

TWO MACEDONIAN GLOSSES IN HESYCHIUS' *LEXICON*¹

PHILOLOGICAL AND SEMANTICAL ASPECTS OF A HESYCHIAN GLOSS

The Hesychian gloss ⁺βαθάρα . πυκλή, Μακεδόνες . πυρλός, 'Αθαμᾶνες² was preserved in a deformed condition and therefore it is necessary to reconstruct its original shape. It is obvious that the form 'Αθαμᾶντες, occurring here instead of *'Αθαμᾶνες³, designates one of the Epirotic tribes. However, three different terms βαθάρα, πυκλή and πυρλός are evidently „mots inconnus par ailleurs et déformés, probablement par les copistes d'Hesychius”⁴.

As a rule, the researchers of the Macedonian question feel powerless in the face of numerous difficulties and give no explanation of this gloss. However, in his monograph on the Macedonian language Otto Hoffmann⁵ proposed two

¹ This article was written during my five-months stay at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (22 IV–22 IX 1991). I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Prof. Georgios Kechagioglou for help and care and to Prof. Christos Tzitzilis for useful comments and valuable criticism. I am also thankful to Prof. M. Margariti-Ronga, who kindly shared with me her intimate knowledge of the archaic Greek dialects. I am not sure that they agree with me as to a non-Greek origin of the Ancient Macedonians. – Naturally, I am responsible for any remaining errors and shortcomings.

² So *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte), vol. I (A–Δ), Hauniae 1953, p. 316, No. β-320 [henceforth HAL₂]. See also *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* post Ioannem Albertum recensuit Mauricius Schmidt, vol. I (A–Δ), Ienae 1858, p. 364 [henceforth HAL₁], and especially E. Degani, *Macedonian Glosses in Hesychius' Lexicon*, „Ελληνικά” 1984, 35, p. 3–28, esp. 14 (No. 40), who made an useful *editio critica* of the Macedonian gloss in question.

³ The emendation *'Αθαμᾶνες (instead of 'Αθαμᾶντες) was already introduced by both editors M. Schmidt (see HAL₁, p. 364) and K. Latte (see HAL₂, p. 316), following Palmerus and Musurus.

⁴ J. N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens. Étude linguistique et historique*, t. 1, Athènes 1954, p. 115.

⁵ O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*, Göttingen 1906, p. 72–73; cf. additionally the same, *Makedonia. VI. Volkstum und Sprache der Makedonen*, [in:] *Pauly's Real Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, hrsg. von Georg Wissowa et alii, Band XIV, 1, Stuttgart 1928, p. 681–697, esp. 689.

following corrections: (a) *βατάρα instead of βαθάρα, and (b) *πύρνος 'aus Waizen bereitet' (or *πύρνον 'Waizenbrot') instead of πυρλός. Both corrections were repeated by Vittore Pisani⁶, who additionally suggested an obscure derivation of the Macedonian word from the Indo-European root *bhōg- 'to bake (a bread)', cf. Old Norse **baka**, German **backen** 'id.', Greek φάγω 'I roast, toast, parch'. Unlike Pisani, Jean N. Kalléris⁷ rejected both Hoffmann's propositions.

The former emendation is worth justifying with regard to 1) an alphabetical order, because the Hesychian gloss in question occurs between βαταίνει and βατᾶς, and to 2) a typical feature of the Macedonian language, which – as Hoffmann asserts – possessed no voiceless aspirates. The final explanation of this problem was given by Enzo Degani, who argued that⁸: „The lemma βαθάρα [...] is unanimously believed to be corrupt, both by editors and by linguists: this is due to the fact that on the one hand – as was underlined by Otto Hoffmann – »das 9 gegen den Makedonischen Dialekt verstösst« (p. 73), and on the other the lemma in question – this is perhaps a less strong argument, but not such as to be ignored – is inserted *extra ordinem* between βαταίνει and βατᾶς. In reality, the *codex Marcianus*, which I have accurately collated in the case of every gloss, reads without any doubt βατάρα. The alleged βαθάρα, over which scholars have been hitherto discussing, is nothing but one of the many printing errors contained in the meritorious but considerably inaccurate work by Niels Schow: this scholar quoted the gloss under discussion because Musurus had declared that the *glossema*, pertaining to it, πυκλή, was corrupt [...] Schow's error was immediately inherited by Wilhelm Dindorf ([...] »codex βαθάρα«), and afterwards by Schmidt ([...] »sic codex«), who proposed ἀθάρα, then by Latte, and by Liddell-Scott-Jones [...] as well as by all the linguists concerned”.

In consequence, we can conclude that βατάρα must be established as the only possible *lectio codicis*.

The second correction, proposed by Hoffmann, is hardly acceptable for a number of reasons. First of all, Hoffman did not take in consideration that both Epirots and Macedonians used a similar dialect or even the same (non-Greek) language⁹. Second, he treated the Macedonian word with no

⁶ V. Pisani, *La posizione linguistica del macedone*, „Rèvue Internationale des Études Balkaniques” 3, p. 8–32, esp. 11.

⁷ Kalléris, *op. cit.*, p. 115–116.

⁸ Degani, *op. cit.*, p. 3–4.

⁹ For the position of Epirotic and Macedonian among the ancient languages of the Balkans, see M. Kokoszko and K. T. Witczak, *Ancient Epirus and its inhabitants*, „Linguistique Balkanique”, 1991, fasc. 1–2, p. 41–49. For phonological divergences between Greek and Epirotic, see especially: the same, *Stosunki etnolingwistyczne w starożytnym Epirze* (in Polish), to appear in „Balcanica Posnaniensia” VII.

explanation of its Epirotic cognate. Third, he took Hesychius' translation of the Epirotic gloss (*πυρλός*) as that of the Macedonian one (*πυκλή*). Fourth, his correction was not verified from a philological point of view nor from an etymological one.

To reconstruct an original shape of the Hesychian gloss in question, it is necessary to emphasize that there is a semantic convergence of both deformed terms *πυκλή* and *πυρλός* because of a close relationship of the Epirotic and Macedonian languages. Beside the criterion of 'a semantical convergence' we must propose (in both cases) the second criterion of 'the closest conformity of a suggested emendation to the preserved text'. On the basis of the above criteria, I shall try to give a new explanation of the Hesychian gloss in question.

It is worth mentioning that a Greek word, being an original form of *πυρλός*, may be a feminine noun like *βατάρα* and *πυκλή*. If so, then we can take into consideration only the Greek word *πύαλος/πύελος* f. (*o*-stem) denoting 1. 'trough (for feeding animals)', 2. 'bathing-tub', 3. 'vat, kitchen-boiler', 4. 'sarcophagus', 5. 'setting, socket of the stone', 6. 'infundibulum (of the brain)', 7. 'a surgical instrument'¹⁰. This possibility is highly probable in connection with the rarity of the feminine *o*-stem nouns in Greek and because of the significant resemblance between *πύαλος/πύελος* and *πυρλός*. The replacement of an original form (**πύαλος/*πύελος*) by the fictitious form *πυρλός* can be explained as the result of an accidental written contamination (interfusion) with *πυρήν* 3. 'bathing-tub' (= *πύαλος/πύελος* [GEL, p. 1556]), especially if **πυρήν* was an original form instead of *πυκλή* (see below).

It is likely that the Macedonian equivalent was primarily explained by a Greek word, whose meaning was similar to that of **πύαλος/*πύελος* or even the same. In this case I can propose the following emendation: the fictitious item *πυκλή* appeared instead of (Ionic) *πυρήν* f. (*ā*-stem) as the result of a defective transcription by copists of Hesychius' lexicon. It is not impossible to suppose that internal -λ- in this item was introduced through contamination of **πυρήν* with **πύαλος/πύελος*. The meaning of Greek *πυρία* (Ionic *πυρήν*) may be given as follows: 1. 'vapour-bath', 2. 'external application of heat', 3. 'bathing-tub' (= *πύελος* 2), 4. 'tomb (= *εἰσώστη*), tomb-chamber'¹¹.

¹⁰ A *Greek-English Lexicon* compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir H. S. Jones, Oxford 1989, p. 1550–1551 [henceforth: GEL]. It should be added that the same emendation was first suggested by Sopingius, see Degani, *op. cit.*, p. 14: „πύελος (pro πυρλός) Sopingius: πύργος Guyetus: πυρός Schm.: πύρνος ('aus Weizen bereitet') vel πύρνον ('Weizenbrot') Hoffm.”

¹¹ GEL, p. 1556. There is also a homonymous noun in Ancient Greek (*πυρία* II. 'fishing by torchlight').

It is worth emphasizing that the Ancient Greek word *πύαλος/πύελος* was not preserved in Modern Greek¹² and went out of use in Byzantine times¹³. Likewise, the noun *πυρία* I. was apparently replaced from the Medieval Greek language¹⁴. Then the defective transcription of the gloss may be easily explained considering the fact that both these words were unintelligible for the copists of Hesychius' lexicon.

On the basis of the above, we can reconstruct the following original form of the Hesychian gloss in question: *βατάρα* . **πυρίη*, *Μακεδόνες*. **Πύελος*, **Ἀθαμᾶνες*.

ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF EPIRO-MACEDONIAN *βατάρα*

The correctness of the above-suggested reconstruction may be checked from an etymological view-point. The Epiro-Macedonian term *βατάρα* 'bathing-tub' (= **πύελος*), vapour-bath (= **πυρίη*)' can be successfully compared with the Common Germanic word **bāpa-* n. 'vapour-bath; bath', also 'bathing-tub', cf. Old Icelandic *bað* n. 'warmes Bad, Dampfbad', OSved. *baþ*, Norw. *bad*, Dan. *bad*, OFris. *beth*, OSax. *bath*, MDu. *bat*, OHG. *bad*, German *Bad*, English *bath*, Dutch *bad* and many others¹⁵. As is well-known¹⁶, the Germanic item continues the Indo-European protoform **bhə₁to-*, which is derived from the root **bhē-* : **bhō-* 'to warm' (cf. OHG. *bājan*, German *bähen* 'to forment'). The close relationship of the Germanic and Epiro-Macedonian terms can be established beyond all question. As a matter of fact, the term *βατάρα* originates from the same protoform **bhə₁to-*, extended by means of the feminine suffix *-rā*¹⁷. Then it is simply an exclusive isogloss, which joins in some way the Germanic and Epiro-Macedonian languages.

¹² Cf. N. Andriotis, *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*, Wien 1974, p. 472 (vacat); the same, *Ετυμολογικό λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής*, Thessaloniki 1990 (reprint of the 3rd edition).

¹³ Note that E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (from B. C. 146 to A.D. 1100), Cambridge 1914, p. 963, cites neither *πύαλος/πύελος* nor *πυρία*.

¹⁴ The noun *πυρία* f. occurs in Modern Greek dialects, but with different meaning 'Fischfang bei Fackellicht' (< *πυρία* II.): *πυρία* Chios, Megiste, *πρὸς* Epeiros [Parga], cf. Mod. Greek *το πυροφάνι*, see Andriotis, *Lexicon...*, p. 474, No. 5164. However, traces of *πυρία* I. are well preserved in the verbs *πυριάζω* 'erhitzen, erwärmen', also 'ausbrütten' (*ibid.*, p. 474, No. 5165) and *πυριῶ* (*ibid.*, p. 474, No. 5166).

¹⁵ See e.g., H. Falk and A. Torp, *Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit*, Göttingen 1979, p. 256; J. de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Leiden 1961, p. 22, s. v. *bað*.

¹⁶ Cf. J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern-München 1959, p. 113 [henceforth IEW].

¹⁷ In any case, the relation of the Epiro-Macedonian and Germanic forms is in some way analogous to that of Mod. Gk. *μπανιέρα* f. 'bath-room; bathing-tub' and *μπάνιο* n. 'bath, bath-room'. [Both Greek words comes from Italian].

The etymology suggested above can be taken as a positive verification of the proposed emendations on the one hand, and as an evidence for the ancient lexical links between the Indo-European tribes of the Balkans and those of the North on the other.

MACEDONIAN ἄδδαι: SEMANTICS AND ETYMOLOGY

There are no philological problems with the Hesychian gloss ἄδδαι . ῥυμοί . Μακεδόνες, though the semantical and etymological aspects are still obscure. Firstly, Jean Kalléris¹⁸ is unsure whether the Greek word ῥυμοί (pl.) designs 'timons de char' (= 'poles of a chariot or car' [GEL, p. 1576]) or 'pièces rondes de bois sec' (= 'log or block of wood for fuel' [ibid.]). Secondly, the Macedonian word has no acceptable etymology¹⁹.

Regardless of the actual meaning of Greek ῥυμοί, the Macedonian word in question can be easily compared with the Indo-European word for 'branch', IE. *ósdos (<*H₃édos), which is well attested not only in Germanic (e.g. Gothic *asts*, OSax. *ast*, OHG. *ast*, German *Ast* 'branch'), but also in numerous non-Germanic languages of the Indo-European family (cf. Arm. *ost* 'twig, branch', Greek Attic ὄζος, Aeolic ὕσδος 'branch', etc.)²⁰. The semantical development of 'branch' to 'pole of a chariot (car)' is easily acceptable especially as any wooden pole is to be made from a branch of a tree. The different change of 'branches' to 'log (block) of wood for fuel' may also be adopted with no semantical difficulties, because 'block of wood' can be comprehended as 'a gathering of (dry) branches'.

As regards the phonological aspects, the development of IE. *o to Mac. a (as well as that of IE. *-oi to Mac. -ai) is wholly regular, compare e.g.,

1) Mac. ἄξος (*Gk. ξύλον) < IE. *óksu- 'wood, firewood, tree, timber', cf. Skt. *áksu-* 'bamboo-pole', Gk. ὄξιν f. 'beech', etc.;

2) Mac. δάρυλλος 'oak' < IE. *dóru- 'tree, wood', also 'oak', cf. Hittite *taru-*, Skt. *dāru-* 'wood', Gk. δόρυ n. 'tree, wood' : δρῦς f. 'oak', etc.;

and, on the other hand,

¹⁸ Kalléris, *op. cit.*, p. 83–85.

¹⁹ For a short survey of the etymological explanations, see esp. Kalléris, *op. cit.*, p. 83–84, fn. 6 and 7. However, none of the proposed hitherto etymologies, including Kalléris' own, can be accepted for some reasons. Firstly, deriving the Macedonian lexical relics from the Greek language is a fundamental blunder of a part of the researchers of the Macedonian question (e.g. Hoffmann, Kalléris, Katičić, Sakellariou and others). Secondly, postulating the prefix *ad- in reference to Mac. ἄδδαι is an ad hoc hypothesis, proposed by another group of linguists (e.g. Schwyzler, Russu, Pisani, Bednarczuk).

²⁰ See S. E. Mann, *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*, Hamburg 1987, p. 893; and IEW, p. 785–786, s. v. *ozdo-s* 'Ast'.

3) Mac. κόμ(μ)αραί (pl.) 'crabs' or 'small crustaceans' in general < PIE. *k^{m̥}H₂eroi (m. pl.) 'id.', cf. Gk. Doric κάμμαρος m. 'a kind of lobster', Old Norse **humarr** 'lobster', German **Hummer** 'id.'

However, it is impossible to decide whether the geminate -δδ- attests the process of an assimilation in Macedonian (i.e. IE. *-sd- > -zd- > Mac. -dd-²¹) or it is only a Greek transcription for Macedonian -zd-.

As a result, we can conclude that Macedonian ῥδδαι (regardless of its actual meaning) represents a straightforward descendant of the Indo-European plural form *ósdoi 'branches'.

DWIE GLOSYPALEOMACEOŃSKIE ZACHOWANE W LEKSYKONIE HESYCHIOSA

(streszczenie)

Chociaż *Leksykon* Hesychiosa stanowi wartościowe i wciąż nie w pełni wykorzystane źródło do badań nad wymarłymi językami antycznych Bałkanów, to jednak zachowane glosy paleobałkańskie wymagają właściwej analizy filologicznej i semantycznej. Autor analizuje pod tym kątem dwie glosy paleomacedońskie. W pierwszym przypadku odtwarza nie tylko właściwą postać wyrazu (mac. βατάρα) i całej glosy, ale też właściwe jego znaczenie: 'łaźnia parowa, wanna'. Zestawia następnie ów termin paleomacedoński z pokrewnymi nazwami, zachowanymi w językach germańskich (por. niem. **Bad**, ang. **bath**, stisl. **bađ**). W drugim przypadku autor rozważa semantyczne aspekty glosy paleomacedońskiej ῥδδαι i na bazie analizy etymologicznej rekonstruuje jej pierwotne znaczenie i postać (ie. *ósdoi 'gałęzie').

²¹ For a phonological analogy, see Old Norse **haddr** m. 'braid, tress' (from Germanic *hazdaz m. 'id.' and IE. *kosdho-) and many others. This process occurs also in some Ancient Greek dialects.