a pity if this important undertaking were to be abandoned.

This fascicle too follows the paths trodden in the first one. There is the same overabundance of information, a display of learnedness mixed with pedantry, a union of the relevant to the trivial; but notwithstanding its ocean of references, the *Lexikon* is easy to use. The only significant departure from earlier practices concerns the accentuation of Latin loanwords, where the editors generally follow the suggestions of J. Kramer, *ZPE* 123 (1998), 129-34.

A few additional examples have accrued since the publication of the *Lexikon*, cf. the on-line wordlists at <http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/fak8/papyWL/WL.pdf>. One may also notice a recent publication on the issue, G. Menci, *PLup* 9 (2000), 279-95.

I append some notes on a few entries that attracted my interest. It is curious that certain Latin loanwords, such as $\beta\acute{o}\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (or $\sigma\gamma\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$), are first attested in papyri of the early Islamic period. But this does not apply to $\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, whose instances should

have included *ὄπερεδάριος* (*P.Oxy.* LIV 3758.120); contrast, for example, the lemmata *βικεννάλιον* or *βικήσιμον*, whose examples include forms in *οὐι-βελόκιον*. Delete the example in *CPR* XIV 31 (very uncertainly read). *βηξιλλιφόρος*: The reading of the word in *O.Bodl.* II 1676 is extremely uncertain (and infringes ‘Youtie’s law’). *βουλγαρικός*: The discussion of the word offers no proof that it corresponds to Lat. *vulgaris*; and there is no way that in *SPP* VIII 1124 = XX 133 we are dealing with an alias. *δεφήνωρ*: This official is probably not identical with the *defensor civitatis* (Greek *ἐκδικος*), cf. D. Hagedorn *apud* B. Kramer, *Pap.Flor.* XIX, p. 308 n. 12, and now *P.Thomas* 24. *δομειστικός*: To the literature on *comites domesticorum* add R. Delmaire, *Byzantion* 54 (1984), 148–53, 175. On *P.Oxy.* XVI 1942 see now *ZPE* 132 (2000), 180. *δούξ*: Further examples in *P.Berol.inv.* 25009r.1 (ed. *GRBS* 17 [1976], 198), *SEG* VIII 355, XXIV 1223–4, and now *CPR* XXII 1. There are two doublets: BM Or. 8903 = *MPER* NS XXIII (elsewhere cited as KSB) 241, and *SB* I 1840 = *I.Syringes* 788. Delete *PSI* VII 800 and *P.Amh.* II 151, where the word is restored. *SB* IV 7475 (= *I.Theb.* 196) and V 8704 have been republished by J. Gascou, *T&MByz* 12 (1994), 339 ff. *P.Lugd.Bat.* XIII 10 dates to 399/400, cf. J. R. Rea, *ZPE* 56 (1984), 79–88; *SPP* III 271b dates to mid-VII, cf. J. Gascou and K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 49 (1982), 89–90, as also does *SB* XVI 12884, see *CPR* XXII 1 intro.; *BGU* III 750 is post-conquest, but does not date to 750. To the bibliography add now C. Zuckerman, *AnTard* 6 (1998), 137–47; J.-M. Carrié, *AnTard* 6, 105–21. The old dating of the texts in *P.Apoll.* to 703–15 (cf. pp. 137, 153, 155) should be condemned to oblivion, and replaced by ‘later VII’, cf. *BL* VIII 10 (referred to on pp. 183, 204, 258). Last, in a lexicon pertaining to the Greek documentary texts *Āgyptens*, examples from *P.Ness.* or *PPG* should have been set apart from the Egyptian material.

Wolfson College, Oxford

N. GONIS