

ANNICK PAYNE

## *Hesychius' Lydian Glosses I*

**ABSTRACT:** The historical distance between Hesychius, whose life dates (approx. AD 500) are only a rough estimate, and the Lydian Empire amounts to over a millennium, and a similar distance separates his work from the oldest surviving manuscript at the Marciana Library in Venice. The Hesychian lexicon contains a number of glosses referring to the Lydians which have been particularly badly understood, and therefore have been subject to emendation throughout their reception history. This unpromising situation is slowly improving due to continued work on the Lydian language and surviving inscriptions. The present article addresses a selection of Lydian glosses preserved in the Marciana manuscript.

**KEYWORDS:** Hesychius, Lexicon, glosses, Lydian, Anatolia.

### 1. Introduction

The work entitled Ἡσυχίου γραμματικοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως συναγωγή πασῶν λέξεων κατὰ στοιχεῖον ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ἀπίωνος καὶ Ἡλιοδώρου was based mainly on an earlier lexicon by Diogenianus, a second century AD grammarian from Heraclea Pontia, as stated in the dedicatory letter to Eulogius. Hesychius' lexicon survives in a sole manuscript of 439 folios from the 15th century AD, conserved in the Libreria Marciana in Venice.<sup>1</sup> The mention of a second manuscript, thought to have existed in the Laurentian Library, Florence, is circumstantial. Alter (1796: 293) cites as evidence a handwritten note from the 1521 Hagenau edition, formerly the property of the historian and Greek scholar Peter Lambeck (1628–1680) from Hamburg.<sup>2</sup> According

\* The author would like to thank Ettore Cingano for help with access to the MS, Geraldina Rozzi for procuring additional pictures. Further thanks go to David Sasseville, Jorit Wintjes and Sabine Ziegler for discussion of ideas, and to the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

1. Marc.Gr.Z 622 (= Codex Venetus Graecus 851).

2. Sold by Lambeck to the Imperial Library at Vienna, today the Austrian National Library. I would like

to this note, Père D. Dupuy begged Heinsius to check an entry in the manuscript, said to be very ancient, at the Grand Duke's library in Florence. Alter dates this to the 17th century AD, thus Heinsius can be confidently identified with the Dutch Classicist Nikolaas Heinsius (1620–1682), who travelled to Italy in search of codices several times between the mid 1640's to early 1650's. He is known to have corresponded with the French Royal Librarian and prior Jacques Dupuy (1591–1656), who – despite a different initial – is the most likely candidate for the above-mentioned Père Dupuy. Lambeck was introduced to the intellectual circle of the Dupuy brothers Jacques and Pierre by his uncle, Lukas Holste (Feola 2016: 112), which suggests that Lambeck himself might have written the note to preserve some information provided by his friend Dupuy. Already Alter (*loc.cit.*) could not find any mention of the manuscript in the printed catalogues, so that its existence cannot be proven.

The Venice codex was a gift to the library by the learned mathematician Gian Giacomo Bardellone (1472–1527) in his testament (Speranzi 2014: 102). The manuscript preserves a corrupted version of Hesychius' lexicon, it is estimated that it contains as much as 30% of interpolated material from the so-called Glossary of Cyrillus.<sup>3</sup> The scribe of the codex remains anonymous, but can with certainty be placed in Constantinople, where he was active min. 1400–1430 AD (Speranzi 2014: 103; 129–130), i.e. during the period when the first humanists travelled east to learn Greek.<sup>4</sup> He had contact with two known copyists, Giorgio Crisococca and Anonymous EE (Speranzi 2014: 129). Comparative analysis of the manuscript's watermark suggests a date of ca. 1413–1437.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Text Editions

The manuscript was first edited by Marcus Musurus, a Cretan philologist (ca. 1475–1517), who wrote his comments with ink in the surviving manuscript, thus relegating the manuscript to the level of copy proofs. The *editio princeps* was printed in Venice in August 1514 (1520<sup>2</sup>, 1521<sup>3</sup>) by Aldo Manuzio. Musurus' corrections ranged from inspired to highly problematic, and his frequent mistaken readings make the Aldina edition highly unreliable. Following editions were based on the Aldina, notably the two volume edition of Johannes Alberti, printed in Leyden.<sup>6</sup> Between 1787 and 1791, Niels Iversen Schow, the founding father of papyrology, collated the manuscript in Venice.<sup>7</sup> His corrected version of Hesychius' lexicon was printed in Leipzig in 1792.

to thank M. Kiegler-Griensteidl (pers. comm., 14.1.2020) for the information that this note is no longer in the book and nothing is known of its fate at the Austrian National Library.

3. Alpers 2006: 115.

4. At least four further manuscripts by his hand have been identified, cf. Speranzi 2014: 103–104.

5. Speranzi 2014: 103.

6. Vol. 1: Alberti 1746; Vol. 2: Alberti – Ruhnken 1766.

7. Cf. Alpers 2006: 113.

His work, too, falls short, as it contains mistakes and fails to address instances where Musurus had deviated from the manuscript. The monumental, five volume edition by Moritz Schmidt (1856–1868), based on the Aldina and Schow's corrections, ignores new insight provided by comparative Indo-European linguistics, and uses a random sample of manuscripts of the Glossary of Cyrillus, to correct his Hesychius.<sup>8</sup> Within the project of a *Corpus Lexicographorum Graecorum*, based at the Danish Academy in Copenhagen under the auspices of Anders Björn Drachmann since 1911, Kurt Latte was signed up for a new edition in 1914, but World War I and, subsequently, other commitments meant serious delays. Between 1926–1928, Latte collated the manuscript in Venice. A further disruption was caused by the rise of the National Socialists in 1933, forcing Latte, who had a Jewish mother, into emeritus status at the end of 1935. Prohibited from work, access to books and foreign correspondence, Latte nonetheless continued his work, with the help of Bruno Snell in Hamburg. The bombing of Hamburg caused the loss of most of his work on Hesychius,<sup>9</sup> which he largely recreated from memory after the war. In 1953, vol. 1 (α–δ) was printed in Copenhagen. Vol. 2 (ε–ο) was largely complete when Latte died in 1964; it was completed by Kaj Barr and printed in 1966. In 1987, Peter Allan Hansen was won for the continuation of the edition, and he completed work on letters π–σ from 1988–2003, published as vol. 3 in 2005. Letter τ has been edited by Hansen and Ian C. Cunningham, who completed the edition (vol. 4: τ–ω; 2009). By 2009, the volumes edited by Latte were out of print, and full revisions of these volumes were commissioned. Cunningham collated the manuscript, recording all errors, and the new editions of volumes 1 and 2 were published, respectively, in 2018 and 2020. As revision led to an increase in size of over 20%, it was decided to publish vol. 2 in two parts (1. ε–ι; 2. κ–ο). An index volume is in planning.

### 3. Lydian Glosses from the Marciana Folio

In contrast to the Marciana scribe, who would certainly have known no Lydian, and Hesychius, for whom one might imagine the same, recent advances in the study of the smaller Anatolian languages offer a new vantage point of linguistic and cultural-historical knowledge from which to reconsider Hesychius' Lydian glosses. The glosses deemed to be Lydian were collected by Gusmani in his 'Lydisches Wörterbuch' (1964: 271–278),<sup>10</sup> in a list which further includes material from some other antique authors. This list contains only limited commentary, and as a rule no translation.

An initial visit to check a single Lydian gloss (κοαλδδεῖν) in the Marciana folio in 2016 brought the surprising result that the manuscript deviated from the known text

8. Alpers 2006: 114–115.

9. A copy of the prolegomena was kept by Snell, and a copy of vol. 1 of the manuscript survived in Copenhagen.

10. Based on earlier collections by Buckler 1924 and Deeters 1927.

editions but in light of current progress in our understanding of the Lydian language, the text of the manuscript, in fact, made more sense. A second visit in 2017 to check the remaining glosses has shown that many show some deviation from the modern text editions. For reasons of space, this article will present and discuss a selection of these glosses only, further glosses will be published subsequently.

### 3.1 βαθυμηῆσαι

At first glance, the Hesychian gloss βαθυμηῆσαι etc. appears deceptively simple and easy to understand. In fact, collation of the Hesychian manuscript at the Marciana Library in Venice shows the gloss as heavily emended and corrupt. The main manuscript text writes βαθυμηῆσαι· γένος ἐπὶ (λυδοῖς) [word encircled] with an omission sign % above. The superscript δοῖς shows partial ligature, the ι connected to the ο in a manner that both letters very much resemble a second δ; the σ hardly more than an upward stroke. In the left margin, at an angle, starting slightly below the line of the main text, % λυδία is added. Curiously, two lines below, in the right margin, one finds another, this time more horizontal addition, % παρὰ. There is no other obvious point of reference anywhere nearby than the single omission sign above λυδοῖς.

An integrated reading βαθυμηῆσαι· γένος ἐπὶ λυδοῖς παρὰ λυδία, ‘Bathymedes: a people amongst the Lydians near Lydia’ is unconvincing, both in content and with a view to the history of the manuscript. It is well-known that Marcus Musurus, when preparing his first print edition, used the folio as if galley proofs, adding comments all over the place. The additions in the margins are therefore likely to be later intrusions. Without having recourse to modern scientific methods to analyse the ink, the difference in colour alone strongly suggests that the two marginal notes were not written at the same time. The small number of letters used for each note means that only α occurs in both additions; it is of a similar formation – and different from the letters of the main manuscript text – yet in λυδία, it is narrower, and not for want of space. In conjunction with the different coloured ink, distinctly darker on the right margin, this may suggest two different hands. λυδοῖς of the main manuscript text, and the left marginal λυδία share the same beginning and may thus be directly compared. The formation of each letter differs: the longer stroke of λ show a stronger curve at the top in the marginal note; υ is plainer in the note, whereas the main text letter begins with a slight, outwards-facing hook; δ is distinctly different in both formations, the marginal letter has a smaller, more angular round at the bottom, and a longer, left-inclined neck, its connection to the following letter shows a more pronounced top-down in contrast to the left-right movement of the main text.

Schow (1792: 168) emended this gloss to γένος παρὰ λυδοῖς, and in this he is followed by Schmidt (1863: 285), Latte (1963: 306) and Cunningham (2018: 414); whereas Musurus’ 1921 third edition writes γένος ἐπὶ λυδοῖς (1521: 136), the variant also adopted by Lydian scholar Gusmani (1964: 272). The sense, with either preposition, seems unquestionably that the Bathymedes were a people amongst the Lydians. The word βαθυμηῆσαι is a hapax, the gloss our only context for what appears to be a forgotten people, whom one does not encounter anywhere else. The riddle of the Bathymedes

can only be approached via the etymology of the alleged ethnonym. One may, thus, analyse βαθυ-μῆδαι as an appositional compound meaning 'Lower Medes', i.e. the Medes of the Lower country or plain; the *a*-stem of μῆδαι instead of commonly attested Greek μῆδοι could have been influenced by the Old Persian *Māda-*, 'Mede', especially if, as will be suggested below, the word is a foreign loan into Greek.

Where should one seek these Lower Medes, and why would they be located in Lydian territory? Following Herodotus (1.72), the river Halys (modern Kızılırmak) is traditionally considered the boundary between Medes and Lydians, allegedly established after the famous battle of the solar eclipse predicted by Thales of Miletus,<sup>11</sup> for which the most commonly accepted date is 585 BC.<sup>12</sup> Yet doubt is cast on this Lydo-Median boundary by the very same passage, as its description of the relevant topography and, in particular, the course of the river is far from accurate. This is why Rollinger (2003: 305–313; 2008: 53) concludes that this river border is a literary construct. A further consideration, which might help solve the conundrum of Lower Medes in Lydian territory, concerns the shape of this boundary. Should one imagine it as a hard border, or rather a shared zone of interest claimed by either party, maybe even a buffer between more tightly controlled Lydian and Median areas? Median settlers in such a region could at the same time have been tributary to the Lydian king.<sup>13</sup> Further, it is likely that historical facts of different periods became conflated over time, and it is worth noting that any Lydo-Median boundary could only have had a brief lifespan of at most ca. 35 years, given that the Median Empire perished in 550 BC.

I would like to offer another, albeit hypothetical solution to this gloss which would altogether erase the 'Lower Medes' from the record, explaining their name as a mistaken late reference, not to an ethnonym but a toponym, namely a loan word for the region called over centuries the 'Lower Land'. The territory below the river Halys is known in Greek as Καππαδοκία, Old Persian *Katpaduka*. These names are a Bronze Age heritage of the toponym 'Lower land'.<sup>14</sup> Its Lydian equivalent is unknown, one might expect a close approximation to Luwian *\*kattapadda-*.

While the following remains highly speculative without further supporting evidence, I would like to offer a tentative scenario: one might imagine, that the term βαθυμῆδαι came into Greek as a part translation (Anatolian *katta*, 'lower' as Greek βαθύς<sup>15</sup>), part transposition (Anatolian *peda* as Greek μῆδα<sup>16</sup>); possibly because the

11. Cf. Hdt. 1.74; Plin. *HN* 2.53.

12. Cf. Payne – Wintjes 2016: 20.

13. For the Lydian custom of exerting tribute cf. Högemann – Oettinger 2018, esp. chapter 3.

14. The Hittite name is only preserved in the Sumerian-Akkadian spelling of KUR *ŠAPLITI*. This common practice in Hittite cuneiform of using Sumerian Logograms and Akkadographic spelling sadly means that for some Hittite words no phonetic spelling has been preserved. I follow Yakubovich's reconstruction of Luwian *\*kattapadda-*, syncopated *\*katpadda-*; suffixed in Old Persian, thus *\*katpad-uk-a-*; from which Greek Καππαδοκία (Yakubovich 2014: 350–51).

15. The anonymous reviewer suggests that *kata* would be a better translation; I should like to reply that the entire scenario rests on a lack of translation skills.

16. Even Luwian *padda-* may have been borrowed as *peda-* into Ionian Greek.

second element of the compound was no longer understood and could therefore not be translated; an attempt to analyze the term may therefore have led to a folk etymology, choosing phonetically close *μηδα* to achieve a meaningful term, which could have been reinterpreted as an ethnonym, possibly because the element *μηδα* had been falsely analysed as an ethnic term. The gloss under consideration could thus go back to an original explanation – possibly antedating Hesychius – of *Bathymeda* (< *katta peda*)<sup>17</sup> as *τόπος εν λυδίᾳ / ἐπὶ λυδοῖς*. With this speculation in mind, it seems almost ironic that Herodotus in the passage cited above states that the Cappadocians were formerly Median subjects (1.72).

### 3.2. βάκκαρις

Lydia was renowned, and sometimes mocked, for a luxurious lifestyle. Goods such as Lydian perfume were famous throughout the ancient world. Hesych explains *βάκκαρις* as follows: *βάκκαρις, μύρον ποιὸν ἀπὸ βοτάνης ὁμωνύμωξ<sup>ov</sup>. ἐνῖοι δὲ ἀπὸ μυρσίνης. ἄλλοι δὲ μύρον Λυδί<sup>ov</sup>. ἐστὶν δὲ καὶ ξηρὸν διάπασμα τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης, ‘Bakkaris, a certain perfume from the plant of the same name. Some (say) from myrtle, others (say) a Lydian perfume. There is also a dry (powder) for sprinkling from the root’*. The texts editions follow the manuscript entry for *bakkaris* closely, with the exception that they reject its superscript emendation *ὁμωνύμου* for the original *ὁμωνύμωξ*.<sup>18</sup>

*Bakkaris* (variant: *Bakcharis*) was known in antiquity as both a fragrant and pharmaceutical plant and it is not always easy to separate its two usages as perfume and medicine.<sup>19</sup> *Bakkaris* is already mentioned as a treatment for uterine problems by Hippocrates (ca. 460-370 BC), who recommends applying it as a salve on the hip bone, as an alternative to white Egyptian oil (*Περὶ γυναικείης φύσιος* 6; 25). The most extensive description of its healing powers comes from the pharmacological treatise *Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς* (*de materia magica*) by Pedanius Dioscurides, a Greek doctor from Cilicia (AD 40-90):

‘*Bakcharis* is a fragrant, coronal plant. Its leaves are rough, their height between violets and mulleins. The stalk is angular, the height of a cubit, a little rough, and has off-shoots. The full bloom is purple, a little white and fragrant. The roots are similar to those of the

17. Interestingly, there is evidence for a borrowing of the complementary term *sara peda*, ‘Upper Land’ into Mycaean Greek (PY Un 718); cf. Nikoloudis 2008: 52.

18. Cunningham (2018: 416) transcribes the two words corrected in the manuscript as *ὁμωνύμωξ* and *Λυδόν*.

19. Cf. also the Hesychian gloss *κυσσοβάκχαρις, ἥτοι τὸν κυσὸν μερίζων, ἢ τῷ κυσῷ μερίζόμενος*, ‘K. (vaginal *Bakcharis*), either anointing the vagina, or being anointed by vaginal fluids’. This has previously been interpreted as referring to perfuming the sexual organs; in view of the multiple use of *Bakkaris* to treat gynaecological issues, this passage should rather be understood as a description of medical treatment, either for uterine problems as per Hippocrates or for menstrual issues, post-partum care or to induce abortion as per Dioscurides.

black hellebore and have a cinnamon-like scent. It loves a rough and dry ground. Her roots, boiled in water, helps with spasms, fissures, falls, shortness of breath, a chronic cough, difficult micturition. It brings on menstruation, it is usefully given to those bitten by animals. Deposited, one of the tender roots draws the embryo. If it is boiled, it benefits women in childbed as a sitz bath, it is useful as a scented powder, as it has a becoming fragrance. The leaves are astringent; as a poultice it helps against headaches, inflamed eyes, a beginning goat-eye, breasts swollen from birth and against Erysipelas.<sup>20</sup> The scent also causes sleep.<sup>21</sup>

Pliny the Elder seems to draw on this source as he likewise mentions the cinnamon-like scent of the root and the plant's preference for dry, thin soils. He cites Aristophanes as an authority for the use of the plant root in salves. Bakkaris is to bear a strong resemblance to another plant, the bushwillow (*combretum*); he rejects the identification with the field nard (*nardum rusticum*), which is the surname of yet another plant, called Asaron (*asarum europaeum*).<sup>22</sup> Pliny's statement that only the root was fragrant disagrees with Dioscurides' description of fragrant blossoms and thus casts some doubt on whether both authors were, in fact, describing the same plant.

During his travels through the orient, 1573–1576, Leonhard Rauwolf (c. 1535–1596) discovered a plant on Mount Lebanon which he identified as the bakkaris described by Dioscurides (1583: 285). This plant is cudweed or *Gnaphalium sanguineum*, L. of the *Asteraceae* family, also classified as *Helichrysum sanguineum*, Boiss. The identification has been accepted by some but has also been doubted and alternatives proposed include *Digitalis purpurea* (foxglove), *Inula squarrosa* (ploughman's spikenard), *Asperula odorata* L. = *Galium odoratum* (sweet woodruff), *Geum urbanum* L. (colewort), *Salvia sclarea* (clary sage) and *Inula vaillantii*.<sup>23</sup>

20. A bacterial infection which causes a red skin rash.

21. Βάκχαρις βοτάνη ἐστὶν εὐώδης στεφανωματική· ἧς τὰ φύλλα τραχέα, μέγεθος ἔχοντα μεταξύ ἴου καὶ φλόμου· καυλὸς δὲ γωνιώδης, πήχεως τὸ ὕψος, ὑπότραχος, ἔχων παραφυάδας· ἄνθη δὲ ἐμπόρφουρα, ὑπόλευκα, εὐώδη· ῥίζαι δὲ ὅμοιαι ταῖς τοῦ μέλανος ἔλλεβόρου, εὐκουλία τῇ ὁσμῇ κινναμώμω· φύλῃ δὲ τραχέα χωρία καὶ ἄνικμα. Ταύτης ἡ ῥίζα ἐψηθεῖσα ἐν ὕδατι, βοηθεῖ σπᾶσμασι, ῥήγμασι, πτώμασι, δυσπνοίαις, βηχὶ χρονίᾳ, δυσουρίᾳ· ἄγει δὲ καὶ ἔμμηνα, καὶ θηριοδῆπτοις χρησίμως σὺν οἴνω δίδοται· προσεθεῖσα δὲ μία τῶν ἀπαλῶν ῥιζῶν, ἔλκει ἔμβρυα· ταῖς τε λεχοῖς εἰς ἐγκάθισμα τὸ ἀφέψημα αὐτῆς ἀρμόζει, καὶ εἰς διαπᾶσματα χρησιμεύει, ἰκανὴν ἔχουσα τὴν εὐωδίαν· τὰ δὲ φύλλα στυπτικά ὄντα, καταπλασσομένα ὠφελεῖ κεφαλαλγίας, ὀφθαλμῶν φλεγμονὴν, καὶ αἰγίλωπα ἀρχόμενον καὶ μαστοῦς ἐκ τόκων φλεγμαίνοντας καὶ ἐρυσσιπέλατα. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὑπνοποιὸς ἡ ὁσμῇ. (3.44)

22. Baccar quoque radice tantum odorata est, a quibusdam nardum rusticum appellatum. unguenta ex ea radice fieri solita apud antiquos Aristophanes, priscae comoediae poeta, testis est; unde quidam errore falso barbaricam eam appellabant. odor est cinnamomo proximus. gracili solo nec umido provenit. simillimum ei combretum appellatur, foliorum exilitate usque in fila adtenuata et procerius quam baccar. haec sutilia tantum. eorum quoque error corrigendus est, qui baccar rusticum nardum appellaver. est enim alia herba sic cognominata, quam Graeci asaron vocant, cuius speciem figuramque diximus in nardi generibus. quin immo asaron invenio vocitari, quoniam in coronas non addatur (Plin. *HN* 21.16.29–30).

23. Cf. Greenewalt 2010: 202; 212 n. 7; Bagordo 2014: 99.

Rauwolf 1583: plate to no. 258<sup>24</sup>

The plant *Baccharis* was not just used as a medicinal plant but also coveted for its fragrance. While the exact preparations for its cosmetic use are not known, ancient sources speak of people anointing themselves with *Baccharis*. This usage is discussed at length by Athenaeus (15.690–691), who quotes many ancient authors as authorities to illustrate its decorative use. The verb used for the application of *Baccharis* does not reveal its exact state, as *χρίω* is used for anointing with scented unguents or oil. Athenaeus raises the question whether *Baccharis* is to be separated from perfume (*μύρον*) because of references where *baccharis* is mentioned together with perfume,<sup>25</sup> or with perfume and scented oils.<sup>26</sup> Most likely, *Baccharis* is mentioned separately in these instances because it was the ‘perfume of perfumes’, so special, so famous, so expensive as to warrant mentioning by name. This would explain two passages cited for the use of *baccharis*, firstly a fragment of the Ephesian poet Hipponax (F107 Degani = F104 W) who states the following: βακκάρη δὲ τὰς ῥίνας ἤλειπον ... οἴηνπερ Κροῖσος, ‘I anointed my nostrils with *baccharis* like Croesus.’ A similar tone can be observed in a passage in Cephisodorus’ Trophonius (fr. 3) in which the request to buy *Baccharis* for someone’s feet leads to staggering disbelief; both passages mockingly allude to excessive luxury – while perfume was already expensive, *Baccharis* would have been reserved for the richest of the rich.

*Baccharis* may originally have been stored in small vessels including the so-called *Lydion*. The *Lydion*, a small container with a wide mouth and high neck, its round

24. Source: urn:nbn:de:bvb:355-ubr03392-0553-0 <24.1.2020>.

25. Aesch., *Amymone* (fr. 14); Arist., *Women Celebrating the Thesmophoria* (fr. 336).

26. Semon. fr. 16.1–2 West.



body ending in a narrow foot, was native to Lydia but also a popular export abroad (Rumpf 1920; Greenwalt 2010: 204–209). Such Lydia were found in great quantities at Sardis, in settled areas but especially amongst grave goods, and notably across different strata of society. The earliest examples originate from the tomb of Alyattes (Greenewalt 2010: 209). Sadly, an analysis of ceramic residues from Sardis indicated that organic breakdown products obscured identification of potential original uses. We are thus no closer to discovering the composition of bakkaris.<sup>27</sup>

The term βάκκαρις was presumably a Lydian loan word. S. Hawkins proposes to derive it from Lydian (*wc*)-*paqēn-*, ‘to trample on’; IE *\*peh<sub>2</sub>k-* (2013: 157) on the basis that this may refer to the grinding of the Bakkaris root to a powder. However, this is neither semantically nor phonologically convincing.<sup>28</sup> Thus, an alternative is suggested here: the Greek name could instead reflect an original Lydian *pakilliš*,<sup>29</sup> ‘belonging to Paki’, i.e. a descriptive name for the plant as sacred to Paki, the Lydian counterpart to Dionysus whose name also lives on in the Greek god’s cognomen Βάκχος. An association of bakkaris with Dionysus was already suggested by Wagler (1896: 2804) on the basis that Vergil mentions the plant together with ivy, a plant sacred to Dionysus: *hedera nascentem ornate poetam ... baccare frontem cingite* ‘decorate the rising poet with ivy ... wreath the forehead with Bakkaris’ (Ecl. 7.25; 27). One might speculate whether this association could have been due to one of the plant’s medical property: a cure against headaches would have been a welcome gift to the followers of Βάκχος. Furthermore, it may not be accidental that Bakkaris and ivy share some attributes, and their traditional medicinal use at least partly addresses similar complaints, headaches, coughs, spasms, animal bites, uterine problems, the promotion of menstruation and the induction of abortion.<sup>30</sup> This raises the question of whether the Vergilian quote attests a confluence of two originally separate associations, namely of Greek Dionysus with ivy and of Lydian Paki with Bakkaris. When, how, and to what extent reciprocal influences might have led to a merging of the two traditions, is unknowable without further textual evidence.

### 3.3. κοαλδδῆν

The gloss is recorded in the most recent text edition of Cunningham (2020: 627) as κοαλδδῆν, Λυδοί, τὸν βασιλέα, and like earlier editions, marked as a crux.

The entry remained mysterious until fairly recently, since the hapax κοαλδδῆν looked like the infinitive of an obscure verb, and thus did not result in a syntactically sensible entry. While the reading κοαλδδῆν dates back to the 1514 Aldina edition, in

27. I thank Peter Grave for this information (pers. comm., 8.1.2020).

28. Note that the etymology proposed by Hawkins is now superceded; the Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages (eDiAna) derives Lydian *paq-* from IE *\*pek<sup>h</sup>-* (Sasseville et al. 2020).

29. Whether a Greek would have heard Lydian *-k-* as a geminate, is uncertain; the change of Lyd. *-alli-* to Greek *-ari-* is unproblematic.

30. Cf. e.g. Hippocrates, Περὶ γυναικείης φύσιος 58; 66; 104; 105; Pliny, *HN* 47; Dioscurides 2.210.

my opinion, it is a mistaken reading for a ligature version of the diphthong *ei*.<sup>31</sup> Collation of the Marciana manuscript and comparisons of simple vowel and diphthong in the vicinity suggests one should instead read alpha, thus *κοαλδδᾶν*, *λυδοὶ τὸν βασιλέα*. Today, this word can indeed be explained: *κοαλδδᾶν* can be understood as the phonetic equation to a Lydian word stem *qaldān-*, a word with a varied history in the study of the Lydian language. It is attested in two spellings within the Lydian text corpus, in the middle Cayster valley (LW 62) with *a*-vocalization as *qaldān-*, elsewhere without as *qldān-* (LW 4b; LW 23; LW 43; LW 120). D. Sasseville points out that it must therefore be the middle Cayster variant that was borrowed into Greek.<sup>32</sup>

Because the name *Qldāns* occurs in several inscriptions together with Artemis,<sup>33</sup> it was commonly understood as that of a god, but there was no agreement amongst scholars as to which god. The co-occurrence with Artemis led to the proposal of a native Lydian equivalent to her twin brother Apollo, which was further supported by a very early, incorrect reading of the first letter as *p*, which falsely suggested a linguistic proximity.<sup>34</sup> Heubeck was the first to read the name correctly as *Qldāns*, and saw *κοαλδδῆϊν* as a phonetic approximation of this, but argued for an identification with the Moon-God,<sup>35</sup> based on one of two symbols carved above the inscription LW 23, in his interpretation a carpenter's square and a moon sickle.<sup>36</sup>

Recently, I suggested a reinterpretation of *Qldāns* as a royal title, derived from the personal name of a king, i.e. with a similar history as that of the name of Caesar (Payne 2019: 237–240). This approach also seemed preferable for a recently published Lydian coin legend (LW 120) *mlī t' tīš qldanlim*, 'I belong to *Qldāns* of *Mlit*', given that Lydian coins are known to carry the name of the minting authority, typically a person. Further, it would be perfectly possible for a king to have shared a *temenos* with Artemis, especially if he was posthumously deified.

Attempts to etymologize *Qldāns* have argued for a derivation from Luwian *kuwalan-*, 'army' (Carruba 2002, 76 n. 3; Oettinger 2015, 137 and n. 29), or from an unattested toponym *\*Kwalyan-* (Schürr 2011: 74). In a recent article, K. Euler and D. Sasseville (in print) argue that *Qldāns* is the Lydian version of a very well-known royal name: *Kroisos*.<sup>37</sup> If one accepts their argumentation, this would only change the

31. I thank A. Rizza for bringing this ligature to my attention. Nonetheless, I still believe that, here, the manuscript shows an alpha.

32. Pers. comm., 25.1.2020.

33. LW 4 and LW 23.

34. Danielson 1917: 24–26.

35. Heubeck 1959: 29–30.

36. I find the interpretation problematic. What possible meaning could two such objects – and in very close proximity – have? I could more easily imagine that this carving either only represents one object, e.g. some workman's tool depicted to demand some further step in the finishing of the stone stela; or if to be separated, it might be an instruction to finish the top of the stela with an angular shape and to decorate it with a moon sickle.

37. I am very grateful to the authors for sharing their work with me.

above derivation of a royal title slightly, in that the name giver was no unknown person but none other than the one the Greeks knew as Kroisos. This new reading would also elucidate the Hesychian gloss perfectly, i.e. *κοαλδδᾶν, λυδοὶ τὸν βασιλέα* could be understood as 'Qλdāns: the Lydians (call thus) the king (Kroisos).'

However, this raises an important question concerning Hesychius's work: why does the explanation not name Kroisos? Given the prominence of Herodotus amongst classical Greek literature, it is unlikely, that Hesychius should have been unfamiliar with his histories. Indeed, should one not rather expect that a lexicographer would have been especially well-read? If the aim was to elucidate the Lydian term, surely the name of Kroisos would have been required to disambiguate him from any of the other Lydian kings. While Kroisos was the most famous example of his species, Greek historians, including Herodotus, knew many other Lydian kings by name. With this background, I think it unlikely that an educated Greek reader would have understood the gloss necessarily as 'Qλdāns: *the* Lydian king'. Lydian history was a popular subject in Greek and Roman literature, and although many of the Classical sources are now sadly lost, a contemporary audience would easily have thought of many Lydian kings, including other legendary figures such as Candaules who, we are told, lost his life to the desire to show off his wife's naked beauty, or Gyges who gained an enduring place in the European literary tradition because of his fictional possession of a magical ring of invisibility.

Accordingly, one must conclude that by the time of Hesychius, any historical awareness of the proposed identity of Qλdāns-Kroisos had been lost, and that this gloss shows both a preservation of knowledge and the loss of it: while the memory of Qλdāns as a Lydian king – whether understood as a specific person or a royal title, we cannot know – lingered on, his identity with one of the most prominent figures of Greek historiography had been lost.

(All translations by the author)

## Bibliography

- Alberti, J. 1764, *Hesychii lexicon graecum*, Vol. 1, Leiden.  
 Alberti, J. - Ruhnke, D. 1766, *Hesychii lexicon graecum*, Vol. 2, Leiden.  
 Alpers, K. 2006, *Zur Geschichte der neuen Hesychausgabe. Ein Bericht aus Anlaß des Erscheinens von Band III der Ausgabe von K. Latte und P.A. Hansen*, «Abhandlungen der Braunschweigischen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft» 57: 109-135.  
 Alter, F.C. 1796, *Ueber eine alte Handschrift des Hesychius*, «Allgemeiner Literarischer Anzeiger» 27: 292-293.  
 Bagordo, A. 2014, *Fragmenta Comica. 1.2 Leukon – Xenophilos*, Heidelberg, Verlag Antike.  
 Buckler, W.H. 1924, *Sardis VI: Lydian Inscriptions, Part 2*, Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis 6, 2, Leiden, Late E. J. Brill.

- Deeters, G. 1927, *Lydia: Sprache und Schrift*, in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (RE) XIII.2, Stuttgart: 2154–2161.
- Euler, K. - Sasseville, D. 2019, *Die Identität des lydischen Qldäns und seine kulturgeschichtlichen Folgen*, «Kadmos» 58: 125–156.
- Feola, V. 2016, *Paris, Rome, Venice, and Vienna in Peter Lambeck's Network*, «Nuncius» 31: 107-128.
- Greenewalt, C.H. jr. 2010, *Lydian Cosmetics / Lidya Kozmetiği*, in N. Cahill (ed.), *The Lydians and their World / Lidyalılar ve Dünyaları*, İstanbul, Yapi Kredi Yayinlari: 201–216.
- Gusmani, R. 1964, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Högemann, P. - Oettinger, N. 2018, *Lydien. Ein altanatolischer Staat zwischen Griechenland und dem Vordere Orient*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Latte, K. 1953, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Vol. 1. A-Δ, Copenhagen, Munksgaard.
- Latte, K. 1966, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Vol. 2. E-O, Copenhagen, Munksgaard.
- Latte, K. - Campbell Cunningham, I. 2018, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon: volumen I: A-Δ* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 11), Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter.
- Nikoloudis, S. 2008, *Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean World*, in B.J. Collins et al. (eds.), *Anatolian Interfaces*, Oxford, Oxbow: 45–56.
- Musurus, M. 1521, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, third edition, printed by Th. Anshelm, Hagenau.
- Payne, A., 2019 *Native Religious Traditions From A Lydian Perspective*, in S. Blakely et al. (eds.), *Religious Convergence in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 231–248.
- Payne, A. - Wintjes, J. 2016, *Lords of Asia Minor. An Introduction to the Lydians*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Rauwolf, L. 1583, *Leonharti Rauwolfen, der Artzney Doctorn vnd bestelten Medici zuo Augspurg, Aigentliche beschreibung der Raiß, so er vor diser zeit gegen Auffgang inn die Morgenländer, fürnemlich Syriam, Iudaeam, Arabiam, Mesopotamiam, Babyloniam, Assyriam, Armeniam etc. nicht ohne geringe mühe vnnnd grosse gefahr selbs volbracht: neben vermeldung etlicher mehr gar schön frmbden vnd außländischen Gewächsen, sapt jren. Lauingen*, 2nd illustrated edition, Lauringen.
- Rollinger, R. 2003, *The Western Expansion of the Median 'Empire': A Re-Examination*, in G. B. Lanfranchi et al. (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?). Assyria, Media, Persia*, HANE/M V, Padova, S.a.r.g.o.n: 289–319.
- Rollinger, R. 2008, *The Median 'Empire', the End of Urartu and Cyrus the Great's Campaign in 547 BC (Nabonidus Chronicle II 16)*, «Ancient West & East» 7: 51–66.
- Rumpf, A. 1920, *Die lydischen Salbgefäße*, «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung» 45: 163–170.
- Sasseville, D. - Rieken, E. - Steer, Th. 2020 s.v. \*peku-, in *EDIANA DB 2* (2017.2). <http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=199>
- Schmidt, M.W.C. 1863, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Jena, Mauk.

- Schow., N.I. 1792, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon ex Codice Ms. Bibliothecae D. Marci Restitutum et ab Omnibus Musuri Correctionibus Repurgatum sive Supplementa ad Editionem Hesychii Albertinam*, Leipzig.
- Speranzi, D. 2014, *Il copista del Lessico di Esichio (Marc. gr. 622)*, in D. Bianconi (ed.), *Storia della scrittura e altre storie* (Supplemento al «Bollettino dei classici» 29, Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: 101–146.
- Wagler, P., 1896 s.v. *Βάκκαρις*, in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (RE) II, Stuttgart: 2803–2804.
- Yakubovich, I. 2014, *From Lower Land to Cappadocia*, in M. Kozuh et al. (ed.), *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*, Chicago, Oriental Institute: 347–352.