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LATIN LOANWORDS IN GREEK


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

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

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

I append some notes on a few entries that attracted my interest. It is curious that certain Latin loanwords, such as *βοῦλλα* (or *αὐγόλλαον*), are first attested in papyri of the early Islamic period. But this does not apply to *βεσεδόν*, whose instances should...
have included ὀφειδάριος (P.Oxy. LIV 3758.120); contrast, for example, the lemmata βεκενάλων or βεκήσαμον, whose examples include forms in ὀφει-, βελόκιον: Delete the example in CPR XIV 31 (very uncertainly read). βθυλλαφός: The reading of the word in O.Bodl. II 1676 is extremely uncertain (and infringes ‘Youtie's law’). βουλγαρικός: The discussion of the word offers no proof that it corresponds to Lat. vulgaris; and there is no way that in SPP VIII 1124 = XX 133 we are dealing with an alias. δεφήνωρ: This official is probably not identical with the defensor civitatis (Greek ἐδικας), cf. D. Hagedorn apud B. Kramer, Pap. Flor. XIX, p. 308 n. 12, and now P.Thomas 24, δομεστικός: To the literature on comites domesticorum add R. Delmaire, Byzantion 54 (1984), 148–53, 175. On P.Oxy. XVI 1942 see now ZPE 132 (2000), 180. δονετυλός: Further examples in P.Berol.inv. 25009r1 (ed. GRBS 17 [1976], 198), SEG VIII 355, XXIV 1223–4, and now CPR XXII 1. There are two doublets: BM Or. 8903 = MPER NS XXIII (elsewhere cited as KSB) 241, and SB I 1840 = I.Syringes 788. Delete PSI VII 800 and P.Anth. II 151, where the word is restored. SB IV 7475 (= I.Theb. 196) and V 8704 have been republished by J. Gascou, T&MByz 12 (1994), 339 ff. P.Lugd.Bat. XIII 10 dates to 399/400, cf. J. R. Rea, ZPE 56 (1984), 79–88; SPP III 271b dates to mid-VII, cf. J. Gascou and K. A. Worp, ZPE 49 (1982), 89–90, as also does SB XVI 12884, see CPR XXII 1 intro.; BGU III 750 is post-conquest, but does not date to 750. To the bibliography add now C. Zuckerman, AnTard 6 (1998), 137–47; J.-M. Carrière, AnTard 6, 105–21. The old dating of the texts in P.Apoll. to 703–15 (cf. pp. 137, 153, 155) should be condemned to oblivion, and replaced by ‘later VII’, cf. BL VIII 10 (referred to on pp. 183, 204, 258). Last, in a lexicon pertaining to the Greek documentary texts Ägyptens, examples from P.Ness. or PPG should have been set apart from the Egyptian material.
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