

TRACING THE HAND OF ZONARAS IN THE LEXICON TITTMANNIANUM

The scholar who attempts to identify any traces of Zonaras' hand in this major Lexicon which in many respects, most of all in supplying grammatical guidelines, by and large surpassed all previous works in lexicography, will soon discover that its authorship remains a well-preserved secret. When it comes to pinpointing a mass of direct borrowings from and establishing a more intimate dependence on Zonaras' works, we are simply discouraged: all we are left with is a feeling of an intellect that traverses a very wide range of literature with, occasionally, an identifiable reference to a specific author, but no compelling revelation awaits us in return for our effort. The scholar who hopes to trace big chunks of Zonaras' text in this Lexicon will be sadly disappointed.

But this, perhaps, precisely points to the way in which the lexicographer displays his initiative and originality, or his procedure of making the compilation at some remove from the text being exploited. Surely repeating oneself is not the only, and certainly not the best, method of referring to one's own writings. Besides, extensive quotations are, in principle, excluded by the purpose of a Lexicon which has the aim of providing specific and practical definitions. On the other hand certain comments which are found in the Lexicon do strike us as coming from Zonaras. It is in the treatment of entries like *χόμη* (1235), for instance, that one is reminded of the chronographer's famous outburst on hairstyles¹. The lexicographer gives a standard definition of hair as an adornment of the body, but then adds that «others» (οἱ δέ) prefer to see a connection between *χόμη* and «wearing long hair» which, supposedly, «deserves attention»! True, it is hard to see whether it is Zonaras who scribbled these gentle lines or whether they simply reflect a typical monkish attitude, but they can, perhaps, serve as a reminder of his polemic².

1. Canon 96 of Trullo: *RP* II, 534-535. The criticism of wearing long hair is found also in Zonaras' *Epitome* VII, 17, 65 (1-4).

2. The lexicon certainly has a lot to say about hairstyles: compare *ξανθίζεσθαι* (1414), *πλόκαμοι* (1552), *οὔλαι* (1480), *οὔλαμός* (1478) and above all *φενακίζειν* (1803) ... *πηνίχην*, ἥ δὲ

Elsewhere in the definition of ἔκτρωμα (661) we read: ὁ ἐν πᾶσι τέλειος Παῦλος ὡς ἀτελῆ ἐν ἀποστόλοις καὶ μὴ μορφούμενον τῇ κατὰ Χριστὸν πίστει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτρωμα φησὶν ἑαυτὸν· ὡς περιττῶ ἔκτρώματι ὤφθη κάμοι. One gets the impression, here, that the writer wants to play with the words τέλειος, ἀτελής and ἔκτρωμα by placing them close together in his text and by trying to direct the readers' notice towards the use of antonyms (τέλειος-ἀτελῆ) or of the same word in an antithetical connotation (ἔκτρωμα-ἐκτρώματι). This kind of wordplay is a distinctive peculiarity of Zonaras' linguistic indulgence which we discuss in the relevant chapter and which can, possibly, be manifested in the above example.

On another occasion, Zonaras, giving an account of the land of Ἰδομαία in his historical work³, draws a parallel between the name of this land and the Jewish name for lentils (Ἐδώμ), especially golden-coloured lentils, which, as the Bible has it, had constituted the mess of pottage exchanged for Esau's birthright. In the definition of the entry Ἰδομαῖος (1086) in the Lexicon we find the same account with a slightly altered wording. The importance of this occurrence is enhanced by the fact that it is not attested in the *Suda* or any earlier Byzantine Lexicon. Such affinity of thought and language between our Lexicon and the chronicle of Zonaras, particularly in the section of his biblical history, is not a single incident and merits a more systematic investigation by scholars⁴.

But if the above examples demand a fair amount of guess-work or of perception, we luckily happen to have a more solid indication if not of Zonaras' authorship in relation to our Lexicon, at least of his substantial influence. Thus, if the historical work of Zonaras is, comparatively, deficient in evidence which would enable us to attribute the Lexicon in question to the chronographer with sufficient certainty, it seems that his ample commentary on canon-law is more rewarding in this respect. There is no need

ἔστι περίθετος κόμη διαπατῶσα τοὺς πολλούς. Zonaras actually uses the word ἀπάτη in connection with pretentious hair styling in the above canon 96 of Trullo. Moreover, that bodily adornment is an act of stupidity and recklessness is a view shared by the lexicographer and Zonaras alike. Compare, e.g., περπέρεια (1534) ὃ μὴ διὰ χρείαν, ἀλλὰ διὰ καλλωπισμὸν παραλαμβάνεται, ὃ καὶ ἡ βλακεία καὶ ἡ προπέτεια. Zonaras in canon 16 of Nicaea: *RP* II, 623 writes in relation to περπέρεια that, according to St. Basil, this was defined as πᾶν, ὃ μὴ διὰ χρείαν ἀλλὰ διὰ καλλωπισμὸν παραλαμβάνεται. And the Trebizond manuscript adds: περπέρεια δὲ λέγεται μὲν καὶ ἡ προπέτεια, λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ βλακεία. We would argue that here the lexicographer has, in fact, quoted from Zonaras' text rather than from St. Basil's, as he again quotes from the former in the next line.

3. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 9, 43 (10-17).

4. Compare also Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 10, 48 (3-4). γίνονται (sc. τῶ Ἰωσήφ) παῖδες ... ὧν ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἦν Μανασσῆς· ἐπιλήθον δὲ δηλοῖ, ὅτι λήθην εὔρατο τῶν ἀτυχημάτων. In the Lexicon under Μανασσῆς (1328) we read: κύριον ... ἐρμηνεύεται δὲ λήθη ἢ ἀπομάθησις.

to resort to entries such as *λομός* (1315) which the lexicographer interestingly defines also as «the bad judge» to be able to think of Zonaras' judicial post and, consequently, draw the connection⁵. We can actually trace over twenty definitions in the Lexicon whose wording is quoted *mot à mot* from an equal number of definitions found scattered in Zonaras' commentary on the canons. Admittedly, we have stated in the beginning of this chapter that it is unlikely for a scholar to manage to identify big chunks of Zonaras' text in the Lexicon, yet it appears that lesser extracts, in the form of brief definitions, can be certainly located so that these are now common to both.

J. Tittmann in his edition of *Johannis Zonarae Lexicon* had, long ago, pointed out in footnotes that fragments of Zonaras' text taken from his commentary on canon-law had formed in whole or part the definitions of certain entries in our Lexicon⁶. But Tittmann had not, at that time, realised the extent of such «common excerpts» nor did he adduce this evidence as a coherent argument in favour of Zonaras' authorship in which he believed. In what follows we will attempt to demonstrate the need for reconsidering the Lexicon's disputed authenticity in the light of this evidence, and to argue that Zonaras can no longer be regarded as the shadowy or foster-parent of this important work, but that he must have been more intimately connected with its composition than is commonly believed.

As a general observation regarding the lexicographer's procedure of compilation it is important to remember that he is making ample use of the *Suda* lexicon, which must have been one of his most basic sources of reference. There are, however, two points to make here. First, the lexicographer's best interests lie in curtailed, comprehensive definitions, and for this purpose he, usually, decides to abridge the text of his sources, including the *Suda*. Second, he nevertheless exercised full control over what he is quoting, makes choices among available possibilities and, more often than not, surprises us with a new reference. It was, perhaps, the fact that Zonaras had the habit of providing brief and concise definitions throughout his critical notes on canon-law which attracted and prompted our compiler to include, in identical words, a fairly large number of them in his Lexicon. These «borrowings» can be classified into two distinct categories: the first includes entries which are, basically, Latin words transliterated into

5. There are more than forty words found in the Lexicon with juridical meaning. With the exception of four entries (*ἀδέκαστος*, *ἄρειος πάγος*, *ἐγκληματικά δίκαια* and *ιδιωτικά δίκαια*) the definitions of the rest of the above words can be found word for word in the *Suda* lexicon.

6. See, e.g., his comments on the entries *εἰρηνικά ἐπιστολά* (633) and *συστατικά ἐπιστολά* (1687).

Greek⁷, while the second extends over a variety of vocabulary which is defined in Zonaras' commentary.

The following table shows (in alphabetical order) the entries of Latin origin which we have been able to identify in our Lexicon. We have printed in inclined letters those words which Zonaras uses and/or defines in his notes on the canons. The reader will notice that the word *δικτατώρεια* (520), which is found in the list (but not in italics), is a word with which Zonaras is very familiar and of which he was fond, as one gathers from the many times it is mentioned in his historical work.

ἀδνούμιον 47	κάλανδα 1159	ὄσπῆτιον 1475
αἰωνάριος 71	καμελαύκειον 1159	ὄστιάριος 1474
ἀκούμβιτα 110	Καπιτώλειον 1159	ὄφικιάλιος 1488
ἀνουμίνοσ 175	Καρμεντάλια 1160	ὄφικιον 1489
ἀντιμίσιον 193	κέρκουρος 1186	ὄφικιον 1495
ἄσσάριον 322	κίμβιξ 1210	πιμεντάριοι 1548
βεμβράνας 383	κομμονιτήριον 1240	πούβλικον 1569
βενεφοικίος 384	κονσίστριον 1241	πραΐδα 1576
βεστία 384	κονσουλάριος 1232	πραϊπόσιτος 1572
βηλός 385	κόρβους 1233	πραιτώριον 1582
βίρρον 389	κουράτωρας 1242	προμιλέγια 1588
βίσεξτον 389	κουρατωρεῖον 1242	πρώμοτος 1574
βιστάκια 389	κουστωδία 1238	ραιφερενδάριος 1603
βρέβιον 407	κῶδιξ 1273	σακερδώς 1627, 1628
δατόν 471	κωνσίλιον 1278	σάκρον, σάκρα 1631
δηλιγατίων 493	κωσιτώριον 1278	σεννάτωρ 1634
δηναδίπτρα 500	λεγέων 1293	σιγίλιον 1646
δικτατώρεια 520	λίβελλος 1308	σίχηρητα 1649
διφενσίων 510	λουδεμιστής 1316	σχιρινάριος 1652
δίφενσος 510	λυπινάριον 1323	σπέκλον 1655
δομεστίκοι 559	μαγίστερ 1327	σπεκουλάτωρ 1666
ἐκτραορδιναρίους 653	μλιαρήσιον 1363	τήβεννα 1727
ἐξέρκετον 764	μιτατώριον 1363	φαικάσιον 1797
ἔπαρχος πραιτωρίων 787	νοῦμμος 1405	φιμινάλια 1810
ἐφραγγέλωσαν 936	ὀκουλούμ 1438	φοσσάτον 1820
ἰγρουσία 1100	ὀλλάρια 1444	φραγέλιον 1825
		φράτορες, -ρος 1821

Let us now examine the actual references to Zonaras' text traced in the definitions of our Lexicon. We have created, therefore, two columns: the left-hand corresponds to the wording in the Lexicon whereas the righthand to the text of Zonaras' canon notes on which the lexicographer has drawn.

7. For a recent work on Byzantine Lexica with Latin terminology (mostly lawyers' jargon) transliterated into Greek, see L. Burgmann - M. T. Fogen - R. Meijering - B. Stolte (eds.), *Fontes Minores VII, Lexica Iudica Byzantina*, Frankfurt, 1990.

Again, the oblique words or phrases are the ones common in both authors:

Lexicon Tittmannianum	Zonaras' canon commentary
κομμονιτήριον (1240) = ἔγγραφον ἔνταλ- τήριον εἰς ὑπόμνησιν κατὰ Ῥωμαίους.	ἔγγραφον ἔνταλτήριον ... εἰς ὑπόμνησιν ... ὃ κομμονιτόριον ὠνόμασαν ⁸ .
βρέβιον (407) = ἡ ἐπιτομος καὶ σύντομος γραφὴ βρεβίω γὰρ κατὰ Λατίνους τὸ τέ- μνω ... καὶ βρεβίτα ἡ συντομία.	βρέβιον λέγεται ἡ κατ' ἐπιτομὴν σύντομος γραφὴ· βρεβίω γὰρ κατὰ Λατίνους τὸ τέμνω, καὶ βρεβίτα ἡ συντομία ... ⁹
πούβλικον (1569) = παρὰ Λατίνους τὸ δεδημοσιευμένον.	πούβλικον γὰρ τὸ δεδημοσιευμένον καὶ πρόδηλον λέγεται, ἡ γὰρ λέξις τῶν Λα- τίνων οὕσα ... ¹⁰
λίβελλος (1308) = ἔκδοτος, ἡ αἰτία τῆς υποθέσεως.	λίβελλος γὰρ Ῥωμαῖστί ἐκδοσις ἐστὶ ¹¹ .
βενεφικίαις (384) = ἅπαν εἶδος χάριτός τε καὶ δεξιώσεως. τῆς γὰρ τῶν Λατίνων διαλέκτου οὕσα ἡ λέξις εὐεργεσίαν δη- λοῖ.	διὰ δὲ τῶν βενεφικίων ἅπαν εἶδος χάριτός τε καὶ δεξιώσεως. τῆς γὰρ Λατίνων οὕσα διαλέκτου ἡ λέξις εὐεργεσίαν δη- λοῖ ¹² .
ιδιωτικαὶ δίκαι (1087) = αἱ εἰς χρήματα τὴν ζημίαν ἐπάγουσαι.	ιδιωτικαὶ (δίκαι) μὲν γὰρ λέγονται αἱ εἰς χρήματα τὴν ζημίαν ἐπάγουσαι ¹³ .
δικαιωτήρια (526) = τὰ δικαστήρια καὶ αἱ ἐκεῖθεν κολάσεις.	λαμβάνεται γὰρ τὸ δικαιῶσαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κολάσαι· ὅθεν λέγομεν, τὰ ἐκεῖθεν δι- καιωτήρια ¹⁴ .
ἀκούμβιτα (110) = στρωμναὶ μαλακαὶ εἰς ὑψος ἠρμέναι ... ἡ λέξις Ῥωμαϊκῆ. ἀκούμβω γὰρ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τὸ ἀνα- πίπτω.	ἀκούμβω γὰρ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τὸ ἀναπί- πτω σημαίνει δὲ στρωμνὰς ἠρμένας εἰς ὑψος, καὶ μαλακάς ¹⁵ .
αὐθέντης (340) = φονεὺς ἢ ὁ ἑαυτὸν κτιν- ύων.	λέγεται γὰρ αὐθέντης καὶ ὁ αὐτοφονευ- τῆς ¹⁶ .
σῆρες (1638) = οἱ σκώληκες.	σῆρες γὰρ οἱ σκώληκες ¹⁷ .
ἀθύρματα (61) = παίγνια παρὰ τὸ θύω, τὸ ὀρμῶ μεираκιώδη ἀθύρματα, ἧτοι παιδικὰ παίγνια ... ¹⁸
Λευίτης (1293) = ὁ διάκονος, ... ἢ Λευίτης ἐστὶν ὁ διακονήσας τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον.	Λευίτας τουτέστι, διακόνους ¹⁹ .

8. Canon 100 of Carthage: *RP III*, 531.

9. Canon 103 of Carthage: *RP III*, 535.

10. Canon 50 of Carthage: *RP III*, 408.

11. Canon 47 of Carthage: *RP III*, 417.

12. Canon 12 of 1st in Nicaea: *RP II*, 141.

13. Canon 6 of 2nd in Constantinople: *RP II*, 182.

14. Canon 5 of 3rd in Ephesus: *RP II*, 198.

15. Canon 74 of Trullo: *RP II*, 476.

16. Canon 3 of St. Sophia: *RP II*, 710.

17. Canon 16 of 7th in Nicaea: *RP II*, 623. The lexicographer here ignores the definition given in the *Suda* (IV, 352): Σῆρες: ἔθνος, ἐνθα ἡ μέταξα γίνεται. ἐξ οὗ καὶ σερικὰ τὰ ἐκ μετάξης ὑφασμένα λέγεται.

18. Canon 9 of 7th in Nicaea: *RP II*, 586.

19. Canon 3 of Carthage: *RP II*, 301.

<p><i>ἐξωμοσία</i> (762) = τὸ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν σωτηρίαν ὁμόσαι.</p> <p><i>φατρία</i> (1796) = συγγένεια, σύνταγμα ἢ κακοθελὲς διαβούλιον καὶ συμφωνία τινῶν ἐπὶ πράξεσι φάβλαις.</p> <p><i>εἰρηνικαὶ ἐπιστολαί</i> (633) = αἱ λεγόμεναι ἀπολυτικά. οἶαι εἰσὶν αἱ διδόμεναι τοῖς μητροπολίταις ὑπὸ τῶν πατριαρχῶν.</p> <p><i>ἀφήλικες</i> (351) = οἱ τὴν ἥβην μὲν ὑπερ-αναβάντες, ἥττους δὲ τῶν κε ἐτῶν ὧν προΐστανται οἱ κουράτωρες.</p> <p><i>ἡμιόλιον</i> (992) = τὸ ἡμισυ τοῦ ὄλου.</p> <p><i>σῆκρητα</i> (1649) = παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις χρι-τήρια.</p> <p><i>κουράτωρας</i> (1242) = φροντιστάς, διοικη-τάς.</p> <p><i>σκηνή</i> (1653) = ἡ κατοικία. παρὰ τὸ σχῶ, το κρατῶ ... σκηνή καὶ τὸ δράμα καὶ ἡ ὑπόκρισις.</p>	<p><i>ἐξωμοσία</i> δ' ἐστὶ τὸ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν σωτηρίαν ὁμόσαι²⁰.</p> <p><i>φατρία</i> δὲ ἐστὶ κακοθελὲς διαβούλιον, καὶ συμφωνία τινῶν ἐπὶ πράξεσι φάβλαις²¹.</p> <p><i>εἰρηνικαὶ μὲν ἐπιστολαὶ εἰσὶν αἱ λεγόμεναι ἀπολυτικά. οἶαι εἰσὶν αἱ διδόμεναι τοῖς μητροπολίταις ὑπὸ τῶν πατριαρχῶν²².</i></p> <p><i>ἀφήλικες</i> δὲ, οἱ μὲν τὴν ἥβην ὑπερ-αναβάντες, ἥττους δὲ τῶν κε ἐτῶν ὧν προΐστανται οἱ κουράτωρες²³.</p> <p><i>τῆς ἡμιολίας, ἥτις ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄλου τὸ ἡμισυ²⁴.</i></p> <p><i>σῆκρητα</i> δὲ τὰ κριτήρια τοῖς Λατίνοις ὠνόμασται²⁵.</p> <p><i>προκουράτωρας, τουτέστι διοικητάς, φροντιστάς²⁶.</i></p> <p><i>σκηνή</i> λέγεται ἡ ὑπόκρισις²⁷.</p>
--	--

The reader will have noticed that the above table comprises a variety of words which are defined in Zonaras' canon-commentary and which the lexicographer faithfully quotes. They range from entries of Latin origin²⁸, of which some would belong to the language of administration, to more

20. Canon 30 of 4th in Chalcedon: *RP* II, 290. The lexicographer continues with the *Suda*'s definition which, however, he places on a lower footing (*Suda* II, 321).

21. Canon 18 of 4th in Chalcedon: *RP* II, 264. The lexicographer quotes a tiny portion of the *Suda*'s definition afterwards (*Suda* II, 704 and 760).

22. Canon 11 of 4th in Chalcedon: *RP* II, 243. The same applies to *συστατικά ἐπιστολαί* (1687) as the Lexicon quotes Zonaras' definition from the above note.

23. Canon 3 of 4th in Chalcedon: *RP* II, 221.

24. Canon 17 of 1st in Nicaea: *RP* II, 152. The *Suda* has a comparable definition [(*Suda* II, 570): ἡμιολία: τὸ ἡμισυ τοῦ κεφαλαίου ...] but the lexicographer prefers that of Zonaras.

25. Canon 27 of Carthage: *RP* II, 540. The *Suda* simply gives the entry *σῆκρητον* (IV, 349).

26. Canon 16 of Carthage: *RP* II, 342. The entry does not exist in the *Suda*.

27. Canon 45 of Carthage: *RP* II, 414. The lexicographer prefers Zonaras' definition to that of the *Suda* (IV, 375-6) which is significantly longer: *Σκηνή* ἐστὶ ἡ μέση θύρα τοῦ θεάτρου. παρασκήνια δὲ τὰ ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν τῆς μέσης θύρας. ἵνα δὲ σαφέστερον εἴπω, μετὰ τὴν σκηνήν εὐθύς καὶ τὰ παρασκήνια ἢ ὀρχήστρα. αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος, ὃ ἐκ σανίδων ἔχων τὸ ἔδαφος ἀφ' οὗ θεατρίζουσι οἱ μῖμοι ...

28. There are, naturally, words of Latin origin which occur in the canon notes of Zonaras but cannot be found in the Lexicon such as *κανάλης* (21 of Sardice), *ληγάτον* (22 of Carthage), *ἐμαγκιπατία* (35 of Carthage), *τρακτάτον* (47 of Carthage), *σεκέρνω* (107 of Carthage), *μάτριξ* (119 of Carthage), *πριβιλέγια* (133 of Carthage) etc.

trivial and common ones. We have not included in the table words which occur both in the Lexicon and in Zonaras' text and which the chronographer does not define²⁹, but even the words which *are* included can, we think, alone, give ground for the hypothesis that the lexicographer was, at least, fully aware and made ample use of Zonaras' definitions. Zonaras' text in this respect must to a certain extent have been equally important to him as that of the *Suda*. Indeed, in some cases as we have seen, the lexicographer gives preference to the wording of the canon-notes of Zonaras over that of the *Suda*, especially when the former provides more concise definitions. In the light of this evidence we are challenged by two possibilities: either we have Zonaras himself working on his Lexicon and now quoting his own writings word for word, now modifying and adapting his phraseology to the needs of his later and major work, *or* we have some other author (in which case it would, perhaps, make sense to regard him as belonging to some monastic community) who writes at a later date and who, having access to and good knowledge of Zonaras' writings on the canons, decided to include some of his definitions, in identical wording, in his Lexicon.

Neither possibility can be proved, although the first one is, admittedly, the more tempting. Of course, there can be objections to it. The most serious could be based on the fact that, as far as we are aware, we do not have parallel examples of chunks of text from Zonaras' historical work being quoted by the author of the Lexicon. And Zonaras, there, *does* give several definitions of words in the middle of his narrative. To assume that the historian Zonaras *first* composed his Lexicon and *then* his world chronicle³⁰ would, possibly, give reasons for this deficiency but it cannot explain, for instance, the occurrence of some of the chronicle's vocabulary in the Lexicon nor of that of writers composing later in the twelfth century.

But before we tackle the problem of dating it would be helpful at this point to cite a number of cases where the compiler seems to be referring

29. Such words include ἀμοιβιδόν (164) also in canon 76 of Carthage, ἐγκαταλείμματα (604) also in canon 84 of Carthage, φραγέλιον (1825) also in canon 27 of the Apostles. Moreover, expressions such as πρὸς τρυφήν ἢ βλακείαν occurring in canon 41 of the Apostles are found in our Lexicon, too (entry ἀκούμβητα [110]). The word εἰληθερούμενος (641) = θερμαινόμενος can be interestingly found in the celebrated note of Zonaras on hairstyles (canon 90 of Trullo: εἰληθερεῖσθαι (sc. τὴν τρίχα τῆς κεφαλῆς) ταύτην ἐν ἀκμῇ θέρους ἀνέχονται) and the list goes on.

30. In which case the sequence of his writing activity would start with his commentary on the canons (as a newly vowed monk would be expected to do), continue with the Lexicon (in whatever form he left it) and finish with his chronography.

more or less directly to Zonaras' historical writing itself. The examples which follow are given on a selected basis and cannot but represent only a very limited picture of the ways in which both the lexicographer and Zonaras worked.

1. To start with, the entry *παράδεισος*, which occurs in the Lexicon (1501) but does not occur in the *Suda*, receives similar treatment in Zonaras' *Epitome*³¹. The idea that man was created and appointed by God to act as His deputy in His earthly kingdom is common in both works. It is, of course, true that this description of man's condition in paradise is a commonplace, especially in religious literature, but the verbal similarities are noteworthy:

Lexicon Tittmannianum	Zonaras' <i>Epitome</i>
(a) ἔμελλεν (ὁ Θεός) πλαστουργεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ... ὡσπέρ τινα βασιλέα ...	οὕτω παράγει (ὁ Θεός) τὸν ἄνθρωπον οἰά τινα βασιλέα ...
(b) ... ὁ θεῖος παράδεισος, Θεοῦ χερσὶν ... πεφυτευμένος	ἔθετο [ὁ Θεός] τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐν παραδείσῳ, ὃν αὐτὸς κατεφύτευσεν.

2. More striking are the instances of identical etymologies of biblical words or proper names found in Zonaras' *Epitome* and the Lexicon. We may here suppose that a consultation of a common source like Josephus occurred or simply that the historian Zonaras had, in his quest for linguistic references, perused the pages of a lexicon other than that of the *Suda*, and that this different work might have been *our* Lexicon:

Lexicon Tittmannianum	Zonaras' <i>Epitome</i>
(a) Κάϊν (1142) = ὁ δὲ Ἄβελ (ἐρμηνεύεται) πένθος	Ἄβελ ... δηλοῖ δὲ πένθος ἢ κλησις ³²
(b) Βαβυλῶν (371) = σύγχυσις, καὶ πόλις οὕτω καλουμένη	Βαβυλῶν καλεῖται διὰ τὴν σύγχυσιν ³³
(c) Μελχισεδέχ (1342) = κύριον. ἐρμηνεύεται δὲ βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης	Μελχισεδέχ· σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο ... βασιλεὺς δίκαιος ³⁴
(d) Ἰακώβ (1077) = κύριον πτερνιστῆς ἐρμηνεύεται	Ἰακώβ ὠνομάσθη· πτερνιστὴν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα καθ' Ἑβραίους δηλοῖ ³⁵ .
(e) Ἰσραήλ (1124) = ἐρμηνεύεται νοῦς ὁρῶν τὸν Θεὸν ...	Ἰσραήλ ... τοῦτο δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι νοῦς ὁρῶν τὸν Θεὸν ἐρμηνεύουσιν, Ἰώσηπος δὲ τὸν

31. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 2, 21 (18-21).

32. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 3, 24 (2-3).

33. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 5, 30 (9). The *Suda* does not have the entry Βαβυλῶν.

34. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 6, 34 (20-21). The *Suda* gives a different definition: ἐρμηνεύεται Μελχισεδέχ βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης. Our Lexicon's definition is, therefore, closer to Zonaras.

35. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 6, 37 (9-10). The *Suda* simply mentions Ἰακώβ with no comment.

- | | |
|---|---|
| | ἀντιστάντα θείῳ ἀγγέλῳ σημαίνειν φησίν ³⁶ . |
| (f) Ναζιραῖος (1383) = ... ἡγιασμένος | Ναζιραῖον ... ἄγιον δηλαδὴ ³⁷ . |
| (g) Δαγών (466) = εἰδῶλον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων θεραπευόμενον, ᾧ τὴν κιβωτὸν λαβόντες ἀνέθεσαν. | οἱ δὲ ἀλλόφυλοι εἰς Ἄζωτον πόλιν ἀπαγαγόντες τὴν κιβωτὸν τῷ Δαγῶν. οὕτω γὰρ τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἐκάλουν Θεόν, ἀνέθεντο ³⁸ . |
| (h) Σαλώμη (1630) = κύριον. ἐρμηνεύεται δὲ εἰρήνη. | ἡ Σαλώμη ... ἡ μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνης σημαντικόν· καὶ εἰρηνικὴν εἶναι τὴν οὕτω κεκλημένην ἐδήλου ³⁹ . |

3. Speaking of common etymologies one should certainly mention the rare occurrence of short definitions, phrases, or verbal elaborations in identical wording in both Zonaras' text and the Lexicon.

Lexicon Tittmannianum	Zonaras' <i>Epitome</i>
(a) σκηνή (1653) = ἡ κατοικία ... σκηνή καὶ τὸ δρᾶμα καὶ ἡ ὑπόκρισις.	οὐ γὰρ ἐτήρησε (ὁ Μιχαήλ) τὴν σκηνὴν τε καὶ τὴν προσποίησιν ... and elsewhere τοῦτο ὃ ἦν ... προσποίησις καὶ σκηνή τὴν τῆς φύσεως διαμαρτίαν τῇ ὑποκρίσει τοῦ σκηνουργοῦ ἐπιτείνοντος ⁴⁰ .
(b) λείον (1298) = τὸ ὀμαλόν.	ὀμαλῶς μετὰ πολλῆς λειότητος ⁴¹ .
(c) φαρμακοῦται (1799) = καταγοητεύεται	... καταγοητευθεῖς (ὁ Γερμανικός) τε καὶ φαρμαχθεῖς ⁴² .
(d) φορύνετο (1820) = τῷ αἵματι ἐφυρᾶτο, ἐμολύνετο ...	οἱ στρατιῶται αὐτὸν (τὸν Οὐτέλλιον) συνέλαβον φοροῦτοῦ πεπλησμένον καὶ αἵματος, ὑπὸ γὰρ τῶν κυνῶν ἐλελύμαντο ⁴³ .
(e) ἀποπληξία (248) = τὸ μετὰ ἀναισθησίας καὶ παρέσεως πάθος.	συνέβη δὲ οἱ (τῷ Τραϊανῷ) καὶ ἀποπληξία, ἣ πάρεσις τοῦ σώματος ἐκ μέρους ἐπηκολούθησεν ⁴⁴ .

36. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 8, 41 (20-22). The *Suda* simply has Ἰσραηλίτης meaning Jew.

37. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 24, 90 (3-4). The *Suda* uses different words in his definition: Ναζιραῖος = ὁ Θεῷ κεχαρισμένος καὶ ἀφιερωμένος, ὁ μοναχός. The Lexicon is again closer to Zonaras' interpretation.

38. Zonaras, *Epitome* I, 26, 98 (6-8). The *Suda* has the definition in identical wording, yet it is interesting to see how Zonaras, too, adapts it into his text, keeping some of the words unchanged.

39. Zonaras, *Epitome* V, 23, 454 (2-5). The *Suda* (IV, 317) simply has ὄνομα κύριον.

40. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVII, 18, 607 (2-3); XVII, 27, 645 (3-5). The *Suda* (IV, 375-6) gives a different definition for σκηνή.

41. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVIII, 20, 730 (14). The *Suda* (III, 258) defines (λείον) as πρᾶον. The Lexicon's definition is closer to Zonaras' text.

42. Zonaras, *Epitome* XI, 2, 438 (8-9). The participle φαρμαχθεῖς occurs in the *Suda*, too (IV, 700).

43. Zonaras, *Epitome* XI, 16, 491 (18-20).

44. Zonaras, *Epitome* XI, 22, 513 (16-17). The *Suda* (I, 314) does not include the word

- (f) *τολύπη* (1737)· εἶδος βοτάνης, ἡ ἐργασία, μηχανὴ ἢ ἄμπελος ἀγρία καὶ βοτάνη δηλητήριος.
- (g) *πήγανον* (1546) = βοτάνη· ὕπερ φυτευόμενον ὑπὸ τῆ συκῆ δριμύτερον ἑαυτῆς γίνεται. μετατίθεται γὰρ εἰς τὸ φυτὸν τὸ ἐν τῆ συκῆ βαρύσομον ...
- (h) *ἱερουργεῖ* (1095) = θύει.
- (i) *πώγων* (1600) = ἔστι καὶ πωγωνίας ἀστροειδὲς πυρὸς ἄθροισμα, ἔμπροσθεν ἔχον τὰς ἀκτῖνας πώγωνος δίκην.
- (j) *ἀκρίβας* (1438) = ὁ ἄμβων ... ἡ εὐθειὰ τῶν πληθυντικῶν ἀκρίβαντες, ἐφ' ὧν ἀκρων ἐστᾶσιν οἱ ὑποκριταί, οἰονεὶ ἀκρίβαντες τινὲς ὄντες ...
- καὶ συνέλεξαν ἐκεῖνος (ὁ διάκονος) τοῦ ἀγροῦ λάχανα, οἷς καὶ *τολύπη* συναναμεικτο· ἡ δὲ βοτάνη ἐστὶ δηλητήριος⁴⁵.
- ... ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις καὶ *πήγανον* ἦν ἄξιον διὰ τὸ μέγεθος θαύματος· *συκῆς γὰρ οὐδεμιᾶς ὕφους καὶ πάχους ἐλείπετο*⁴⁶.
- οἱ δὲ (πολέμιοι) οὐδὲν ἤττον ἦσαν *ἱερουργοῦντες καὶ θύοντες*⁴⁷.
- ... ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις (τοῦ Ἰουστίνου) ἀστὴρ ἐφάνη κομήτης ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, κάτω τὰς ἀκτῖνας ἀφιεῖς, ὃν πωγωνίαν οἱ μετεωρολογοῦντες φασί⁴⁸.
- ἔστειλεν οὖν (ὁ Ἀναστάσιος) εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸν λογοθέτην τε καὶ τὸν ἑπαρχον· οἱ ἐν τῷ ἄμβωνι ὡς ἐπ' ἀκρίβαντος στάντες διαγγέλλειν ἤρξαντο⁴⁹.

4(a). In a passage on the economic exploitation of a famine in tenth-century Byzantium by the emperor Nicephorus II Phocas (963-969) at the expense of the public, Zonaras narrates with horror how Nicephorus illegally increased the price of wheat, selling it dearly to those starving. The emperor did this, and disregarded all danger entailed in such measures which eventually made him the object of hatred. The text reads as follows: καὶ γέγονε λιμὸς ἰσχυρὸς, ὃν εἰς οἰκτεῖον κέρδος ὁ Νικηφόρος μετήνεγκε, τιμιουλκῶν τὸν σῖτον καὶ πολλοῦ τοῦτον ἀποδιδόμενος τοῖς λιμώττουσι, μηδὲ

πάρεσις in its definition.

45. Zonaras, *Epitome* II, 16, 173 (22-25). The *Suda* defines *τολύπη* as ἀγρία κολοκύντη.

46. Zonaras, *Epitome* VI, 28, 554 (14-16). The *Suda* simply mentions εἶδος βοτάνης making no reference to the fig-trees.

47. Zonaras, *Epitome* V, 6, 402 (1). The *Suda* does not have the phrase.

48. Zonaras, *Epitome* XIV, 5, 146 (14-16). The *Suda* seems to ignore the existence of a comet under that name. It simply defines πωγωνίας as ὁ μέγας πώγων (IV, 184).

49. Zonaras, *Epitome* XIV, 3, 138 (14-16). Speaking about the monophysite preferences of the emperor Anastasius I (491-518) Zonaras mentions that the addition of the words «who was crucified for us» to the Trisagion ordered by Anastasius had caused great disturbances and almost brought about the deposition of the emperor. The «heretic» Anastasius, Zonaras explains, sent his two ministers to the great church who, in front of the congregation, ascended the pulpit to announce the imperial decree. Anastasius' messengers are depicted as vile comic characters, almost clowns, uttering their pernicious doctrine. This is suggested by the Greek ὡς ἐπ' ἀκρίβαντος στάντες διαγγέλλειν ... In other words they turned the pulpit (ἄμβων), normally reserved for proper sermons, into a theatre's stage, from which the actors declaim their nonsense. What is interesting for our purpose here is that the lexicographer defines ἀκρίβας as ἄμβων, thus connecting the two senses exactly in the same way in which Zonaras connects them in his text. The *Suda* (III, 515) seems to ignore any reference to the pulpit in his definition of ἀκρίβας.

φροντίζων ὅτι δημοκατάρατος ἦν ...⁵⁰. The Lexicon contains the entry τιμιουλκῶν (1733) which is defined as: τιμιουλκῶν τὸν σῖτον, ἀντὶ τοῦ βαρυτιμῶν. Now the *Suda* in its definition of the same entry (IV, 556) provides all the necessary wording employed by our compiler yet, interestingly, the *Suda* adds the phrase ὁ τιμιουλκῶν σῖτον δημοκατάρατος (ἐστὶ) which includes the word «cursed by the people» (δημοκατάρατος) found in Zonaras' text. The least this means is that Zonaras had opened up his lexicon, whether that of the *Suda* or the compiler's.

(b). Elsewhere Zonaras quoting the words of the emperor Leo VI (886-912) to one of his generals, Constantine, writes: «σὺ δὲ εἰ μὲν ἦν ἔλαχες σπάρταν κοσμεῖς, ἔσται σοι εὖ· εἰ δὲ νεωτερίσεις καὶ τυραννίδι ἐπιχειρήσεις, ... ἡ κεφαλὴ σου τοῦ λοιποῦ σώματος χωρὶς εἰσαχθήσεται»⁵¹. The *Suda* simply mentions an entry σπάρτα (IV, 416) which it defines as σχοινία, but our lexicographer is more elucidating: Under σπαρτίον (1663) we read: τὸ σχοινίον. καὶ κλῆρος. καὶ στέργει σπάρτα, ἥπερ ἔλαχε. Tittmann (op.cit., 1663) thinks that we should replace σπάρτα with Σπάρτην, i.e. the city Sparta. He calls attention to expressions like Σπάρταν ἔλαχες, ταύταν κόσμει found in Cicero (*ad Attic.*, IV, 6, 163) and argues that *sine dubio* the compiler has made an error. However, there is little doubt that both Zonaras and the compiler refer not to the city of Sparta or any expression alluding to it⁵², but to a phrase which had probably developed as a proverb, namely σπάρταν λαγχάνειν meaning to be given a lot, a share etc., (κλῆρος) which one could honour (στέργειν, κοσμεῖν) or dishonour! Thus Zonaras' phrase makes perfectly good sense in the light of what we read in the Lexicon and vice-versa.

(c). Speaking of the great wrong which the emperor Romanus I Lecapenus (920-944) did to emperor Constantine VII, Zonaras succinctly ob-

50. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVI, 28, 514 (1-3). «And a severe famine occurred which Nicephorus exploited to his own advantage, by overpricing the corn and selling it dearly to those starving, not considering that he was accursed by the people».

51. Here we adopt the lectio σπάρταν found in Dindorf's edition (XVI, 20, 65): «If in the meantime you content yourself with your lot, you will be fine; but if you revolt and attempt a coup ... your head will be brought separated from the rest of your body».

52. See also *ad Attic.* I, 20, 3: The origin of this phrase is an anapaestic dimeter verse surviving among the fragments of the *Telephus* of Euripides, in which Agamemnon urges his brother Menelaus to confine his attention to his own province: The words are Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, χείνην κόσμει. Cicero quotes this saying in the form in which we find it in *ad Attic.* IV, 6. It is possible then that this phrase developed into a proverb during Byzantine times meaning, basically, the same thing but introducing σπάρτα(ν) instead of Σπάρταν which now would refer to the word lot, not the city of Sparta. Zonaras and the lexicographer seemingly draw on the same tradition which is different from that of Euripides or Cicero, but not necessarily erroneous!

serves that although Divine Providence allows wrongdoers some time to show repentance, she nevertheless follows them slowly in their footsteps and finally makes them pay: *κἂν βραδύτερον ἴσως μέτεισι τοὺς ἀδικούντας ἢ πρόνοια, μετανοίας αὐτοῖς ἐπιμετροῦσα καιρόν, ἀλλά γε τοῦ κακοῦ μὴ ἀπεχομένους μέτεισι σχολαίῳ ποδί καὶ δίκας εἰσπράττεται*⁵³. The phrase *μέτεισι σχολαίῳ ποδί* cannot be found in the *Suda* or any other lexicon but is used as a quotation in the definition of *σχολαίῳ* in our *Lexicon* (1699): ἀργῶ. *σχολαίῳ ποδί*. The phrase is rare (Tittmann notes a similarity with *σχολαίῳ βαδίσματι* found in Synesius, *Ep.* 104) and can, therefore, have some significance for our investigation.

(d). In an interesting passage on the last illness of the emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118) Zonaras narrates how the emperor had to be transferred to the palace of Mangana (τὰ τῶν Μαγγάνων ἀνάκτορα) where he underwent a series of treatments which, however, proved unsuccessful. Zonaras mentions a saying namely «ἐν ἀχεσώδυνοις πεσεῖται» which was said to have been written concerning Alexius by those who laboured over these matters. «They explained and named the Mangana residence as «pain relief» (ἀχεσώδυνα) because of the medical centre that was there, as providing relief for aches»⁵⁴. Now the word ἀχεσώδυνος is, usually, taken as an adjective meaning «allaying pain». This is certainly the case with ἀχεσώδυνα in Zonaras' text which should qualify the noun κατοικίαν. If we accept this interpretation, then the phrase ἐν ἀχεσώδυνοις πεσεῖται which, according to Zonaras, had formed an old prophecy concerning Alexius, should mean «he will succumb to pain-relief. This is supported by the standard definition of ἀχεσώδυνος found in all lexica⁵⁵. Yet once again our *Lexicon* surprises us with a totally new meaning for the word. Ἀχεσώδυνος (99) we read means (as a masculine noun this time) ὁ ἰατρός, ὁ θεραπευτής. In this sense the phrase in question should mean «he will succumb at the hands of the doctors». This is an interpretation which is in agreement with the rather negative picture of the doctors and their unsuccessful therapies drawn by Zonaras in his narrative. What the chronographer seems to be hinting is that the old saying about Alexius, namely that he will become the «victim» of doctors, had eventually come true⁵⁶.

53. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVI, 20, 480 (7-10).

54. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVIII, 28, 759 (11-15). Τὸ γὰρ ἐν ἀχεσώδυνοις πεσεῖται περὶ ἐκείνου γεγράφθαι λέγοντες οἱ περὶ ταῦτα ἐπισημνομένοι ἀχεσώδυνα τὴν τῶν Μαγγάνων κατοικίαν ἐξηγοῦντό τε καὶ ὠνόμαζον διὰ τὸ ἰατρεῖον τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἄκας ταῖς περιωδυνίας περιποιούμενον.

55. The *Suda* (I, 80) mentions ἀχεσώδυνον (the neuter of the adjective) meaning θεραπευτικὸν τῶν ὀδυνῶν. In other words it gives the standard definition for the word.

56. If one would want to go even further one might argue that Zonaras, who is ever fond

Unfortunately in the oracles attributed to the emperor Leo VI which reflected a popular anticipation of the last things to happen in Byzantium, one cannot find any reference to Alexius' illness and so our argument cannot be further reinforced⁵⁷.

(e). Finally, in a description of Rome's last Macedonian war, Zonaras narrates how Aemilius Paulus managed to overcome all natural obstacles and eventually find access to Perseus' entrenched camp and defeat him. He dug through the sandy foothills of Mount Olympus whereby he provided against water shortage and thus saved his army. The text reads as follows⁵⁸: *διαμησάμενος γὰρ (ὁ Αἰμίλιος Παῦλος) τὴν ἐν τῇ ὑπωρεΐα τοῦ Ὀλύμπου ἄμμον ὕδωρ εὔρε δαψιλές τε καὶ πότιμον*. The lexicographer defines *διαμησάμενος* (531) as *διορύξας· διαμησάμενος πᾶσαν τὴν τοῦ Ὀλύμπου ἄμμον*. Now Thucydides (IV, 26) uses a similar phrase to describe a situation when soldiers had to dig through a pebbly surface to find water (*διαμώμενοι τὸν κάχληχα οἱ πλείστοι ... ἔπινον ... ὕδωρ*). Polybius also uses the participle *διαμησάμενος* in connection with Hannibal's attempt to dig through a snow-covered mountainside (*διαμησάμενος τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῷ χιόνα, ... ἐξωκοδόμει τὸν κρημνόν ...*). But more interestingly in *Suda's* definition of *διαμησάμενος* (II, 66) we read: *διορύξας· διαμησάμενος γὰρ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπὸ τὰ κράσπεδα τοῦ Ὀλύμπου ἄμμον ὕδωρ πολὺ καὶ πότιμον εὔρεν ...* One can see at a glance that Zonaras has carefully modified the wording of the *Suda* and adapted it into his own narrative. He has kept *διαμησάμενος, τὴν τοῦ Ὀλύμπου ἄμμον* and *πότιμον ὕδωρ* unchanged whereas he has modified *Suda's* *κράσπεδα τοῦ ὑπωρεΐα* and *πολύ* to *δαψιλές* all of which are exact or near synonyms. Naturally it might be argued that Cassius Dio is probably Zonaras' historical source here, and if so, both the *Suda* and Zonaras can be independently following him. This poses the problem of whether in cases when the *Epitome*, the *Suda* and a third source (e.g. Dio Cassius) provide more or less identical information, Zonaras the historian drew on the *Suda* rather than his other source. Thus, did Zonaras overlook Dio Cassius' des-

of wordplay, was actually suggesting a double meaning for the name of the palace where Alexius was hospitalised. Ἡ τῶν Μαγγάνων κατοικία could perhaps, be taken as meaning much more than a place-name. Words like *μαγνεύειν, μαγεύειν, μαγγανεύειν* were of interrelated meaning and the notion of *ἰατρὸς φαρμακείων*, Zonaras, *Epitome* X, 7, 317 (15), can be found in the Lexicon, too, e.g. *φαρμάξας* (1799) = *ιατρεύσας ... ἀπατήσας, γοητεύσας*. Compare also Zonaras, *Epitome* XVI, 11, 437 (6-7). Ὁ δὲ Λέων ... τῷ Σανταβαρηνῶ οὐκ ἠρέσκετο, ἀλλὰ φαρμακὸν ἀπεκάλει καὶ γόητα καὶ ἀπατῶντα ... and the Lexicon: *γόης* (446) = *ὁ πλάνης, ὁ ἀπατεῶν, ὁ φαρμακός, ὁ μάγος*. Doctors and magicians were, sometimes purposely, confused by those not in the profession as both parties would equally claim expertise in healing.

57. See *Imperatoris Leonis Oracula* in *P.G.* 107, 1130-67.

58. Zonaras, *Epitome* IX, 23, 271 (15-16).

cription of a Roman triumph used by Tzetzes⁵⁹ and, instead, follow that of the *Suda*? The answer is not always easy, but it is possible that Zonaras had consulted both and did not neglect the *Suda*.

Suda (II, 729)

- (a) πρῶτον, πρὶν ἐπινοηθῆναι τὰ προσωπεῖα, συκῆς φύλλοις ἐκάλυπτον πάντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν πρόσωπα καὶ δι' ἰάμβων ἔσκαυον.
 (b) καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται μιμούμενοι τοὺς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, τὰ ἑαυτῶν πρόσωπα φύλλοις συκῆς ἐν τῷ σκώπτειν καλύπτοντες σκώματα εἰς τοὺς θριαμβεύοντας ἔλεγον.

Zonaras' *Epitome*⁶⁰

- πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ τὰ προσωπεῖα ἐπινοηθῆναι τοῖς σκηνικοῖς συκῆς φύλλοις τὰ ἑαυτῶν καλύπτοντες πρόσωπα δι' ἰάμβων ἐποιοῦντο τὰ σκώματα.
 καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐπινικίαις πομπαῖς φύλλα συκῆς ταῖς ἑαυτῶν ἐπάγοντες ὄψεσιν εἰς τοὺς τὰς πομπὰς ποιοῦντας ἀπέσκαυον.

Our Lexicon under θριάμβος (1052) reads: ἡ ἐπίδειξις, ἡ πομπή, καὶ τὸ σεμνύνεσθαι ἐν τισὶ πόλεσιν ἐπὶ νίκη πολέμου. These words summarize Zonaras' definition [op.cit., 619 (3-4)] which reads: κἀντεῦθεν ὀνομασθῆναι νομίζεται θριάμβους τὰς ἐπινικίους πομπάς. What does this all amount to? In principle we will agree that the evidence we have been able to collect naturally does not prove that Zonaras and the lexicographer were the same person. For that, in addition to other proof, we would need to establish a substantial number of lengthy quotations from Zonaras' *Epitome* in the Lexicon and, as we have stated at the beginning of this article, facts do not point in this direction. Instead, we have seen how the lexicographer has included in his work some rare vocabulary, peculiar phrases and expressions, proverbs and etymologies which can be found in Zonaras' historical composition and which, occasionally at least, constitute a unique body of common reference in both writers.

What we hopefully *have* managed to demonstrate, on a selective basis, is that the historian Zonaras seems to have been interested in lexicography as he repeatedly used the lexicon of the *Suda* as a useful and approved source of information and as a practical reference book which he must have consulted at times whenever he was in need of a special word explanation, a linguistic elaboration or some interesting piece of information concerning Byzantium's Roman past⁶¹. We would argue that there certainly exists a

59. *Epistulae* 141-2.

60. Zonaras, *Epitome* XII, 32, 618-9.

61. Zonaras' text is abundant with «linguistic borrowings» from the *Suda*. Compare the proverb ἡ δὲ ξυρὸς ἦν εἰς ἀκόνην. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVI, 1, 382 (16) and *Suda*'s (III, 503) ξυρὸν εἰς ἀκόνην. Also τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ὑπόγειον λόγισαι Zonaras, *Epitome* XVI, 2, 387 (9) and *Suda*'s (IV, 668) ὑπόγειον ... εἰς αἰσχύνην τοῦ δεδρακότος. Also οἱ δὲ (φρουροὶ) ... τοῦ ἀκράτου σπάσαντες ἀκρατέστερον ἐλήθησαν ὑπὸ βαρεῖ Zonaras, *Epitome* XIII, 5, 30 (10-11) and *Suda*'s (IV, 416)

linguistic affiliation between Zonaras' history and the *Suda* and that if Zonaras knew the *Suda* very well, then he might be the «conduit» for the presence of some *Suda* material in the Lexicon. Coincidentally, the *Suda* is also the indispensable source of reference for our compiler. On the other hand, assuming that Zonaras was the composer of the Lexicon, would an avoidance of direct quotations from his history in connection with a systematic admission of definitions found in his commentary on canon-law make sense? In our view it would. If Zonaras would want to search for a specific terminology or word etymology the obvious place to look it up would be a lexicon or a treatise and not a history, even if it were his own!

But what if the Lexicon Tittmannianum had been composed outwith Zonaras' life time? What if, as some scholars suggested, it was the work of a writer who lived not a few but many years later, in the thirteenth century? K. Alpers is one of the more recent exponents of this theory, which relies on the information supposedly deducible from the entry *ἤλεκτρον* (986) in the Lexicon⁶². The definition reads: *χάλκωμα καθαρόν, ἢ ἀλλότυπον χρυσίου μεμιγμένον ὑέλω και λιθεία, οἷας ἦν κατασκευῆς ἢ τῆς ἁγίας Σοφίας τράπεζα ὁ πανεξάιρετος τοῦ Θεοῦ ναός ...* On the basis of just one word, the imperfect *ἦν*, those in favour of a later composition argue that since the compiler speaks of the altar of St. Sophia which was (and no longer is) made of *ἤλεκτρον* etc., this provides sufficient grounds for the hypothesis that the Lexicon was written after 1204 when Constantinople was sacked by the Franks and the altar destroyed. Yet there is no need to take this *ἦν* literally any more than we need to take the example which the lexicographer gives when he illustrates the grammatical use of the personal pronoun literally (*ἀντωνυμία* σσ. 185-6). We read there that the personal pronoun can replace proper names and common nouns, thus «instead of saying Nicephorus, one can say I». It is too far-fetched to argue with Alpers (*op.cit.*, 738) that, therefore, the compiler was called Nicephorus.

To return to the use of *ἦν* in connection with the altar of St. Sophia we would like to suggest that the verb in question refers to the time of its construction and «was made of» does not rule out the possibility that «it still is», exists. Indeed in a legendary account of the building of St. Sophia which can be ascribed to the ninth century, we read concerning the mate-

σπασάμενος ἀκράτου: οἴνου ἐκπιών, (I, 89) ἀκρατισαμένη: ἀκράτου σπάσσασα. Indeed compare the reference to Julius Caesar in both the *Suda* (III, 85) and Zonaras' *Epitome* X, 11, 331-2, where again the latter quotes from the *Suda* with only a slight alteration of his wording. The list can go on.

62. K. Alpers, under «Zonarae Lexicon» in *RE* II 10 A (1972) 736-7.

rials used in the amalgam of which the altar was made:⁶³ οἱ δὲ ἔφησαν αὐτῶ· εἰς χωνευτήριον ἐμβάλωμεν χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους καὶ παντοίους καὶ μαργαρίτας καὶ ζάμβυκας, χαλκόν, ἤλεκτρον, μόλυβδον, σίδηρον, κασσίτερον, ὕελον καὶ λοιπὴν πᾶσαν μεταλλικὴν ὕλην. καὶ τρίφαντες ἀμφότερα αὐτῶν εἰς ὄλμους καὶ δῆσαντες, ἐπὶ τὸ χωνευτήριον ἔχυσαν· καὶ ἀναμαζάμενον τὸ πῦρ ἀνέλαβον ταῦτα οἱ τεχνίται ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἔχυσαν εἰς τύπον καὶ ἐγένετο χυτὴ πάμμικτος ἢ ἀγία τράπεζα ἀτίμητος. We would like to think that the compiler drew his description of the altar from the above source. Gold, copper, amber, glass and various precious stones alike are mentioned as building materials of the altar in both texts and in the same context. If, then, there is no proof that the Lexicon must have been written after 1204 it could have been composed during Zonaras' lifetime depending on the dates within which his life fell. The Lexicon itself gives us no clue regarding dates or contemporaries⁶⁴, and the best way of establishing a *terminus scribendi* would be to labour over the attempt to trace idiomatic vocabulary which would characterize certain twelfth-century writers. This is, however, a major task, far exceeding the purpose and the size of this article. Of the twelfth-century writers we have managed to discover just two whose vocabulary can be more or less clearly identified in our Lexicon: Anna Comnena and John Tzetzes. Our study will be, therefore, restricted to the work of these two composers:

I. In the following pages we have listed a total of 130 words common in the *Alexiad's prooimion* as well as book I and the Lexicon. Naturally the list is merely indicative of the possibility that the lexicographer was familiar with Anna's history. Not all of these words bear the stamp of her style and some, like ἐρεβοδιφῶντες or ἐρεβοδιφῶσι (872), occur also in Theophylact Simocatta's history: we know that Anna had read Theophylact and, consequently, must have enriched her vocabulary through her reading. Moreover in all likelihood Zonaras, too, had owned or borrowed his own copy of the *Alexiad* and read it. Otherwise it would be hard to explain the praise he sings concerning Anna's accomplished Attic style: he must have admired her, and her compositional skills attract about the longest favour-

63. *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger, vol. 1, Leipzig 1989, 95.

64. Occasionally we find an interesting reference to contemporaries e.g. under σκῶρ (1656) we read: τὸ κόπρον. τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφιστῶν ὁ ἐνδοξότατος ἐν τινὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ γέγραφε τὸ σκάτος, ἀγνοήσας, ὅτι ὀρθῆ πτώσις ἐστὶ τὸ σκῶρ, αἱ δὲ πλάγια τοῦ σκατὸς καὶ τῶ σκατὶ ... There can be no certainty as to who this «most famous professor of our times» could be. The topic, however, must have been a popular controversy among grammarians. Compare what Tzetzes says (IV, 1, 87) concerning the use of σκῶρ when he aims at the *Suda*: σκῶρ ἢ κόπρος· τινὲς λέγουσιν (i.e. the *Suda* IV, 388) ἐτερόκλητόν ἐστι· σκῶρ γὰρ ἡ εὐθεία, κλίνεται δὲ σκατὸς. ἡμεῖς δὲ (i.e. Tzetzes) σκῶρ, σκωρὸς κλίνομεν.

able comment in the *Epitome*⁶⁵: τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἀντείχετο καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν εἶχεν ἀκριβῶς ἀττικίζουσιν καὶ τὸν νοῦν πρὸς ὕψος θεωρημάτων ὀξύτατον. ταῦτα δ' αὐτῇ προσεγένετο φύσεως ὀξύτητι καὶ σπουδῇ. προσετετέθει γὰρ τοῖς βίβλοις καὶ λογιῶσι ἀνδράσι καὶ οὐ παρέργως ὠμίλει αὐτοῖς ... If Zonaras were the author of the Lexicon this affection towards Anna's vocabulary which the latter displays would indeed make sense. Below is the list of words shared by Anna and the compiler:

<i>Alexiad</i>	Lexicon Tittmannianum
ἀκάθεκτα, ἀκάθεκτον <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἀκάθεκτος 102
ἀκρολοφίας 38	ἀκρολοφία 106
ἀλαζονείας 48	ἀλαζονεία 124
ἀλαλαγμοῖς 33	ἀλαλαγμός 117
ἀλέας 41	ἀλέα 124, 125
ἀμελετήτως <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἀμελέτητος 153
ἀναλεξαμένη <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἀναλεξάμενος 201
ἀναχαιτίζεσθαι 47	ἀναχαιτίζειν 208
ἀνδραγαθιμάτων 9-10	ἀνδραγαθία 184
ἀνερρίπιζε 43,	ἀναρριπίζειν 206
ἀνερριπίσθη 50	ἀνερριπίσθη 222
ἀντικαταστῆναι 15	ἀντικαθίστασθαι 218
ἄντικρυς <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἄντικρυς 226
ἀξιάγαστα 9	ἀξιάγαστος 227
ἀξιάγαστος 10	ἀξιάγαστος 227
ἀπαίσιον 9	ἀπαίσιον 252
ἀποκαραδοκήσωσι 15	ἀποκαραδοκῶν 242, 263
ἀπολεγόμενος 27	ἀπολεγόμενος 265
ἀπονοίας 55	ἀπόνοια 241, 244
ἀπορροή 43	ἀπορροή 247
ἀποχρώσας 15	ἀποχρῶσα 274
ἀργαλέον 13	ἀργαλέος 286
ἀσυμφανῶς 31	ἀσυμφανῶς 328
αὐγή 20	αὐγή 343
αὐτόχρημα 20	αὐτοχρῆμα 349
ἀφαιροτέρας 38	ἀφαιρῶς 350
ἀφηγήσασθαι <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἀφηγεῖσθαι 358
ἀφορήτοις 13	ἀφόρητον 356
ἄωρον 52	ἄωρος 367
βαρύς 10	βαρύς 371
βρούχος 53	βροῦχος 401

65. Zonaras, *Epitome* XVIII, 26, 754 (11-16). This is noteworthy since Zonaras is, usually, extremely laconic in his approval of other peoples' literacy. With, perhaps, the exception of Constantine I [XIII, 4, 25 (12-16)] who, besides, was a saint-emperor for the Byzantines, the rest receive a two word remark like λόγοις ὠμίλει [XII, 10, 556 (8-9)] etc., and nothing more.

βυθόν <i>προοιμ.</i>	βυθός 411
δαδουχομένου <i>προοιμ.</i>	δαδουχεῖ 471
διΐθυνε 17	διΐθύνων 552
διωλύγιον <i>προοιμ.</i>	διωλύγιον 526
δορύκτητον 27	δορύκτητον 564
ἐγκώμιον <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐγκώμιον 604
ἔδνον 39	ἔδνα 614
ἐκασταχοῦ 25	ἐκασταχῆ 680
ἐκποδών 12	ἐκποδών 681
ἐμβριθεία 17	ἐμβρίθεια 700
ἐμπίπλαμαι <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐμπιπλάται 709
ἐνεφοροῦντο 14	ἐμφοροῦμαι 711
ἐνθυμήμασι 31	ἐνθύμημα 736
ἐξαπορούμενος 11	ἐξαπορηθῆναι 766
ἔξεδρον 34	ἔξεδρον 759
ἔξήνιον 60	ἔξήνιοι 756
ἐξορχεῖσθαι <i>προοιμ.</i> , -μενος	ἐξορχησάμενος 783
ἐπειλημμένος <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐπειλημμένη 833
ἐπικαλύματα 15	ἐπικάλυμα 814
ἐπίνειον 53	ἐπίνειον 812
ἐπιρρώσας 14	ἐπιρρωννύς 841
ἐπισχήπτει 45	ἐπισχήπτει 844
ἐπιστροφάδην 26	ἐπιστροφάδην 856
ἐπιτηδευμάτων <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐπιτήδευμα 816
ἐπιτρεχούσης <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐπιτρέχειν 848
ἐπωμίδα 17	ἐπωμῖς 807
ἐρεβοδιφῶν 32	ἐρεβοδιφῶντες 872, ἐρεβοδιφῶσι 872
ἐρείδει 25	ἐρείδειν 878
ἔρυμα <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἔρυμα 871
ἐσχετλίαζε 55	σχετλιάζει 1702
εὐψυχότερους 22	εὐψυχος 905
ἐφελκυσάμενος <i>προοιμ.</i>	ἐφελκηστής 926
ἐφέστριδι 23	ἐφεστρίδες 929, 930
ἐωνημένον 12	ἐωνημένων 947
θάμβος 20	θάμβος 1023
θητικόν 22	θητικὸν πλῆθος 1043
θούριδος 21	θούριδος 1049
θυραίας <i>προοιμ.</i>	θυραῖος 1060
καθάπτεσθαι <i>προοιμ.</i>	καθαπτόμενος 1164
καινοτομούμενον 16	καινοτομοῦνται 1176
κατηφές 10	κατηφής 1144, 1148
κενεμβατοῦσα 26	κενεμβατεῖ 1196
κλισίας 31	κλισία 1219
κλωπετεῦειν 19	κλωπετεῦω 1222
κομιδῆ 14	κομιδῆ 1248
κουλεοῦ 25	κουλεός 1230

χυλινδούμενος 33	χυλινδούμενος 1271
λήξεως 18	λήξεως 1304
λήρος 51	λήρος 1302
μηχανήμασιν 11	μηχάνημα 1359
μορμολυττομένους 46	μορμολύττει 1373
νεήλυδας 24	νήλυς 1388
νήδυμος 27	νήδυμος 1396
νουνεχής 58	νουνεχής 1405
οδίταις 38	οδίτης 1425
οφέλος 9	οφέλος 1489
Παλαμήδειον 15	Παλαμήδειον (ἔπος) 1511
παλίμβολα 60	παλίμβολος 1497
παλινδρομεῖν 12	παλινδρομεῖν 1516
παπταίνειν 40	παπταίνων 1524
παραμείβοντες 18	παραμείφας 1519
παραμυθησαίμην προοιμ.	παραμυθοῦμαι 1523
πάρδαλις 26	πάρδαλις 1509
πεπάλακτο 50	πεπαλάσθαι 1539
ποδήρη 17	ποδήρης 1559
ποικίλον 45	ποικίλος 1559
πρανοῦς 41	πρανοῦς 1571
πυκάσασα προοιμ.	πυκάζω 1599
προεδρίας 47	προεδρία 1578
πτάρθους 41	πτάρθος 1590
συνερράγησαν 50	συνερράγησαν 1692
σφηκιάι 25	σφηκία 1696
τολμητίας 25	τολμητίας 1736
τριχθά 33	τριχθά 1753
τρυτάνης 19	τρυτάνη 1748
ύπηνήτης 11	ύπηνήτη 1768
φορτίδες 53	φορτίς 1819
φωρᾶσαι 11	φωραθῶσιν 1838
χαυλιόδοντα 29	χαυλιόδους 1841

The above list is, naturally, drawn from a very limited section of text and our argument for a trace of the *Alexiad's* vocabulary in the Lexicon, which could bring the compiler closer to Zonaras, is perhaps weakened by an objection: in the overlapping part of their histories Anna and Zonaras in a number of cases offer a different account or information regarding the same events. However, this objection can be met if we consider the remarkably greater number of occasions when they agree and if we accept the idea that reading and esteeming someone's work, especially on stylistic grounds, does not at all times exclude a possibility of divergent presentation of events. Although contemporary composers do not always *have* to know each other or each others' writings it would seem odd that Zonaras

could have been aware of Anna's prose, have formed such a strong and positive view about her style and still not have read her book.

II. We are seemingly more fortunate in our attempt to pinpoint certain vocabulary, use of phrases and definitions which are employed by our second twelfth-century writer, John Tzetzes, and which also occur in the Lexicon. To begin with, Tzetzes is clearly mentioned as one of the compiler's grammatical sources. Under *ιός* (1078) we read: τὸ φάρμακον. ἐκ τοῦ ἰάω ἰῶ, τὸ θεραπεύω. ἰός δὲ τὸ βέλος δασύνεται, ἐκ τοῦ ἴημι, τὸ πέμπω. οὕτως εὔρον παρὰ τῷ Τζέτζη. This entry has shocked some scholars who argued that since Tzetzes lived later than Zonaras, the quotation in question must have been a later interpolation (Tittmann, op.cit, 1078). At any rate it appears strange that the lexicographer should draw information from a source of dubious reliability such as Tzetzes⁶⁶. Yet whether the former acknowledged Tzetzes as a credible source or not⁶⁷, the fact is that he used his writings, especially his commentary on Aristophanes, more than once as the following table shows:

Lexicon Tittmannianum	<i>Tzetzes' scholia on Aristophanes</i>
(a) ἀβέλτερος (4) = ἀνόητος, ... τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ βέλτερος. ὡσπερ γὰρ παρὰ τὸ φέρω, φέρτερος, οὕτω παρὰ τὸ βάλλω βέλτερος καὶ στερήσει του α, ἀβέλτερος	βέλτερος = ἀπὸ τοῦ βάλλω, ἀβέλτερος δὲ ὁ μωρός ⁶⁸ .
(b) σισύρα (1645) = ἡ γοῦνα σισύρα (1645) = τὸ ἄτριχον ἱμάτιον.	σισύρα = ... μαλλωτὰ ἐπιβλήματα σισύρα = δέρμα ἄτριχον ... φορούμενον ὡς ἱμάτιον ⁶⁹ .
(c) ἐσπέρα (879) = ἡλίου στήρησις ἢ πέρας τῆς ἡμέρας· ἕως γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα.	τὴν ἐσπέραν δάσυνε· πέρας γὰρ τῆς ἕως καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστίν ⁷⁰ .
(d) ἀλαζών (117) = ὁ ἀπατεῶν, ἡ κομπαστής· παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἄλλῃ καὶ πλάνῃ ζῆν	ἀλαζών. ἄλλῃ καὶ πλάνῃ ζῶν ⁷¹ .
...	
(e) ὀρχήσασθαι (1471) = τρία δὲ εἰσὶν εἶδη τῆς ὀρχήσεως· πυρρίχη, ... σίκιννις,	τρία εἶδη ὀρχήσεων, ἐμμέλεια τραγική, σίκιννις σατυρική, ἡ κόρδαξ δὲ κωμική

66. For some, at least, of his contemporaries Tzetzes was untrustworthy. Compare what he himself writes as a complaint for this contempt (IV, I, 73): οὕτω τεχνικῶς εἰσι πάντα τὰ πάλαι γεγραμμένα καὶ πρὸς κανόνων ἀκρίβειαν ... καὶ ὁ Τζέτζης ἐστύγεται· ὅθε πρὸς ἀχαρίστους καὶ ἀδαήμονας λέγειν κανόνας ἐπιστημῶν καὶ τεχνῶν λογικῶν παρεάσει· ἔστωσαν δὲ καὶ ἡγεῖσθωσαν τούτοις πάντα ταυτόν ...

67. In the case of *ιός* the phrase οὕτως εὔρον suggests that the writer is at some remove from the actual quotation in the sense that he is merely reporting Tzetzes' etymology.

68. Tzetzes (III, 987). The *Suda* (I, 5) offers no etymology for ἀβέλτερος.

69. Tzetzes (II, 378). The *Suda* does not have these entries.

70. Tzetzes (IV, 2, 426). The *Suda* does not have the entry.

71. Tzetzes (IV, 2, 489). The *Suda* has a similar definition for ἀλαζών (I, 97) = παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἄλλῃ ζῆν. It omits however the word πλάνῃ found in Tzetzes. Besides, the *Suda* continues with

- ... και ὁ καρδιακισμός, αἰσχροῦ τις ὢν και μᾶλλον κωμικοῖς ἀρμόδιος.
- (f) *θυεῖαν* (1061) = ἔγδην
- (g) *κιχηλάς* (1209) = ὁ κίχλας, πλεονασμῶ τοῦ η. κρεάτων ὀρνίθιασι κιχηλῶν.
- (h) *νηπύτιος* (1397) = ἄφρων, ἀνόητος. παρὰ τὸ νη στερητικὸν και τὸ πιτυτὸν γέγονε νηπινύτιος, και συγκοπῆ τοῦ ι και τοῦ ν νηπύτιος.
- (i) *ἀδολεσχῆσαι* (48) = τέσσαρα σημαίνει, τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν ... και τὸ παίζω, ... και τὸ ὀλιγωρῶ, ... και τὸ φλυαρεῖν.
- (j) *Κῶς* (1276) = ἡ νῆσος. ἀπὸ Κῶς, θυγατρὸς Μέρπος και Ἐχεμείας. ἢ παρὰ τὸ κῶ, τὸ κοιμῶμαι. ἐξ οὗ και κῶδιον, τὸ τοῦ προβάτου δέρμα.
- (k) *βυρσοδέψης* (411) = σκυτοτόμος. παρὰ τὸ τὰς βύρσας δεψῆσαι, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀπαλύναι.
- (l) *ῥάβδω* (1604) = ... εἴρηται *ῥάβδος* παρὰ τὸ ῥάσσω, ἢ παρὰ τὸ ῥαπίζω, ἢ παρὰ τὸ ῥᾶον βαινειν.
- (m) *ἀνδράποδον* (190) = ὁ δοῦλος. εἴρηται και ὁ ποῦς ὁ ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου μέρους τῶ ὄλω· ὑπόκειται γὰρ τῶ δεσπότη ὁ οἰκέτης, καθάπερ ὁ ποῦς τῶ ἀνωτέρω και ὄλω σώματι.
- (n) *ἔμπουσα* (701) = φάντασμα δαιμονιωδὲς ὑπὸ Ἐκάτης πεμπόμενον, ἀλλά-
- ἢ αἰσχρῶς περιδινοῦσα τὴν ὀσφύν⁷².
- θυεῖα* δὲ κυρίως ἡ ἔγδη καλεῖται⁷³.
- κρέα* τε ὀρνίθια κιχηλῶν, ἀντὶ τοῦ κιχηλῶν⁷⁴.
- νηπύτιος* = ἄφρων, ἀνόητος, παρὰ τὸ νη στερητικὸν και τὸ πιτυτὸν γέγονε νηπινύτιος και συγκοπῆ τοῦ ἰῶτα και τοῦ ν νηπύτιος⁷⁵.
- ἀδολεσχία* σημαίνει δ' ἡ φιλοσοφία, ἡ ὀλιγωρία, ἡ φλυαρία και τὸ παίγιον⁷⁶.
- και ἡ νῆσος ... *Κῶς* ἐπεκλήθη. ἐκ τοῦ κῶς οὖν τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ πρόβατον κωίδιον τὸ δέρμα τοῦ προβάτου και κῶδιον λέγεται⁷⁷.
- βυρσοδεψεῖ* = δεψεῖ και μαλάττει και ἀπαλύνει και κατεργάζεται τὰς βύρσας ...⁷⁸.
- γίνεται δὲ ῥάβδος παρὰ τὸ ῥάπτω, τὸ ῥαπίζω, ῥάβδος ... ἐτυμολογεῖται δὲ και παρὰ τὸ ῥᾶον βαινειν ἐν τῇ ὁδῶ⁷⁹.
- ἀνδράποδον* δὲ εἴρηται ὁ ποῦς ἐν ἀδράσιν ἀπὸ ὑποκειμένου μέρους τῶ ὄλω· ὑπόκειται οὖν ὁ οἰκέτης τῶ δεσπότη, καθάπερ ὁ ποῦς τῶ ὄλω σώματι⁸⁰.
- οἱ δὲ (οἶονται εἶναι τὴν ἔμπουσαν) φάντασμα δαιμονιωδὲς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκάτης πεμ-

an alternative etymology which the lexicographer ignores, although when the latter is quoting from the *Suda* he does so faithfully.

72. Tzetzes (II, 511). The *Suda* (III, 566) recognizes two ὀρχήσεις and their names do not accord with those of the Lexicon or of Tzetzes.

73. Tzetzes (II, 543). The *Suda* (II, 733) defines *θυεῖα* as ἀγγεῖον. On the other hand the Lexicon continues with the *Suda*'s definition.

74. Tzetzes (IV, 2, 465). The *Suda* (III, 124) defines *κίχλα* as εἶδος ὀρνέου.

75. Tzetzes (IV, 2, 579). The *Suda* (III, 462) gives a completely different definition: *νήπιος* ... ἐστερημένος τοῦ πεπνύσθαι. This quotation from Tzetzes is important and has passed, so far, unnoticed by scholars!

76. Tzetzes (IV, 2, 687). The *Suda* (I, 52) gives a different definition.

77. Tzetzes (IV, 1, 52). The *Suda* (III, 169) has a similar definition.

78. Tzetzes (IV, 1, 52). The *Suda* (I, 501) has a similar definition but in different wording. Occasionally the lexicographer combines information from both Tzetzes and the *Suda* which he then adapts into a briefer formula. He would very seldom copy a source virtually unmodified.

79. Tzetzes (IV, 1, 77). The *Suda* does not have the entry.

80. Tzetzes (IV, 1, 126). This quotation has been noted by Tittmann and W. Koster in his edition of Tzetzes' *scholia* (op.cit., 322).

<p>σον μορφάς πολλές ...</p> <p>(ο) βαλαντιοτόμος (369) = ὁ κλέπτης, ὁ τὰ βαλάντια τέμνων.</p>	<p>πόμενον καὶ τὰς μορφάς ἐναλλάττον, ...⁸¹.</p> <p>βαλαντιοτόμοι εἰσὶν οἱ ... τέμνοντές τε καὶ ἀφαιρούμενοι ἔκ τινων τὰ νομισματοδόχα φασκώλια.</p> <p>and elsewhere:</p> <p>τοῖς βαλαντιοτόμοις = τοῖς κλέπτουσι τὰ βαλάντια⁸².</p>
--	---

From the above table it appears that our compiler has definitely used Tzetzes' commentary on Aristophanes and, therefore, Tzetzes as a source. Considering that Tzetzes composed his works, basically, during the second half of the century, this creates a problem as far as Zonaras' authorship is concerned. Was Zonaras alive at the time of Tzetzes' compositional activities to be able to quote from this source in his Lexicon? Unfortunately we lack any internal evidence from the *Epitome*. We know that he is writing after the death of Alexius I, but how much later? Now and then in his history we read about the «bad signs» of his times. We hear about the high taxation imposed by those in authority who «like thieves kill the sheep and suck them to the marrow»⁸³. High taxation had, of course, been a social hazard since the reign of Constantine IX, but it reached its peak during the reign of Manuel I (1143-1180) whose endless wars took a heavy toll on the empire⁸⁴. Elsewhere we learn about contemporary emperors insisting on «wearing barbaric clothing at all times» or using barbaric *insignia*⁸⁵ and about modern «*Kinginati*» who would be courtiers wearing long hair and frequenting the palace⁸⁶. There is underlying evidence, in our view, that this is a reference to Manuel's consistent patronizing of western customs and fashion in his court. Moreover, in a passage on the indecency of those who marry twice in his commentary on canon-law Zonaras observes bitterly that ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ πατριάρχης ὤφθη, καὶ μητροπολίται διάφοροι, συνεστιώμενοι δευτερογαμήσαντι βασιλεῖ⁸⁷. Again the obvious suspect is Manuel who took two wives as the last previous candidate would be

81. Tzetzes (IV, 3, 780). It appears that the lexicographer begins with Tzetzes' definition, but continues with other two etymologies which occur in the *Suda* (II, 263) and thus combines all three of them which for him is typical. Tittmann has noticed this quotation.

82. Tzetzes (IV, 3, 900-1). The *Suda* (I, 450) offers a similar definition.

83. Zonaras, *Epitome* XIII, 3, 15 (9-15); III, 7, 227 (22-25).

84. At the latest, Constantine IX, Constantine X, Michael VII and Botaneiates are also candidates.

85. Zonaras, *Epitome* X, 28, 394 (77-11).

86. Zonaras, *Epitome* VII, 17, 65 (1-4).

87. Canon 7 of Neocaesarea: *RP* III, 80.

Botaneiates⁸⁸. Finally in two of the «more recent» *codices*, according to Th. Büttner-Wobst, of Zonaras' *Epitome*⁸⁹ we find an additional clue concerning dates. Following a passage [*Epitome*, XVIII, 6, 672 (8-10)] on the construction of the church of St. Thecla which the emperor Isaac I Comnenus (1057-1059) had built in the palace, these two «interpolated» *codices* add the following words: *ναὸν δὲ πολλὴν κατηγοροῦντα τῆς ἐκείνου προαιρέσεως μικροπρέπειαν*⁹⁰. ὃν ὁ ἐκείνου καθελὼν ἐξανέψιος ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ ἀλεξίου υἱός, σφόδρα μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἀνεδομήσατο εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ... Büttner-Wobst argues that these are words added by some *viri docti Byzantini* who had reviewed Zonaras' history and here and there amended and adorned his narrative with a charitable remark which would flatter the Comnenian dynasty. But if Zonaras actually *did* write the above favourable comment on John's building activity then the date of the reconstruction of this church dedicated to Jesus, would make for a *terminus post quem* as far as the composition of the *Epitome* is concerned! All the above is, though, pretty conjectural as Zonaras obviously proved to have been faithful to his principles and to the statement he makes at the end of his history: «It has not been judged profitable for me or opportune to present the rest in writing». Alexius' I reign is as far as he can afford to remember and record.

Conclusion

Our investigation has come to its end and there is time to summarize a few concluding points: we have not managed to prove that Zonaras in fact was the compiler of the Lexicon Tittmannianum. Resemblance, it seems, does not provide sufficient proof of fatherhood, even for physical offspring, much less for products like wordbooks! Yet our contribution concentrates on the attempt to show that Zonaras *could* have been the compiler not only for reasons of writing aptitude but also for chronological ones. More specifically we have tried to demonstrate:

A. That the Lexicon need not have been written outwith Zonaras' lifetime and that the theory according to which it was composed later than 1204 is not valid. It is true that some of its entries bear the stamp of mid twelfth-century authors like Tzetzes, and possibly later authors too, but we have argued that, equally, on the basis of internal evidence, Zonaras

88. In this case the comment would have been written post 1161.

89. i.e. Codices B and C. See *app. crit.*, 10.

90. It is interesting that Choniates says of Manuel's palace buildings that they *φιλοκαλίαν* ... *κατηγοροῦσι* ...; cf. Choniates, *Chronice diegesis*, ed. J. A. van Dielen, 206 (48).

might be living as late as Manuel Comnenus' reign and, therefore, might have been active at the time of the above authors.

B. That the Lexicon's quotations from Zonaras' commentary on canon-law are far more substantial and extensive than either Tittmann or Ziegler have acknowledged. Moreover, a closer textual analysis of Zonaras' history has shown that not only can the Lexicon serve as an indispensable word-guide to the *Epitome*, in addition it shares with it a considerable number of rare words, phrases, proverbs and etymologies which do not occur elsewhere⁹¹. If a transliterated Latin terminology and a law-vocabulary mean anything, these, also, can be found in the Lexicon. More importantly, we have called attention to the fact that Zonaras had developed a strong interest in lexicography as his repeated quotations from the lexicon of the *Suda* sufficiently indicate. Zonaras besides being a historian was a grammarian, a supporter of orthodoxy and of antiquarian ideas and his writings abound in definitions and word derivations all of which are characteristics of the compiler.

C. Finally we have demonstrated that the Lexicon Tittmannianum is much more than what Hunger calls simply a «compilation», an «assortment» of words. It is the product of a serious and industrious effort to present a source of reference which combines a wealth of entries with brevity and comprehensiveness of expression and as such it deserves further study. It would be to our satisfaction if this article should point others in this direction.

Θεσσαλονίκη

IORDANES GREGORIADES

91. E.g. the inhabitants of Heracleia in Thrace are called Περίθιοι in Zonaras' history [XIII, 3, 19 (3)] and in the Lexicon (1531). All other sources (including Cassius Dio and the *Suda*) refer to them as Περίθιοι.