

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 2
G–O

General Editor
Georgios K. Giannakis

Associate Editors
Vit Bubenik
Emilio Crespo
Chris Golston
Alexandra Lianeri
Silvia Luraghi
Stephanos Matthaios



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Table of Contents Ordered by Thematic Category	xv
Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	xxi
List of Illustrations	xxiii
Articles A–F	1

VOLUME TWO

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles G–O	1

VOLUME THREE

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles P–Z	1
Index	547

ISBN: 978-90-04-22597-8

We can expect new results from socio-linguistic and typological research on the linguistic interferences between the languages of the ancient Mediterranean. Our current state of knowledge can be summed up in the words of De Simone (2007:787): “The Etruscan language now seems genetically to be a language isolate and cannot therefore be related in any way to Greek (or pre-Greek/para-Greek)... The text of the Lemnos funerary stele has simply been composed in a variant of ancient Etruscan: Thus it is the Etruscans who migrated (at some point in the ninth-seventh centuries BC) from Italy to Lemnos (and Imbros)”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agostiniani, Luciano. 1981. “Duenom duenas: *kalos kalō: mlaχ mlakas*”, *SE* 49:95–111.
- Colonna, Giovanni. 1973–1974. “Nomi etruschi di vasi”, *Arch-Class* 25–26:132–150.
- . 2007. “Un etrusco a Perachora, a proposito della gemma iscritta già Evans col suicidio di Aiace”, *SE* 73:215–221.
- Cristofani, Mauro. 1993. “Un etrusco a Egina”, *SE* 59:159–162.
- De Simone, Carlo. 1968–1970. *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*, I–II. Wiesbaden.
- . 1972. “Per la storia degli prestiti greci in etrusco”, *ANRW* 1.2:490–521.
- . 1996. *I Tirreni a Lemnos: evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche*. Florence.
- . 1998. “‘Etrusco’ e ‘Tirreno’ di Lemnos: ‘Urverwandtschaft?’”, *RFIC* 126:392–411.
- . 2007. “Greek and Etruscan”. In: *A history of Ancient Greek. From the beginning to Late Antiquity*, ed. by A.-F. Christidis, 786–791. Cambridge.
- Devoto, Giacomo. 1927. “Tendenze fonetiche etrusche attraverso gli prestiti dal greco”, *SE* 1:255–287.
- . 1928. “L’etrusco come intermediario di parole greche in latino”, *SE* 2:307–341.
- Durante, Marcello. 1961. “Etrusco e lingue balcaniche”, *AION* 3:59–77.
- . 1973. “Una sopravvivenza etrusca in latino”, *SE* 41:196–197.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1930. “Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin”, *BSL* 30:82–124 (= *Philologica* 1:21–51).
- . 1954. *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*. Paris.
- Fiesel, Eva. 1928. *Namen des griechischen Mythos im Etruskischen*. Göttingen.
- Gras, Michel. 1985. *Trafics tyrrhéniens archaïques*. Rome.
- Martino, Paolo. 1987. *Il nome etrusco di Atlante*. Rome.
- . 1995. “I semitismi antichi nel latino”. In: *L’Italia e il Mediterraneo antico*, ed. by A. Landi, 65–117. Pisa.
- Peruzzi, Emilio. 1980. *Mycenaean in early Latium. With an archaeological appendix by L. Vagnetti*. Rome.
- Pfiffig, Amros J. 1989. “Zu *tališa* auf einem etruskischen Bronzespiegel des 5. Jahrhunderts”, *MedLR* 4–5:43–46.

PAOLO MARTINO

Greek and Hebrew

As early as the pre-exilic period, and especially in the period from the seventh to the fifth century

BCE, the Hebrew world was repeatedly exposed to Greek culture and language, through commercial and military contacts as well as through other channels. Yet it was only with the Ptolemaic Age (323–198 BCE) that Greek truly began to spread in Israel, not only in the coastal areas of Canaan but also in Galilee, Samaria, and the very heart of the country, Judaea and Jerusalem. Monumental inscriptions (→ Epigraphy) in Greek first appear under Antiochus III (242–187 BCE) and Greek → personal names soon became widespread (Hengel 1974:58–65). After the Hellenization promoted by the Seleucids (198–140 BCE), especially by the last members of this dynasty, Greek finally took its place among the languages currently used in the region. In the third and second century, when Greek spread increasingly in scholarly as well as trading and administrative milieus, Hebrew was already losing ground to another fast-expanding language, Aramaic, which had long been well-established in the area, especially among the middle and mercantile classes. Nevertheless, the use and prestige of Hebrew in the religious sphere remained undiminished. Hebrew was still the only liturgical language allowed in the Temple, although in synagogues Aramaic had been in use for some time already alongside Hebrew for simultaneous translations of Bible readings (the Targum). Hebrew also held its ground as a literary language, and as the preferred medium of expression not only of the priestly elites but also of other classes of the population. From a linguistic perspective, the pressure of Hellenism contributed to increasing internal divisions in Judaic society, whose Hebrew-Aramaic bilingualism quickly evolved into a complex triglossia of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek (→ Bilingualism, Diglossia and Literacy in First-Century Jewish Palestine). This situation did not, of course, occur uniformly over the region or across all social classes: the three languages, as far as we can judge from often only indirect evidence, appear to have had different distribution areas, with one or the other taking priority in usage in different communities of speakers. Only the lower stratum of the population seems to have been largely excluded from the active use of Greek.

In the Diaspora, the coexistence of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek soon gave way to the replacement of one language by another. While the earliest Judeo-Egyptian documentation, the papyri of Elephantine (5th–4th c. BCE), shows

a uniform use of Aramaic by a community connected to the local garrison, in Ptolemaic Egypt the situation appears to have been substantially different. Alexandria had a sizable Jewish community from the time of its foundation, especially after the arrival there of the thousands of deportees brought from Judaea and Samaria by Ptolemy I, according to the testimony of Flavius Josephus. Significantly, in Alexandria even the holy language was forced to give way to Greek, notably with the beginning of that translation of the Bible into → Koine Greek later known as the Septuagint, or simply 'LXX', in the third century BCE. The → Septuagint has a variable relationship with the Hebrew source text (the scrolls, according to the *Letter of Aristeia to Philocrates*, were brought for the purpose directly from the Temple of Jerusalem). While the translation of the main part of the work, the Torah or Pentateuch, appears to adopt a homogeneous approach, the translations of Prophets and even more so of Hagiographers – the completion of which took a number of decades – show differences in language, as well as in the approach to translation, which covers the whole range from calque to paraphrase. Searches for Hebraisms in the Septuagint have highlighted various interferences of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, both syntactical and lexical (Thackeray 1909:25–55 § 4; Walters 1973:141–264). The Septuagint's peculiar transliterations of certain noun categories found in the Hebrew Masoretic Text, studied by Tov (1979:227), constitute a problem unto itself. These categories are: 1) personal, geographical, and ethnic names; 2) technical terms, and weights and measures; 3) unknown words and *hapax legomena*. Although the vocalization of the Masoretic Text was only added several centuries after the writing and fixation of its consonantal text, some scholars regard the testimony of the Septuagint as an important proof of the phonological diversity of ancient Hebrew, compared to the one belatedly recorded by the Masorets. Others have challenged this view, invoking the differences between the two writing systems, the uncertainties of manuscript tradition, as well as other factors. The debate has remained essentially unresolved (see, among others, Brønno 1940 and Tov 1973). The distance between the Greek translation and the Hebrew source was already perceived in antiquity, but does not seem to have hindered the adoption of the former in the synagogues of the Diaspora, or to have diminished its long-lasting reputation.

On the other hand, the prominence of the Septuagint in the western Diaspora does not seem to have increased appreciation for the Greek language in Jerusalem. Still, even here the translation must have had wide circulation, since some fragments (of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy) were found in Cave 4 at Qumran, and other Greek fragments of Biblical, apocryphal, and unidentified texts were discovered in Cave 7 (Ulrich 1992).

Much of Judaic society was intolerant of Hellenization. This prevailing attitude did not, however, prevent the new Hasmonean dynasty (140–37 BCE) from being influenced by Hellenism, in spite of this dynasty's local origin and commitment to refounding a Judaic state with a strong national, cultural, and religious ideology. The Hasmoneans ruled over a country whose cultural leaders were aware of the importance of Greek for reaching out to a broader public, one not necessarily limited to Diaspora Jews. Greek was used for the documents of the alliance between Judaea and the foreign countries (1 *Mac* 15), and later on, Greek appears alongside Hebrew on the coins of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE). Even more importantly, Jewish national historiography was now carried on in Greek. In the Hebrew Bible it had halted at the Persian period with the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah. The final redaction of the first Book of the Maccabees was in Greek, and would outlive its Hebrew original. The latter, according to the *Prologus Galeatus*, was still in circulation in the time of Jerome, but was never admitted into the Hebrew canon. A very similar destiny befell an important work of the wisdom-text genre, the Siracides (or Ecclesiasticus) by Yešua' ben Sirā: the Greek translation carried out by the author's grandson in Alexandria in 132 BCE outlived the Hebrew original written only fifty years earlier. The prologue contains an interesting statement, where the translator justifies his translation's lack of efficacy compared to the original, "since things said in Hebrew do not have the same force when translated into another tongue" (*ou gār isodunamēi autà en heautois Ebraisti legómena kai hótan metakhthēi eis hetéran glóssan*, vv. 21–22). He also immediately adds that the same problem plagues the translation of the books of the Bible. He is clearly alluding to the Septuagint: "Not only this work but Laws, Prophecies, and the other books show differences from the original that are not small" (*ou mónon dè taúta, allà kai autòs ho nómos kai hai prophēteiai kai tà*

loipà tôn biblîôn ou mikrân ékhei tèn diaphoràn en heautoîs legómena, vv. 23–26). → Epigraphy provides clues suggesting that Greek had taken hold among the Sadducee priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem. Among the various inscriptions in Aramaic – none in Hebrew – in the so-called Tomb of Jason, mainly used in the first century BCE, the principal text is made up of calques of Greek funerary expressions, with turns of phrase that are never attested in Hebrew-Aramaic funerary epigraphy: *qyn' 'lm' 'byd lyswn br p[... 'hy]*... 'Let an everlasting lament be made for Jason son of P[...], my brother (etc.)' (Avigad 1967). On another wall in the same monument, a less mournful appeal was added with a charcoal crayon, possibly readable as *euphraíneste hoi zôntes t[ò] dè (loi)pò[n.] peîn hómá pha[geîn]* 'Rejoice, oh living, you who can still drink and eat' (Hachlili 2005:163–166, for both).

There is evidence of a considerable expansion in the use of Greek under Herod II the Great (37 BCE–4 CE) as a significant part of his Hellenization program, although his measures were much gentler and more respectful of tradition than the drastic and unpopular measures adopted by the Seleucids in their time (Rocca 2008:240–248). Hebrew ceased to be used on the coins of this ruler of foreign origin (half Idumaeen and half Nabatean), leaving only Greek. Possibly for the first time, Greek appears on Temple Hill, in the inscription warning Gentiles not to step beyond the area set aside for them (SEG 8.169). In this case the use of Greek is of course justified by the fact that the inscription was meant to be read by non-Judeans; Greek is also the language, however, of all the inscriptions mentioning the private donations collected by Herod to renovate the Temple, such as one by a certain Paris son of Akēsōn of Rhodes (Isaac 1983). Between the Herodian period and the full Roman age, inscriptions on ossuaries found in Jerusalem and its surroundings, dated between 30 BCE and the second century CE but mostly from the first century CE, show ample use, but not a prevalence, of Greek. Out of 233 ossuaries bearing inscriptions, 73 are in Greek, 14 in both Hebrew or Aramaic and Greek, and the rest in Hebrew. In bilingual Hebrew and Greek texts, the latter is used more extensively (Rahmani 1994:11; Hachlili 2005:171): the Greek text, besides indicating the deceased's name and patronymic, sometimes adds brief warnings. For example:

- (1) *Roùphou hós d'ân metenénkē pa[r(ébē)] tòn hórkon aut(oû)*
'Of Rufus; whoever moves it breaks his vow'
(Rahmani 1994, n. 142)

The bilingual Greek and Hebrew epitaph on the ossuary of the family of Nicanor of Alexandria, the famous donor of the door of the Herodian temple, carries an elaborate Greek text, while the Hebrew text is limited to the name *nqnr 'lks'*, *Nikanor Alexa(nder)* (CJ 2.1256; Hachlili 2005:172–173).

In the years following the destruction of the Temple, Greek appears to have held sway, partly because of its widespread use by the Roman administration, which seems to have employed Latin only rarely. This increased use of Greek, however, led to a counter-reaction: there were attempts to restore Hebrew as the sole or at least main national language. After the repression that followed the rebellions of 115 in the Diaspora, a ban on the teaching of Greek was enacted in religious contexts: "...during the war of Quietus, [the Wise Men] forbade wreaths for brides and that a man teach his son Greek" (Mišnah, *Soṭah* 9.14). The most significant testimonies for the second century come from the non-literary documents from the Desert of Judah, including inscriptions, ostraka, and → papyri, and among these last especially the Letters of Bar Kokhva, which comprise a little more than twenty texts, mostly in Hebrew or Aramaic, with two in Greek. In one of the last letters (P.Yadin Hēv 3) a man named Soumaios, possibly a Nabatean, apologizes for writing his letter in Greek "because nobody could be found to write it in Hebrew" (*egráphē d[è] helēnistì dià t[ò] hor]màn mè heurēth[ē]nai hebraistì g[rá]psasthai*). Actually in this period *hebraistì* can refer to Aramaic as well as Hebrew. At any rate, it appears clear that Greek was the easiest medium for communication between rebels of different ethnic groups.

Remaining on the subject of linguistic reaction, the second century also witnessed the drafting of new Greek versions of the Hebrew Bible by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, meant as alternatives to the Septuagint. Other Greek versions of the Bible had actually been circulating for some time already, as attested, for example, by the fragments of a first-century BCE Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets from Naḥal Hēver (8HēvXIIgr) showing numerous variants compared to the Septuagint and also some compared

to the Masoretic Text (cf. Tov & Kraft 1995). The second-century versions, however, were commissioned in a completely different climate than that in which the Septuagint arose: they were written in the aftermath of the second and last anti-Roman revolt in 132–135, and their purpose was to provide Greek-speaking Jews with a more solid contact with the Hebrew original. These versions, included in Origen's Hexapla (185–254), mostly survive in fragments of citations, with the addition of some fragments from the Genizah of Cairo, and rare epigraphic citations. Although scarce, these sources nevertheless allow us to perceive the translations' essential characteristics. The proselyte Aquila produced a hyperliteral translation, with one Greek word for each Hebrew one, even → particles, as in the case of the Hebrew use of the preposition 'et for the accusative, which he renders in Greek with *sún* (→ Adpositions (Prepositions)). A classic example is *Gen.* 1.1:

- (2) *ḅ-rešith bara' elohim 'et-ha-šamayim we-'et-ha-'ares*
 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth'
 which Aquila renders as:
- (3) *en kephalaíōi éktisen ho theòs sùn tôn ouranòn kai sùn tèn gèn*

It seems that his version was the one that met with the least resistance in rabbinic milieus. The later translator Symmachus took a wholly different approach. Using a uniform and elegant style, he avoids the imitation of Hebrew syntax and verbal construction in favor of Greek idiomatic constructions, and employs any particle that can help to render the text more accurate and intelligible. Theodotion's version, largely a revision of other Greek translations, including the Septuagint, lies halfway between the other two. His version appears to be closer to the Masoretic text and elegant, without being either as literal as Aquila's nor as free as Symmachus'. Theodotion also cautiously refrains from translating technical terms and terms of uncertain meaning, preferring to give them in transliteration. These characteristics made his version much appreciated. His translation of Daniel's Book even replaces that of the Septuagint in almost all of the manuscripts.

The last testimony of contact between Hebrew and Greek is provided by the Mišnah,

the first normative code of post-Biblical Judaism. Completed at the beginning of the third century, this text was formed in a milieu that was linguistically divided between Aramaic and Greek, and where Hebrew was the domain only of erudite and Rabbinical circles. The 'language of the wise men', a particular evolution of post-Biblical Hebrew, fully reflects the heterogeneity of the milieu in which the Mišnah was compiled. The text incorporates many loan words not only from Aramaic, but also from Greek and, in lesser measure, Persian and Latin. Scholars have been studying and indexing the corpus of these transliterations and loans for a long time, seeking explanations for various modes of phonetic adaptation and considering possible shifts of meaning (Krauss & Löw 1898–1899; Sperber 1977–1979). This corpus is one of the clearest pieces of evidence for the stagnation of Hebrew at the end of antiquity, caught as it was in a deadly squeeze between Greek from the West and Aramaic from the East.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avigad, Nahman. 1967. "Aramaic inscriptions in the Tomb of Jason", *Israel Exploration Journal* 17:101–111.
- Benoit, Pierre. 1967. "L'inscription grecque du tombeau de Jason", *Israel Exploration Journal* 17:112–113.
- Bickerman, Elias J. 1988. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge, MA.
- Brønno, Einar. 1940. "Some nominal types in the Septuagint. Contributions to pre-masoretic Hebrew grammar", *Classica et Mediaevalia* 3:180–213.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio. 1998. *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*. 2nd ed. Madrid. [Engl. trans. 2001: *Introduction to the Greek versions of the Bible*. Leiden.]
- Hachlili, Rachel. 2005. *Jewish funerary customs, practices and rites in the Second Temple period*. Leiden.
- Hengel, Martin. 1969. *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr.* Tübingen. [Engl. trans. 1974: *Judaism and Hellenism: studies in their encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic period*. Philadelphia – London.]
- . 1976. *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren: Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit*. Stuttgart. [Engl. transl. 1980: *Jews, Greeks, and barbarians: aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian period*. Philadelphia.]
- Hengel, Martin and Christoph Marksches. 1989. *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the first century after Christ*. London – Philadelphia.
- Hezser, Catherine. 2001. *Jewish literacy in Roman Palestine*. Tübingen.
- Isaac, Benjamin. 1983. "A donation for Herod's temple in Jerusalem", *Israel Exploration Journal* 33:86–92. [Repr. in: id. 1998. *The Near East under Roman rule. Selected papers*, 21–28. Leiden.]
- Krauss, Samuel and Immanuel Löw. 1898–1899. *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*. Berlin.

- de Lange, Nicholas, Julia Krivoruchko, and Cameron Boyd-Taylor, eds. 2009. *Jewish reception of Greek Bible versions*. Tübingen.
- Millard, Alan. 2000. *Reading and writing in the time of Jesus*. Sheffield.
- Rahmani, Levi Y. 1994. *A catalogue of Jewish ossuaries in the collections of the State of Israel*. Jerusalem.
- Rajak, Tessa. 2001. *The Jewish dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in cultural and social interaction*. Leiden.
- . 2009. *Translation and survival. The Greek Bible of the ancient Jewish Diaspora*. New York.
- Rocca, Samuel. 2008. *Herod's Judaea. A Mediterranean state in the classical world*. Tübingen.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. 1988. *Historia della lingua hebrea*. Sabadell. [Engl. transl. 1993: *History of the Hebrew language*. Cambridge.]
- Sperber, Alexander. 1977–1979. “Greek and Latin loanwords in rabbinic literature. Prolegomena to a new dictionary of classical words in Rabbinic Hebrew”, *Bar-Ilan* 14–15:6–60, 16–17:9–30.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. 1909. *A grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1973. “Transliteration of Hebrew words in the Greek versions of the Old Testament – a further characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. revision?”, *Textus* 8:78–92 [Repr. in: id. 1999. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: collected essays on the Septuagint*, 501–512. Leiden.]
- . 1979. “Loan-words, homophony and transliteration in the Septuagint”, *Biblica* 60:216–236.
- Tov, Emanuel and Robert A. Kraft. 1995. *The Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl collection I)*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 1992. “The Septuagint manuscripts from Qumran: a reappraisal of their value”. In: *Septuagint, scrolls and cognate writings: papers presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and other writings (Manchester, 1990)*, 49–80. Atlanta, GA.
- Walters, Peter. 1973. *The text of the Septuagint: its corruptions and their emendation*. Cambridge.

DOROTA HARTMAN

Greek and Illyrian

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The study of Greek-Illyrian relations presents the same problems as the study of the relationships between Greek and the other ancient Balkan languages (→ Greek and Thracian), but in a particularly acute form as the data at our disposal are extremely scarce. Defining the historical depth of Greek-Illyrian linguistic relations, as well as their ultimate fate, depends on the solution to a problem which still remains open: what is the relationship between Illyrian and Albanian? Is the latter the continuation of the former, as many researchers propose, or, as others maintain, are these in fact two independent languages? There are strong arguments for both

sides, with the result that, given the present state of things, it would be difficult to accept either of these points of view without reservations. Thus we will have to examine the relations between the ancient Greeks and the Illyrians without considering these issues.

The Greeks entered into relations, mainly commercial in nature, with Illyrians in the Adriatic at quite an early date. For several centuries there had been Greek cities along this coast, including Epidamnus (Dyrrachium), Apollonia, Oricum and perhaps Lissus. There is no doubt that the inhabitants of these cities brought some knowledge of Greek to the Illyrians they came into contact with. According to Strabo, there was also an intermixture between the Epirotes and the more southerly Illyrians. Relations between the Illyrians and the Macedonians were notably hostile. By the 3rd century and even earlier, some of the Illyrians, and especially their chieftains and the dominant class, had acquired a considerable degree of Hellenization (Walbank 1976:267).

2. THE ILLYRIAN LANGUAGE

The study of the Illyrian language is based on the analysis of personal names, place names, and mainly on the analysis of glosses. The scarcity of the material at our disposal allows us to know very little about the Illyrian language and its position among the other Indo-European languages. It is not by chance that Eichner (2004) gives an article of his on the Illyrians the title “Illyrisch, die unbekannte Sprache” (“Illyrian, the unknown language”).

It appears that in Illyrian, as in the other ancient Balkan languages, the PIE voiced aspirated stops become voiced stops (cf. IE **grob^hos* > **grabus* ‘beech’ > γράβιον [*grábion*] ‘firebrand or torch’). It is not clear whether it is a *centum* language or a *satem* language, as analysis of the data leads to contradictory conclusions. Thus the analysis of *Oseriates* ‘name of an Illyrian tribe’ (< IE **ag^her-* ‘lake’), suggests a *satem* language, cf. Slav. *ozero* ‘lake’, while the development in the name *Vescleves* (< **u(e)su-* + **kleu-* ‘glory’, cf. Gk. *Eukleés* < *eû* + *kléos*) is characteristic of the *centum* languages. These data have led some scholars to regard Illyrian as a *centum* language, while some others consider it to be a *satem* language with centum remnants.