

*S. Douglas Olson*

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE LETTER  
*LAMBDA* IN A NEW GREEK-ENGLISH  
DICTIONARY  
IV. ΛΟΓΟΣΚΟΠΟΣ – ΛΩΦΑΩ\*

At Pallad. *Io.* 6. 69, **λογοσκόπος** (glossed “*person who spies on word*” (*sic*), and as a substantive “*spy, informer*”) is specifically contrasted with **ἐργοσκόπος** (omitted). The former thus means ~ “eavesdropper”, while the latter means ~ “spy”.

**λογοτέχνης** at *Rhetores Graeci* II p. 90. 6 means not “*author of speeches*” but ~ “wordsmith” (τὸν δίκην ὕλης τὸν λόγον ... κοσμοῦντα, “he who lends form to his speech as if it were a craftsman’s material”).

**λογοφίλης** (an adjective, although seemingly lemmatized and translated as a noun) at Phil. *Leg.* 1. 74 means not “*friend of speeches*” but “fond of words” (thus LSJ s.v.) or “fond of speeches”. **λογόφιλος** (Zeno [fr. 300] observed that some of his students were φιλόλογοι, others merely λογόφιλοι), meanwhile, means not a “*friend of speeches*” (as if this too were a noun) but “fond of argument” or “fond of empty words” (cf. Stob. II. 7. 11 k, p. 105. 4–6 Wachsmuth).<sup>1</sup>

S.v. **λόγχη**, “devourer of catapults and spears” at Timocl. fr. 12. 5 is a description not of “a cowardly braggart” but of the fire-breathing orator Demosthenes. At S. *OC* 1312 οἱ νῦν σὺν ἐπτὰ τάξεσιν σὺν ἐπτὰ

---

\* See *Hyperboreus* 29: 1 (2023) 133–156; 29: 2 (2023) 299–325; 30: 2 (2024) 286–309. Thanks are again due Benjamin W. Millis and David Sansone for their comments on earlier drafts of these notes. I would also like to express my gratitude to the *Hyperboreus* editorial team for their extraordinarily careful and generous attention to the individual entries in this article.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the distinction between actual philologists and individuals who merely produce catalogues of words.

τε / λόγχαις τὸ Θήβης πεδῖον ἀμφεστᾶσι πᾶν (“who now surround the entire Theban plain with seven ranks, with seven spears”), plural λόγχαι means “*host of lancers*” only by extension, the reference being in the first instance to the spears carried by the individual Seven against Thebes. Intriguingly, Thucydides never uses the word.

A λόγχη is properly a metal spear-tip or javelin-tip (not necessarily made of iron) and by extension a spear or a javelin. S.v. λογχίον, the *Dictionary* follows LSJ s.v. in citing *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1541. 17 στυράκιον λογχίον<υ> (“the butt-end of a *logchion*”) rather than the more recent and authoritative *IEleusis* 140. 17 στυράκιον· λόνχιον (“a butt-end; a *logchion*”) and is thus misled into translating “small shaft” (as if the primitive meant “spear-shaft” rather than “spear-tip”). *SEG* XLVI 185. 14 ἀκόντια ΔΔΓΓΙΙΙ, λογχία οὐ[κ ἔ]χοντα ΙΙΙΙ (“28 javelins, 4 lacking *logchia*”; omitted) leaves no doubt that the word means “metal tip (of a spear/javelin)”. The ὄρμος λ[ογχω]τός, λονχί[ων·–] at *ID* 338 face B fr. a. 4 (ignored) is thus likely so-called because it was made up of pieces that resembled spearheads, was ornamented with dangling spearheads, or the like. The number of λογχία in such objects, at any rate, is reported in inventories (e.g. *ID* 296. 46).

λογγήρεσι ... ἀπισταῖς at E. *IA* 1067 means not “armed with spears and shields” (as if ἀπιστής were also an adjective) but “shield-bearing men armed with spears”, i.e. “hoplites armed with spears”.<sup>2</sup>

The λογχίς (glossed “*small spear*”; a *hapax*) dedicated by a goatherd at Lycophronid. *PMG* 844. 3 θηροφόνον λογχίδ(α) is probably a javelin, i.e. a throwing weapon to be used to fight off predators or perhaps kill occasional small game.

λογχοδρέπανος (glossed “*having an elongated form with a point like a scythe*” [*sic*]) is used substantively at *Suda* γ 390 and Σ Lyc. 836, 843 (ignored) to refer to the weapon with which Perseus beheaded Medusa, i.e. a sickle-like cutting tool of some sort.

---

<sup>2</sup> S.v. λογχίδιον (glossed “*small spear*”), the odd “Hsch. 2. 261. 54” is apparently intended as a reference to Hsch. λ 154 (λογχίδια μικρά as a gloss, the presence of the adjective making it clear that the word is not diminutive except in a formal sense).

**λογχοφόρος** is an adjective and thus means “armed with a spear” (or javelin), but “spear-bearer” only as a substantive. For the latter sense of the word at Ar. *Pax* 1294; X. *Cyr.* 2. 1. 5, the *Dictionary* offers instead “lancer”. But a lancer is a type of cavalry soldier, and Xenophon in particular seems to use the word to mean ~ “hoplite” (ἰππέας ... εἰς ὀκτακισχλίδιους ..., λογχοφόρους δὲ σὺν πελτασταῖς οὐ μείους τετρακισμυρίων, “about 800 cavalry, and no less than 40 000 *logchophoroi* combined with peltasts”, i.e. more lightly armed foot-soldiers).

The paradosis λογοδεστερον at Arist. *Resp.* 481 b 27 makes no sense, and Dobson accordingly emended to λογοδεέστερον (< the otherwise unattested λογοδεής, glossed “wanting in reason or reasonableness” by LSJ s.v.), which is printed e.g. in the Loeb. The *Dictionary* nonetheless includes the passage s.v. **λογώδης** (glossed “similar to prose” at Aristox. *Harm.* 18), but translates the emended version of the text (“bereft of foundation”).

S.v. **λοιδορέω**, E. *Hel.* 1171 ἐγὼ δ’ ἔμαντὸν πόλλ’ ἐλοιδόρησα combines an external and an internal accusative with an instantaneous aorist and means not “I have many things to reproach myself” (*sic*) but “I find much fault with myself”. S.v. **λοιδόρημα**, Plu. *Mor.* 607 a τὸν πτωχὸν λοιδόρημα ποιοῦνται means not “they outrage the beggar” but “they abuse the beggar”. **λοιδορημάτιον** (Ar. fr. 92) is glossed “a small insult” (*sic*) but likely means “a bit of abuse”.<sup>3</sup>

S.v. **λοιπός**, X. *Smp.* 4. 1 λοιπὸν ἂν εἶη ἡμῖν ... ἀποδεικνύναι means not “it would remain to be demonstrated” but “it would remain for us to demonstrate”, i.e. “we would still need to demonstrate”.

**λοιίσθων** (a *hapax* at Hsch. λ 1248 in the accusative plural) is coyly glossed “over-indulgent in love”. The actual definition of the word in Hesychius is τοὺς ἀκρατεῖς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια (“sexually unrestrained persons”).

---

<sup>3</sup> S.v. **λοιπογραφέω**, English says not “concede a deferment of payment” and “be registered as a debit” but “grant a deferment of payment” and “be registered as a debt”.

**Λοκρῶν** ξύνθημα (cited as a proverb at Hsch. λ 1254 = Phot. λ 393) is translated “pact in the Locrian manner”, which is then clarified as meaning “treason”. But the phrase really means ~ “an agreement made by Locrians”, and Hesychius says it is used ἐπὶ τῶν παρακρουομένων· Λοκροὶ γὰρ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς πρὸς τοὺς Πελοποννησίους (“in reference to those who are cheated; because the Locrians ... their agreements with the Peloponnesians”), i.e. the phrase apparently referred to making an agreement and then backing out of it.

**λολλοῦν** is glossed “*pap*, a child’s word” and traced to Hermipp. fr. 86 and Hsch. λ 1255 (which is where the fragment is preserved and thus not a second attestation of the word). The text of Hesychius is corrupt – the manuscript has λογχ\*\* out of alphabetical order between Λοκρῶν ξύνθημα and λομβούς, followed by the gloss τὰ παιδία τῶν θεῶν· κέχρηται τῇ λέξει Ἑρμῖππος (“the children of the gods; Hermippus uses the word”) – but Phot. λ 394 offers λολλοῦν· τὰ παιδία τὸν θεόν. οὕτως Ἑρμῖππος (“*lolloun*: the children the god. Thus Hermippus”; between Λοκρῶν ξύνθημα and Λοξίας). Editors have offered various emendations of the definition of the word, whatever it might be, including Latte’s τὰ παιδία τὸν πόλτον (“children [refer thus] to porridge”; cf. Phot. λ 461 † λυλω †· βρωμά τι παιδίων ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ γινόμενον ἐκ γιγάρτων καὶ σύκων κεκομμένων (“† *lylō* †: a food consumed by children in Euboea, made from grape-seeds and minced figs”), which seems have provided the basis for the *Dictionary*’s definition. Cf. below s.v. **λωλον** (another version of the material in Photius).

**λόξευμα** at Man. 1. 307 πόλου λοξεύματα βαίνων / ~ 4. 479 πόλου λοξεύματα βᾶσα / is a concrete astrological term and thus means neither “*obliqueness*” nor “*oblique direction*” but “*obliquity*” (thus LSJ s.v.).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> S.v. **λοξίν** (glossed “*obliquely, off the track*”; better “*off course*”), note that the word – a *hapax* at Nil. Anc. *Ep.* II. 217 ὁ δὲ λίθος λοξὴν πορευθεὶς – appears to be an adverb equivalent to λοξόν (to which it should perhaps be emended).

Tyrt. fr. 11. 2 οὐπω Ζεὺς ἀνέχεται **λοξὸν** ἔχει means not “not yet does Zeus turn his neck elsewhere” (signaling attention to someone or something else) but “in no way does Zeus turn his neck sideways” (signaling indifference).

A **λοπάς** is a stewing-pan or the like (attested in this sense already at Eup. fr. 5; 60. 2, half a century or so before Eub. fr. 108. 2); see in general Arnott on Alex. fr. 115. 21–23, noting that “The diminutive **λοπάδιον**” – glossed “*small dish*” by the Dictionary – “occurs in Attic comedy ... as a metrically convenient alternative to **λοπάς** without any apparent distinction of size”. **λοπαδάγχη** (an abusive nonce-word at Eub. fr. 137. 3) accordingly means not “*plate-strangler*” but “stewing-pan-strangler”; **λοπαδαρπαγίδης** at Hegesand. fr. 2, *FHG* iv. 413 *ap.* Ath. 4. 162 a means not “*dish-robber*” but “snatcher of stewing-pans” (*sc.* away from other guests at a party, food regularly being served in the vessel in which it was prepared rather than being shared out on individual plates among the guests); **Λοπαδέκθαμβος** (an imaginary parasite’s name) at Alciph. 3. 1. 1 means not “Dish-frightener” but “Crazy-about-stewing-pans” *vel sim.*; and **λοπαδοφυσήτης** at Mnesim. fr. 10. 2 means not “*who blows on cymbals*” (*sic*) but “who blows on stewing-pans” (*sc.* to cool their contents). **λοπάδια** at Men. fr. 351. 9 (something a cook can use to “capture” an Arcadian, who has no experience of the sea and thus of seafood) means not “*oysters*” but once again “stewing-pans”, as does **λοπάς** at Ar. *Eq.* 1034 and Alciph. 3. 17. 1, where the word is glossed “*disk*” (*sic*).<sup>5</sup>

S.v. **λοπίς**, note that at Ar. *V.* 790 the word (glossed “*scale*”) means “fish scale”. At Aen. Tact. 20. 3 τὸν δὲ καρκίνον ἐσκευάσθαι, ὅπως ὑπὸ τὴν λοπίδα καθίηται καὶ ῥαδίως τὴν βάλανον μετεωρίζῃ (“to design the pincers so that they pass under the *lopis* and easily raise the bolt-pin”; instructions regarding gate-locking technology), the **λοπίς** is seemingly not a “*pin, peg*” (thus also LSJ s.v.) but a metal plate of some sort – i.e. something that resembles a fish scale or a pan – that holds the door-pin in place.

<sup>5</sup> A clumsy typographical error for “dish” (still wrong, but at least comprehensible)?

Phot. λ 401–402 defines **λόπισμα** not “*bark*” but ἡ περικειμένη ἔξωθεν τοῦ κρομμύου λεπίς· καὶ πᾶν λέπος, φλοιός, δέρμα λεπτόν, ξηρόν (“the skin that surrounds an onion on the outside; also any sort of husk, bark, light dry skin”).

Active **λορδῶω** may well have a sexual sense (“bend [someone] backwards”, *sc.* to have sex with them) at Mnesim. 4. 55, as it certainly does in the middle – not simply equivalent to the active – at Ar. *Ec.* 10 λορδουμένων σωμάτων (“our backward-bending bodies”, of women having sex with men) with Ussher *ad loc.* **Λόρδων** at Pl. *Com.* fr. 188. 17 (a name in a list of invented divine beings to whom women wanting sex are supposed to make sacrifice, playing on **λορδῶω**) is anachronistically glossed “*lascivious demon*” (following LSJ s.v. “*the demon of impure λόρδωσις*”<sup>6</sup>).

**λόρδωμα** in Hippocrates is glossed “*bending backwards*”, as if it were identical to **λόρδωσις** rather than a concrete noun meaning “backward bend”.

Hsch. λ 1269 defines **λοῦκα** (a *hapax*) not as “*a porridge made of chickpeas*” but as ρόφημα ἐξ ἀλφίτων (“a gruel made of barleymeal”).

The **λουτήρια** at Antiph. fr. 206. 3 are part of a doctor’s equipment, and Poll. 10. 46 (quoting the fragment) distinguishes the sense of the word there (seemingly “basin”) from that at A. fr. 366<sup>7</sup> (glossed “*bath*”).

The ᾠα **λουτρίς** mentioned at Theopomp. *Com.* fr. 38. 1 is glossed “*bathing suit*”, which in colloquial English means a costume worn to swim. Poll. 7. 66 ~ 10. 181 makes it clear that the item in question was actually worn for modesty’s sake when men and women were in the baths together (thus LSJ s.v. “*bathing drawers*”, LSJ Supplement s.v. “*loin-cloth*”). Hsch. λ 1277 ~ Phot. λ 408 (citing Ar. fr. 849) cites λουτρίδες (literally “bathers”) as a term for two girls assigned cultic

<sup>6</sup> Corrected in LSJ Supplement s.v. to “humorously invented erotic deity”.

<sup>7</sup> Unhelpfully cited as “fr. 714 Mette”. S.v. **λουτρικός**, “Hsch. 2. 730. 200 L.” appears to be a garbled reference to Hsch. λ 200. Cf. “Hsch. 2. 584. 632 L.” at s.v. **λυκόσπαστος**, seemingly intended as a reference to Hsch. λ 632.

duties for Athena, presumably giving one of her statues its annual washing.<sup>8</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 794* (early 5<sup>th</sup> c. BCE) is a dedication by one such girl, who uses the alternative title *πλύντρια* for the office (called *πλυντρίς* in Hsch. = Phot. and allegedly by Aristophanes).

S.v. *λουτρόν*, note that *ψυχρά ... Ἡράκλεια λουτρά* (“cold baths of Heracles”) are mentioned at Ar. *Nu.* 1051 only to make the point that they do not exist.

*λοετροχόον τρίποδ(α)* at *Il.* 18. 346 ~ *Od.* 8. 435 is glossed s.v. *λουτροχόος* as “recipient on a tripod for preparing water for the bath” (*sic*). The adjective means “pouring washing water”, and thus by extension ~ “containing water to be poured for washing”.

*λουτρών* at [X.] *Ath.* 2. 10 (the Athenian people have built themselves many gymnasia, changing rooms and *loutrônes*) is glossed “*bathroom, bath*,” which seems to have been taken over from LSJ without reference to the original text. The manuscripts actually have *λουτρά* (printed e.g. by Marchant and by Bowersock in his Loeb).<sup>9</sup>

The human spine consists of 7 cervical vertebrae (= the neck), 12 thoracic vertebrae (= the back), 5 lumbar vertebrae (= the lower back), and the sacrum + tailbone/coccyx. Poll. 2. 178–179 reports that the last cervical vertebra is called the *ἄτλας*; the first thoracic vertebra the *λοφαδίαν* or *λοφίαν*; the second thoracic vertebra the *μασχαλιστήρ*; and the twelfth and final thoracic vertebra the *διαζωστήρ*. LSJ glosses these words “*seventh of the neck-vertebrae*”, “*first dorsal vertebra*”, “*second dorsal vertebra*”, and “*twelfth vertebra in the spine*”, respectively.<sup>10</sup> The *Dictionary*, by contrast,

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Bulloch on Call. *Lav. Pall.* 7–8 and pp. 8–12 (on similar ceremonies for other cult-statues).

<sup>9</sup> “Bathroom” is in any case reserved in American English for what in other countries is called a “toilet, WC, loo”; read “bath-house” (as in LSJ s.v.) or “bathing facility”.

<sup>10</sup> The absence of a coordinated system of technical language here exposes the somewhat free-wheeling style of LSJ’s glossing generally, but also the profound competence of the team as a whole, since these look like separate entries produced by different scholars, all of whom nonetheless managed to get both the Greek and the anatomy right.

systematically garbles the terms, glossing the first three “*first cervical vertebra*”, “*name of the first vertebra*”, and “*vertebra*”, respectively, and omitting the fourth.

**λοφάω** at Ar. *Pax* 1211 is a nonce-word that seems intended to mean something like “have a sore crest”. But Hsch. λ 1284 (~ Phot. λ 414), cited as supporting this translation, claims instead that the verb means **λόφου ἐπιθυμεῖν** (“to desire a crest”).

**λοφιήτης** at Agath. *AP* 6. 79. 2 (of Pan) is not “*hill-dweller*”, i.e. “one who lives in the hills” (seemingly a misunderstanding of LSJ s.v. “dweller on the hills”), but “*crest-dweller*”, i.e. “one who lives on top of hills”.

**λόφιον** in Σ<sup>EF</sup> Ar. *Ach.* 1109 is opaquely glossed “*the least of the three plumes*” and described as a v.l. for **λοφεῖον**. In the manuscripts and all modern editions, the Aristophanic line in question reads τὸ λοφεῖον ἐξένεγκε τῶν τριῶν λόφων (“Bring out the *lopheion* of my three crests!”; Lamachus arms himself for battle). The *scholion* says that if the diminutive **λόφιον** is read (as no other witness proposes), Lamachus is saying “Bring the little one of my three crest-feathers!”<sup>11</sup>

Ath. 15. 699 d uses the word **λοφνία**, but identifies it as ἐκ φλοιοῦ λαμπάς (“a torch made of bark”) not a “*torch made of prunings, of vines*”. Ath. 15. 701 a, on the other hand, cites Cleitarchus’ *Glossary* to the effect that the inhabitants of Rhodes used **λοφνίς** to refer to ἐκ τοῦ φλοιοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου λαμπάς (“a torch made of grape-vine bark”) but not a “*torch made of vine prunings*”.

**λοφορώξ** at Hippon. fr. 103. 39 (fragmentary and obscure) is glossed “one who has broken his neck or crest”, with reference to Hsch. λ 1294 (citing the word in the accusative singular). But Hesychius defines the word τὸν ἀπερρωγότα τοὺς ὤμους (“someone who has broken his shoulders”; emended by Latte to τὸν ἀπερρωγότα τὰς ἀκρωμίας).

<sup>11</sup> S.v. **λοφίς**, read “helmet-case” for “*helmut-case*”.



λόφωσις at Ar. *Av.* 291 τίς ποθ' ἡ λόφωσις ἡ τῶν ὀρνέων; (lit. "What in the world is the *lophōsis* of the birds?"; Peisetairos notes the costuming of some of the special bird-dancers) means not "*tufi*", i.e. "crest" (thus ~ "Why do the birds have crests?"), but "cresting" (i.e. ~ "Why have the birds donned crests?").<sup>12</sup>

λοχαῖος is glossed "*bending down*, of stalks of grain blown by the wind", i.e. "*beaten down* by the wind", at Thphr. *CP* 3. 21. 5 (south winds and fair weather in the spring ποιουσι λοχαῖον, "cause (the grain) to grow quickly and make it *lochaios*"), 3. 23. 5 (south winds and fair weather λοχαίους ποιουσιν, "make [grain-crops] *lochaios*"); cf. Phot. λ 420 λοχαῖος σῖτος· ὁ βαθύς· ἢ ὁ δι' ἐπομβρίαν κεκλιμένος ("*lochaios* grain: that which is deep; or that which has been knocked over by heavy rainfall"). But what Theophrastus means is that conditions such as these are overly favorable for growth (3. 21. 5 ταχὺ ἀναδιδόασιν, they cause the grain to "shoot up quickly"), and the grain-stalks then collapse under their own weight. Cf. Hsch. λ 1303 λοχαῖος· κλινόμενος σῖτος ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐτροφεῖν ("*lochaios*: grain that lies down because it grows luxuriantly").<sup>13</sup>

S.v. λοχάω, the *Dictionary* collects a number of examples of the verb "in aorist participle with another verb", e.g. Hdt. 6. 87 λοχήσαντες ... τὴν ... νέα εἶλον (translated "having lain in wait, they captured the ship", as if the participle were a perfect). This has nothing to do with either the meaning of the verb or any peculiarities of its usage, but is simply a question of basic Greek syntax, and the material should be eliminated. Hdt. 5. 121 ἐλόχησαν τὴν ... ὁδόν means not "they occupied the road by ambush" but "they laid an ambush along the road". Jos. *BJ* 3. 116 τὰς ... λοχᾶσθαι δυναμένας ὕλας means not "the forests were well-suited for setting traps" but "forests apt for setting ambushes".<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Despite the implication of the initial comment s.v. λοχαγός ("Doric, but used in Attica" – by which "in Attic" is seemingly meant, as also s.v. λοχαγία), Epicharmus is a Doric poet.

<sup>13</sup> Euripides used the expression already in fr. 725 λοχαῖον σῖτον (from *Telephus*), supposedly in reference to a stand of grain from which one could launch an ambush (thus the *Et. Gen.*); whether this interpretation is based on direct acquaintance with the original text, and thus whether it is right, is impossible to say.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hsch. λ 1309 λοχιάδες· αἱ ὕλαι (omitted s.v. λοχιάς).

S.v. **λοχεία**, Pl. *Th.* 149 b ἄλοχος οὔσα τὴν λοχείαν εἴληχε (of Artemis) means not “although she has never given birth, she has had the task of protecting women in child-birth” but “although ..., she has child-birth as her sphere”.

S.v. **λοχεύω**, E. *Ion* 455–457 Προμηθεῖ Τιτᾶνι λοχευθεῖσαν κατ’ ἀκροτάτας κορυφᾶς Διός (‘*locheutheisan* by the Titan Prometheus from the crest of the head of Zeus’; of Athena<sup>15</sup>) is offered as a unique example of the verb used in the sense “*bring to light*”. But this is a variant version of the story according to which Hephaestus split Zeus’ head open in order to allow Athena to emerge, and the participle thus has its expected meaning “given birth to”. Elevated poetic vocabulary (once in comedy in paratragic lyric at Ar. *Pax* 1014, and once in Attic prose at Arist. *HA* 616 a 34, of the halcyon).

**λοχίζω** is glossed “*place in ambush, station*” and is then translated with the second sense at Th. 3. 107. 3, where the point is however clearly that Demosthenes concealed the men in question so that they could, if necessary, attack the enemy unexpectedly, i.e. he placed them in ambush. The same is true at D. H. 2. 55. 1, where the verb refers to the actions of a commander who places troops where they can suddenly emerge from hiding and hit the enemy from behind. The supposed weak second sense of the word should accordingly be struck.

S.v. **λόχιος**, E. *Ba.* 89 ὠδίνων λοχίαις ἀνάγκαισι is translated “the painful necessity of childbirth”, but the Greek says “the childbirth necessities consisting of pangs”, i.e. “the pangs that necessarily accompany childbirth”.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> For this odd detail (otherwise attested only at Apollod. *Bib.* 1. 20 and in a *scholion* on Pi. *O.* 7. 36, both perhaps simply referring back to Euripides), see Martin on E. *Ion* 455.

<sup>16</sup> S.v. **Λοχία** (“goddess of childbirth”; an epithet of Artemis at E. *Supp.* 958; *IT* 1097, both lyric; note also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4547. 4–5, early 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and *IG* VI, 1 960. 10, from Boiai, both with *iota* rather than *epsilon-iota*), the *Dictionary* refers the reader to s.v. **λόχιος**. But the note there is simply a cross-reference to s.v. **λοχεῖος**.

**λοχίτης** is glossed “guard” at A. *Ch.* 768 (of Aegisthus’ potential companions) and S. *OT* 751 (of the men with Laius when he died). But in both cases the normal and expected sense of the word (“men belonging to his unit, members of a military unit under his command”) makes good sense; that such men can serve as guards is true but incidental to the sense of the word itself.

The first meaning given for **λόχη** is “bush”, but the word seems consistently to mean “clump of brush, thicket, copse of trees”. The boar that wounded the young Odysseus, for example, was not hiding “in a dense bush” (*Od.* 19. 439 ἐν λόχη πυκινῇ) but “in a dense thicket, in a dense patch of undergrowth”. Ar. *Ec.* 60–61 μασχάλας / λόχης δασυτέρας thus means not “armpits more hairy than a bush” (a strange and unlikely image) but “armpits shaggier than a clump of brush”. The ὁδὸν ... **λοχμώδη** where Demosthenes placed his troops in ambush (see above s.v. **λοχίζω**) – misdescribed as “roads” (*sic*) “running between woods” – was not “wooded, forested” but “brush-covered” (allowing them to conceal themselves), and when Theophrastus describes certain plants growing this way, he means not that they are “similar to a bush, bush-shaped” but that they “grow in clumps” (of e.g. cane and reeds at *HP* 4. 8. 1, 4. 11. 13).

**λυγγανάομαι** (a *hapax*) is glossed “hiccup” (normally λύζω) with reference to Hsch. λ 1330. But Hesychius says that the word means λύζων ἐν τῷ κλαίειν (i.e. “wailing with great sobs” *vel sim.*). Cf. S. *OC* 1621 **λύγδην** ἔκλαιον πάντες (~ “they were all sobbing and wailing”).

**λυγίζω** at Theoc. 1. 97 τὸν Ἔρωτα κατεύχεο ... λυγίζειν (“you boast that you will *lugizein* Love”) means not “submit, dominate” but “cause to submit” or “master” (thus LSJ s.v.).

**λύγξ** (1) at Th. 2. 49 λύγξ ... κενή (“an empty *lynx*”; one of the common symptoms of the plague) means not “vomit” (i.e. that which is produced when one vomits) but “retching” (i.e. the action of vomiting, although in this case unproductively).

S.v. **λύγος**, Long. 2. 13. 3 λόγον δὲ χλωρὰν μακρὰν στρέψαντες ὡς σχοῖνον (a description of the production of a substitute mooring

cable) means not “long green rushes interwoven like ropes” but “twisting a long green willow branch like a rope”, i.e. “twisting some long willow branches to serve as a rope”.

S.v. **λγγρός**, Hes. *Op.* 530 λγγρὸν μυλιόωντες (translated “gnashing their teeth in a pitiful way”) is described as an “adverbial neuter”. It is actually an internal accusative – literally “gnashing a pitiful (gnashing)” – that can be translated adverbially.

**λυδίζω** (better Λυδίζω) at Hippon. fr. 95.1 and Ar. *Eq.* 523 is literally “imitate the Lydians”, i.e. “play the Lydian”. But in both places it really means “speak Lydian”.

**λυδοπαθής** (better Λυδοπαθής) at Anacr. *PMG* 136 is not precisely “as refined as a Lydian”, since “refined” is an unambiguously positive term in English and what is meant is ~ “who lives like a Lydian”, *sc.* in enormous luxury.

Hdn. *Grammatici Graeci* III. 1 p. 59. 23–24 asserts τὸ δὲ λυῆς λυῆντος ἀπὸ τοῦ λυήεις (“*lyês lyêntos* is from *lyêeis*”). Neither form is attested elsewhere, but the implication is that λυῆς is a known if problematic word, λυήεις the – otherwise unknown and perhaps invented – uncontracted form from which it comes. LSJ lemmatizes both; treats λυήεις as an adjective; and glosses it “discordant”. The *Dictionary* omits λυῆς; treats λυήεις as an adjective; and nonetheless glosses it as a noun (“discord”).

For **λυθίγραμμος** (= Pi. fr. 85), the reader is told “see διθύραμβος”, but no comment or clarification is offered there. The *EM*, cited at the end of the note, offers λυθίραμβος / λυθίραμμος, whereas λυθίγραμμος is from one manuscript of Cyril’s version of the same material (cod. Vind. 319). What Pindar wrote is unclear, and no further progress can be made on the issue until a reliable modern edition of Cyril’s lexicon appears.

Homer uses λύθρω (something with which one is splattered in hand-to-hand combat) repeatedly, always in the dative singular. The *Dictionary* glosses the word “blood mixed with dust or sweat, bloody filth”; nothing in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* obviously supports

the reference to dust and sweat, and the reference at *Od.* 23. 48 to Odysseus among the dead suitors resembling a lion splattered αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ, *sc.* as it stands over an animal it has killed, would seem to count decisively against this interpretation. The gender of the word was clearly obscure already in antiquity, and the fact that some authorities opt for masculine, others for neuter, shows only that they were taking sides in this scholarly debate, not that they had any substantial additional information regarding the point. LSJ accordingly combines λύθρον, τό and λύθρος, ό as a single lemma.

Λύκα (the name of one member of a group of aged sex-workers at Timocl. fr. 27. 2) is crudely glossed “prostitute”, as if the name served as a generic term. The *Dictionary* appears to lack an overall policy for collecting and handling such items; of the other women’s names that appear in the fragment, most are glossed “female name”; Plangon is described as “pers(on)”; Nannion is described as “hetaira”; and Lopadion and Hieroklea are ignored. Λυκαΐνη and Λύρα at Luc. *DMeretr.* 6, 12. 1 get similarly rough treatment as “prostitute”.

What a λυκάβας is at *Od.* 14. 161; 19. 306 (Eumaeus and Penelope, respectively, told by the Stranger that Odysseus will return to Ithaca τοῦδ’ αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος, “within this very *lykabas*”) is unclear, and “temporal cycle, month, year” merely disguises the problem. That the word was eventually picked up e.g. at Philodem. *AP* 5. 13. 1 λυκαβαντίδας ὥρας (where the sense is “years”) shows that it came to be of interest to Homeric scholars, but not that anyone knew what it meant.

λυκαΐνιον at Poll. 4. 150 is lemmatized Λυκαΐνιον and glossed “kind of comic mask”, as if this were a stock-character mask like those of the servants called Μαΐσων and Τέττιξ mentioned earlier in the same section. What Pollux says, however, is τὰ δὲ γυναικῶν πρόσωπα εἴη τοιαῦτα· γράδιον ἰσχνὸν ἢ λυκαΐνιον, γραῦς παχεῖα, γράδιον οἰκουρόν ... τὸ μὲν λυκαΐνιον ὑπόμηκες· ῥυτίδες λεπταὶ καὶ πυκναί ... (“women’s masks are the following: an old woman who is withered up or *lykainios*; a fat old woman; an old domestic servant ... The *lykainion* (mask) is quite long, with many fine wrinkles ...”). The word (omitted by LSJ) is thus an adjective, λυκαΐνιος -η -ον, and likely means “resembling a she-wolf” (hence the extended chin).

S.v. **λυκαιμίας** is too badly garbled to decipher entirely, but the lemma is apparently intended to be **λυκαιμίας**, with reference to Alc. fr. 130 b. 10 **λυκαιμίας**, hence the etymology with the second element < αἰμός. For further clarification, the reader is directed to the non-existent lemma **αλυκαιμίας** (*sic*). The note appears at one point to gloss \***λυκαιμία** as “*battle of wolves*”; did the word exist, it would more likely mean “*battle against wolves*”, in the same way that e.g. **Γιγαντομαχία** means not “*Battle of the Giants*”, but “*Battle against the Giants*”.<sup>17</sup>

**λυκήλατος** (a *hapax*) is glossed at τὰς ἐνχαλινωθείσας (“those fitted with a bit”; fem. acc. pl.) at Hsch. λ 1378. The *Dictionary* suggests that the word means “held in check by a bit shaped like a wolf’s teeth”, a suggestion that requires a cross-reference to Plu. *Mor.* 641 f (some authorities believed that ἵπποι λυκοσπάδες got their name ἀπὸ τῶν χαλινῶν τῶν λύκων, “from the wolf-bits, from the bits known as ‘wolves’”). See below on **λυκοσπάς**.

**λυκοβατίας** (glossed as a noun, “*where wolves walk, place of wolves*”) is an adjective at Hsch. λ 1370 **λυκοβατίας** δρυμός, where it is said to mean ἐν ᾧ οἱ λύκοι διατρίβουσιν (a thicket “in which wolves spend their time”).

**λυκοεργής** is glossed “*made in Lycia ... spears or spits made in Lycia, used for killing wolves*” at Hdt. 7. 76 προβόλους δύο Λυκιοεργέας ἕκαστος εἶχε (“each man had two *lykioergeis* javelins”; of the arms carried by some of Xerxes’ colorful Asian allies). This appears to represent a confused amalgam of several separate attempts to make sense of the word: the warriors are patently carrying spears rather than spits, and if the adjective means that these spears were of Lycian workmanship, there is no reason to posit a connection with λύκος (“wolf”).

**λυκοθαρσής** (a *hapax*, although note the entry in Hesychius cited below) at Myrin. *AP* 7. 703. 5 (of a shepherd) is glossed “*zealous*

---

<sup>17</sup> LSJ Supplement s.v. suggests instead “*wolf-battle*, i.e. wolf-like or guerilla fighting”.

against wolves”, following LSJ s.v. “not fearing wolves”. But the best parallel for the word is κυνοθαρσής at Theoc. 15. 53, which means “bold as a dog”, not “bold against dogs”, suggesting that λυκοθαρσής ought actually to be glossed “bold as a wolf”. Cf. Hsch. λ 1386 λυκοθρασής· θρασύς (“*lykothrasês*: bold”; almost certainly referring to the same epigram).

λυκοκαρίς (a *hapax*) at Hsch. λ 1404 is glossed “hot barley-water”. But Hesychius’ definition (θερμὸν ἀπ’ ἀλφίτου πιεῖν, “hot from barley-meal to drink”) is more obscure than this and seemingly garbled.

λυκόποδες 1 at Arist. fr. 394 is glossed “guardians of a tyrant”. What Aristotle (as reported by Σ Ar. *Lys.* 665) actually says is that *lykopodes* was the term for τοὺς τῶν τυράννων δορυφόρους, “the bodyguards of the Tyrants”, i.e. of Pisistratus and his sons. The claim that this comment is offered “as an interpretation of λυκοπέρσιον” (an Egyptian plant mentioned by Galen) is false. Thus the manuscripts of Aristophanes, joined in reading λυκό- by Hsch. λ 1392. But the paradosis λυκόποδες is metrically impossible in the text of *Lysistrata*, and what is wanted is patently Hermann’s λευκόποδες (supported by Hesychius’ διὰ τὴν τῶν ποδῶν λευκότητα, “on account of the whiteness of their feet”); the lemma λυκόποδες 2 should accordingly be struck. What Pisistratus’ bodyguards were called is impossible to say, but it seems just as likely that they too were “White Feet” rather than “Wolf Feet”.

ραίω is “break into pieces”, and the λυκορραΐσται ... κύνες at Ion AP 7. 44. 2 (the dogs that killed Euripides) are not just “wolf-killers” but “wolf-shredders, that tear wolves to pieces”.

S.v. λύκος, the proverb λύκον ἰδεῖν (referring to being dumb-struck) is not literally “to see the wolf” but “to see a wolf”. The proverbial πρὶν κεν λύκος οἶν ὕμεναιοῖ (of something impossible) at Ar. *Pax* 1076, 1112 (in both cases after a negative clause) means not “before a wolf weds a sheep”, but “until a wolf weds a sheep”. λύκος κεχηνώς at Ar. *Lys.* 629 means not “a wolf remained with his mouth agape” but “a wolf with his mouth agape” (sc. and ready to swallow you down). The word at Strato AP 12. 250. 2 ἄρνα λύκος ... εὔρον

(lit. “I, a wolf, found a lamb”; a pederastic predator is speaking about a pretty boy) is mischaracterized as “said of catamites”.

**λυκοσπάς** (glossed “*torn by wolves*”) is said to be used at Nic. Th. 742 ταῦροι δὲ μελισσῶν / σκήνεσι πυθομένοισι λυκοσπάδες ἐξεγένοντο “of bees born from the carcasses of bulls torn to pieces by wolves”. But this is confused – the adjective ought to refer to the bees, not the bulls (cf. Nic. Al. 446–447) – and the line was accordingly deleted by Bentley, followed by Gow–Scholfield (the *Dictionary*’s nominal text of reference), hence the somewhat misleading “dubious reading”. Bentley also suggested λυκοσπαδέες ἐγένοντο; Schneider printed τούρων δὲ μέλισσαι; and Jacques in the *Les Belles Lettres* text (2002) put a half stop at the end of 741, allowing for a change of subject. The earliest attestation of the word is in any case at Call. fr. 488, where someone is riding an Ἀτράκιον ... λυκοσπάδα πῶλον (“*lykospas* colt from Atrax”, a city in Thessaly). Hsch. λ 1398 says such horses are found “around the Adriatic”,<sup>18</sup> while Phot. λ 454 traces them to Enetia, i.e. the area around what is today Venice, which amounts to the same thing. Plu. Mor. 641 f – 642 a offers a silly explanation of the adjective, according to which horses that are chased (and presumably torn) by wolves, but are fast enough to get away, are called λυκοσπάδες and recognized as being of particularly high quality. This all looks like a folk-etymology of some non-Greek term for a region or the like.

S.v. **λυμαίνω**,<sup>19</sup> at Hdt. 1. 214. 4 λυμαينوμένη δὲ τῷ νεκρῷ ἐπέλεγε τάδε (presented as an example of the verb taking the dative), τῷ νεκρῷ is more easily taken as governed by ἐπέλεγε. E. Ba. 632 αὐτῷ τὰδ’ ἄλλα ... λυμαίνεται (of the Stranger’s treatment of Pentheus inside the palace) is translated “he crushes him with other misfortunes”; but τὰδ’ ἄλλα is an internal accusative and αὐτῷ is a dative of disadvantage, and the sense is ~ “he does him the following injuries”. Theoc. 10. 15 τίς δέ τυ τῶν παίδων λυμαίνεται; means not “Which is the girl who makes you suffer?”, but “Which of the girls is doing you injury?” X. Mem. 1. 3. 6 τὰ λυμαινόμενα γαστέρας καὶ κεφαλὰς καὶ ψυχὰς ταῦτ’ ἔφη

<sup>18</sup> Pace the *Dictionary*, however, Ael. NH 16. 24 does not.

<sup>19</sup> As Renihan 1975, 132 notes, the active is late, hence LSJ’s decision to lemmatize as λυμαίνομαι.



εἶναι means not “he said that what ruins the stomach, the head, and the soul are these” but “he said that the aforementioned are what ruin stomachs, heads and souls”. The reference to “D. 18. 203” is actually to 18. 303, where εἰ ... πάντα ταῦτ’ ἐλυμαίνετο τοῖς ὅλοις means not ~ “if all these things together have worsened the situation” but ~ “if all these things went on doing damage to the whole enterprise”.

**λυμαντήρ** at X. *Hiero* 3. 3 is a noun and thus means “*destroyer*” (better “*damager*”) but not “*that ruins*” (as if the word were an adjective). The cognate adjective **λυμαντήριος** at A. *Ch.* 1438 γυναικὸς τῆσδ’ ὁ λυμαντήριος, meanwhile, is glossed first “*that outrages*” (better “*that damages*”) but then “*corrupter*” (as if the word were a noun), apparently in an attempt to make the genitive seem more natural in English. The noun **λυμαντής** at S. *Tr.* 793 λυμαντὴν βίου is glossed as an adjective (“*that destroys*”), which is then converted into an odd verbal phrase (“*is a ruin*”, which in colloquial English means “is ruined, is a disaster”), once again in order to make the genitive (“of life”) easier in English.<sup>20</sup>

“**λυμνός** see γυμνός” is a reference to Hsch. λ 1417, an example of a simple uncial error (ΛΥΜΝΟΣ for ΓΥΜΝΟΣ) converted by ancient scholarship into a lexicographic oddity and perpetuated as such in the *Dictionary*. Cf. s.v. **λίσκος** above (*Hyperboreus* 30: 2 [2024] 301).

S.v. **λυπέω**, E. *Ion* 1311 λυπήσομέν τιν’ ὧν λελυπήμεσθ’ ὅπο means not “whoever has made me suffer, I will make him suffer”, but “We will cause pain for one of those who caused us pain”, i.e. “I will cause pain for one of those who caused me pain”. Heliodor. 2. 33. 4 λυπεῖ με λύπην ἀνίατον is an example of the verb with a combination of an internal and an external accusative, the subject of the verb is a woman, and the meaning is thus not “he afflicts me with incurable pain” but “she causes me incurable pain”. Th. 4. 53. 3 λησταὶ ... τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἥσσαν ἐλύπουν ἐκ θαλάσσης (a generalizing statement) is another example of λυπέω with a combination of an internal and an external accusative (the former here effectively translated into

<sup>20</sup> S.v. **λύμη**, Plb. 5. 59. 11 πάσας ... τὰς ἀνθρωπείας λύμας means not “all human waste” but “all the human waste”, i.e. all the sewage of Seleucia.

English as an adverb) and means not “the pirates less often attacked Laconia coming from the sea” but “pirates did Laconia less damage (by raiding) from the sea”. Pl. *Grg.* 494 a τὰς ἐσχάτας λυπεῖν λύπας means not “to suffer the last pains” but “to suffer the most extreme pains” (so too *Prt.* 354 b). E. *Med.* 286 λυπῇ δὲ λέκτρων ἀνδρὸς ἐστερημένη means not “it pains you to be deprived of your conjugal bed” but “you feel grief when you are deprived of your husband’s bed”. D. 18. 217 ταῦτ’ ἐλυπεῖθ’ ὁρῶν; means not “it was painful to see these things” but “Did he feel grief when he saw these things?”

S.v. **λύπη** (glossed “*pain, affliction, sorrow, suffering*”), “in a moral sense” must be intended to mean “in an emotional sense”.

**λύπημα** is “*sorrow*” or “*grief*” but not “*suffering*” (which would be \*λύπησις).

S.v. **λυπηρός**, Th. 6. 16. 5 οἶδα δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους ... ἐν μὲν τῷ καθ’ αὐτοὺς βίῳ λυπηροὺς ὄντας means not “I know that such men are unpopular in their life” but “I know that such men are unpopular in their own lifetime” (in contrast to the verdict rendered by posterity).

S.v. **λυπρός**, A. *Eu.* 174 κάμοι γε λυπρός (of Apollo) means not “it was painful for us” but “he brings pain to me as well”. λυπρὴ γῆ at Hdt. 9. 122. 4 is not “sterile earth” but “difficult land” (where the Persians choose to settle as free men, rather than working the rich soil in the plains for others). At Thphr. *CP* 2. 4. 5 (discussing the sorts of crops that rich soil favors and disfavors), the word is applied to vegetable and cereal crops generically (τὰ λάχανα καὶ ὁ Δημήτριος καρπός) and patently means not “*poor, thin, miserable, insufficient*” but “containing little oil” *vel sim.*<sup>21</sup>

A **λυσαιδός** is properly not a “*lyre-player*” (i.e. a **λυσιστής**) but “someone who sings to the accompaniment of a lyre”; cf. the distinction between κιθαρωδός and κιθαριστής.

<sup>21</sup> The passage is cited twice, first “of plants”, the second time “of food”; the former is correct, although the reference is clearly to the food such plants produce.

There is probably no real difference of meaning, or at least not one involving size, between the primitive λύρα and its formal diminutive **λύριον** (glossed “*small lyre*”).<sup>22</sup> The same is likely true for **λυροφοινίκιον** (glossed “*a small Phoenician lyre*” (< **λυροφοῖνιξ** (glossed “*Phoenician lyre*”).

**λυρογηθής** (adesp. *AP* 9. 525. 12; of Apollo) is glossed “*who loves the lyre*”. But the second element in the compound is < γηθέω, and the sense is accordingly “*who takes pleasure in the lyre*”.

The second element in **λυρωνία** at *Ar. fr.* 251 is < ὠνέομαι, and the word thus means not “*acquiring a lyre*” but “*the purchase of a lyre / lyres*”.<sup>23</sup>

**λυσιαῖδες** are not “*lupins*” but “*lupines*” or “*lupine seeds*” (normally θέρμιοι); Polemon *fr.* 91 Preller identifies this as specifically Spartan vocabulary.

The attractive stone mentioned at *Plin. Nat.* 37. 172 is there referred as a *lysimachos* = Greek **λυσίμαχος**, not as a “*lysimacha*”.

**λυσίμβροτος** is not “*that destroys or weakens men*” but “*that destroys or weakens mortals*”.<sup>24</sup>

S.v. **λύσις**, *Arist. Somn.* 454 b 25–27 has been heavily rewritten as ἡ λύσις αἰσθήσεως ἐγρήγορσις and translated “*the reawakening and release from sensation*”. The original Greek is very different: τῆς δ’ αἰσθήσεως ... τὴν μὲν ἀκινήσιαν καὶ οἷον δεσμὸν τὸν ὕπνον εἶναι φαμεν, τὴν δὲ λύσιν καὶ τὴν ἄνεσιν ἐγρήγορσιν (“*we declare that sleep is the immobilization and as it were fettering of perception,*

<sup>22</sup> See Petersen 1910, 97.

<sup>23</sup> S.v. **λυσίζωνος**, “*of a woman: who loosens or has loosened one’s belt, i.e. married*” would have to mean that the woman loosens her partner’s belt, *sc.* to have sex with him; read “*who has loosened her belt*”.

<sup>24</sup> It is unnerving to find such translations still being offered in an authoritative source. Cf. part II, *Hyperboreus*. 29: 2 (2023) 301 n. 3 (on the *Dictionary*’s evasive language in regard to slavery); s.v. **λεία**, where ἀνθρώπους is translated “*men*” rather than “*human beings, people*” or the like.

and that the loosing and relaxation of (this immobilization / fettering) is waking up”<sup>25</sup>). In the Aristotelian *Poetics*, where λύσις is glossed “*dissolution, solution*”, it is actually a technical term (1455 b 28–29) for the portion of the action of a tragedy that extends ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς μεταβάσεως μέχρι τέλους (“from the beginning of the transformation [of the central character’s fortunes] to the end”, i.e. ~ “the high point of the action, the denouement”).<sup>26</sup>

S.v. **λυσιτελής**, Ael. *NA* 10. 50 τοῦ δέοντος πρίασθαι λυσιτελέστερον means not “to buy below cost” but “to buy for less than you should”.

**λυσσός** (poetic) is treated as a noun in LSJ (λυσσός, -άδος, ἡ) and handled ambiguously in the *Dictionary* (lemmatized simply λυσσός, -άδος). It is in fact an adjective of a sort restricted to use with feminine objects; cf. above s.v. **Λεσβιάς** (*Hyperboreus* 29: 2 [2023] 315). **λυτηριάς** (“liberator”) is lemmatized λυτηριάς, -άδος, ἡ, i.e. as a noun, in LSJ; again simply λυτηριάς, -άδος in the *Dictionary*.

LSJ s.v. **λυσσάω** glosses the verb “*suffer from rabies*” at e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 298. The *Dictionary* (with reference to the same passages) uses instead the archaic “*hydrophobia*” (and not simply in reference to the hydrophobic stage of the disease).

**λυσσόδηκτος** (glossed “*bitten by a rabid animal*”) is cited from the *Geoponica* and Marcus Aurelius, but is already attested centuries earlier in Crateuas (fr. 10 Wellmann) and then repeatedly in Dioscurides (e.g. 2. 10. 1).

**λυτήρ** (A. *Th.* 941; E. *El.* 136) is a noun and thus means “*liberator*” or “*resolver, referee*” but not “*that loosens*” (as if the word were an adjective).

<sup>25</sup> Adapted from Hett’s translation in the Loeb (Hett <sup>2</sup>1957, 325).

<sup>26</sup> S.v. **λυσιτέλεια**, the use of the word at Plb. 31. 27. 11 is glossed “*attention to gain, consideration of what is useful*”, after which Polybius’ περὶ τὸν χρόνον is quoted and translated “with regard to due dates”; what is meant is “with regard to when debts are due”.

S.v. **λύτρον**, Th. 6. 5. 3 λύτρα ἀνδρῶν ... αἰχμαλώτων λαβὼν τὴν γῆν means not “the territory having been taken as the price for the prisoners’ ransom” but “taking the land as ransom payments for the prisoners”.

**λυτρωτήριος** (Byzantine Christian vocabulary) is an adjective and accordingly means not “*redeemer*” but “*redeeming*”.

λύττοι (a *hapax*) at Hsch. λ 1470 is treated as an adjective (**λύττος -η -ον**) and glossed “*lofty, sublime*”. But Hesychius treats the word as a noun meaning οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τόποι (“elevated spots”).

**λυχνόπτης** at Hsch. δ 16<sup>27</sup> is a noun (“lamp-lighter”) but is glossed as an adjective (“*that lights or carries a lamp*”).

**λυχνέλαιον** (in a medical recipe at Alex. Trall. *Ther.* I 445. 23) is not an “*oil-lamp*” but “lamp-oil”.

Ar. fr. 291 ὥσπερ λύχνος / ... καθεῦδ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ λυχνιδίου (“just like a lamp, he slept on the *lychnidion*”) makes it clear that a **λυχνίδιον** is not a “*small lamp or oil lamp*”<sup>28</sup> but a “lamp-stand” or the like.

S.v. **λύχνος**, Ar. *Nu.* 18 ἄπτε λύχνον (Strepsiades issues an order to a slave) is not “Light the lamp!”, but “Light a lamp!” Hdt. 7. 215 περὶ λύχνων ἀφάς is not “when the lights come on” (as if modern streetlights were in question), but “around lamp-lighting”, i.e. “around the time when people light their lamps”. *LXX II Sam.* 21. 18 οὐ μὴ σβέσῃς τὸν λύχνον Ἰσραὴλ means not “lest you extinguish the lamp of Israel” but is a strong prohibition: “Do not extinguish the lamp of Israel!”

**λυχνούχος** is glossed not just “*lamp-holder*” but “*candlestick, candelabra*”, with reference to a number of 5<sup>th</sup>/4<sup>th</sup>-century fragments. But the Greeks did not use candles, at least for lighting, and the latter definitions should be struck (or attributed only to Roman-era sources).

<sup>27</sup> Obscurely cited as “Hsch. 1. 397. 16”.

<sup>28</sup> All lamps were “oil lamps”, and what the difference between the two definitions is supposed to be is unclear.

S.v. **λύω**, E. *Hec.* 539 λῦσαι ... πρύμνας ... / νεῶν is “to loose the sterns of our ships” and thus only by extension “to weigh anchor”. S. *El.* 743 λύων ἡνίαν ἀριστεράν is not “loosening the left rein” but “slackening the left rein” (but the text is problematic in any case, and Finglass prints Toepfer’s τανύων). Plu. *Flam.* 10 τοῦ ποδὸς λύσας τὴν Ἑλλάδα means not “freeing Greece from the shackles imprisoning its feet” but ~ “freeing Greece (from the shackle) around its foot”. λύειν στόμα at E. *Hipp.* 1060 is not equivalent to λύειν σιωπὴν at Alciphr. 3. 19. 6: the former means “to set one’s tongue free to speak”, while the latter means ~ “to put an end to silence”. At [Arist.] *Po.* 1456 a 10, the word refers to a tragic poet’s handling of the climax (**λύσις**; see above s.v.) of the action of his play (thus perhaps “*resolve*”, but not “*dissolve*”). *Il.* 11. 107 ἔλυσεν ἀποίνων is translated “freed upon payment of ransom”; ἀποίνων is a genitive of price (“he freed him for ransom money”), and it is unclear whether the text has been misunderstood or this is merely another example of normal Greek syntax treated as peculiar to a particular verb (cf. s.v. **λοχάω**).<sup>29</sup> “To cancel previous errors” catches the general sense of S. *Ph.* 1224 λύσων ὅς’ ἐξήμαρτον ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ, but what the Greek actually says is ~ “in order to make good whatever mistakes I made in the past”. γούνατ’ ἔλυσεν at *Il.* 5. 176 and similar expressions in Homer mean literally “dissolve the knees”. But the sense of the phrase is not “murder” in the context of the war at Troy but “kill”; in the *Odyssey* it routinely means ~ “break the strength of” in both active (e.g. 20. 118) and passive (e.g. 4. 703); and this sense works just as well in the cited passages in the *Iliad* as well. The expression λῦσαι τὰς αὐτὰς ὠδῖνας, used a number of times by Saint John Chrysostom to mean “be uterine siblings”, is treated as a different expression from λῦσαι ὠδῖνας in the sense “put an end to birth-pangs, give birth”; but Chrysostom is using flowery language, and “put an end to the same birth-pangs” is an elaborate way of saying “put an end to birth-pangs for the same woman”, i.e. “be born from the same womb”. X. *HG* 7. 5. 22 τὴν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πρὸς μάχην παρασκευὴν means not “the souls’

<sup>29</sup> Cf. the extensive treatment below of constructions such as λῦσαι ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (a commonplace use of ἐκ + gen. and thus irrelevant to a discussion of λύω in particular). Despite the implication of the organization of this note, λῦσαι τίνα ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is not an example of the verb + acc. + gen. in the sense “free someone from something”.

disposition to fight” but “the readiness in their souls for battle”.<sup>30</sup> Expressions such as λύσαντες τὰς ... σπονδάς (“violating their treaty”) at Th. 1. 23. 4 are not examples of an extended use of λύω in the supposed sense “to divide” but are simple figurative uses of the basic sense of the verb “break, destroy”. X. *An.* 3. 4. 36 οὐ ... ἐδόκει λύνειν αὐτοὺς νυκτὸς πορεύεσθαι means not “it did not seem fitting that they should travel by night” but “it did not seem advantageous for them to travel by night”.<sup>31</sup> A. *Pers.* 592–594 λέλνται ... λαὸς ἐλεύθερα βάζειν, ὡς ἐλύθη ζυγὸν ἀλκᾶς (of the Ionian cities, now that Persia’s power has been broken) means not “the people is free to speak freely once the yoke of power has been loosened” but “the population has been released to speak freely, since the yoke of force has been removed”. NT *Mark* 7:35 ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ (of a deaf-mute man healed by Jesus) means not “his tongue was loosened” but “the bond upon his tongue was loosened” (*sc.* allowing him to talk). Aeschin. 3. 197 ἐπειδὴν δὲ τῇ πρώτῃ ψήφῳ μὴ λυθῇ τὸ παράνομον means not “unless the accusation of illegality is annulled at the first votes” (*sic*) but “but whenever the charge of illegality is not dismissed by the first ballot” (i.e. by the preliminary vote on the question of whether the motion being offered was actually illegal). NT *John* 10:35 οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή means not “the validity of Scripture cannot be abolished” but “the Scripture cannot be done away with”, i.e. what it says is what it says.

S.v. λῶβη, *Od.* 24. 433 λῶβη γὰρ τάδε γ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι means not “these things are also a cause of shame for those who will learn of them in the future” (i.e. they too will be embarrassed at these events) but “these things are a cause for derision also for people to come to hear about” (i.e. they too will speak badly of what was done to us, when they hear the story).

λωβήτεια and λωβητήρ are both nouns but are glossed as adjectives (“that ruins, destructive” and “that offends, that outrages”,

<sup>30</sup> In the translation of *Od.* 20. 118 immediately before this, read “one’s knees” for “one’s knes”.

<sup>31</sup> This and the others examples cited of the verb used intransitively in the sense “pay off, bring benefits, be useful” are equivalent to τέλη λύω, a point obscured here but treated crisply and effectively in LSJ s.v. V.2.

respectively). **λωβητής** is also a noun glossed as an adjective (“*that offends, that ruins*”). **λωβητήν ... ἄντυγα** at Nonn. *D.* 26. 159 does not mean “shaved head”, although this approximates the sense of part of the line as a whole, **λωβητήν ἐκάλυπτε λιπότριχος ἄντυγα κόρσης** (lit. “he concealed the outraged curve of his hairless head”, of an Indian whose king abused him by shaving his head and then forced him to join a military campaign against Dionysus).

Hsch. λ 1494 does not define **λωγάλοι** (cited in the plural) as “*catamites*” but as **πόρνοι** (“male prostitutes”).<sup>32</sup> Cf. Hsch. λ 1495 **λωγάς· πόρνη** (“*lôgas*: a prostitute [fem.]”).

**λώγασος** at Hsch. λ 1496 is glossed “*lash*”, but Hesychius actually said that it means **ταυρεία μάστιξ** (“a whip made of cow-hide”).<sup>33</sup>

**λωλον** (a *hapax* at Hsch. λ 1505) is glossed “*a pie for children, made of figs and grapes*”. But the Greeks did not eat anything resembling pie, and Hesychius actually defines the word as **βρωμα ἐκ γιγάρτων καὶ σύκων γενόμενον, παιδίοις πεφωσμένον** (“a food made of grapeseeds and figs that is toasted for children”). **λωλώ** (glossed **ὅταν σῦκα μετὰ γιγάρτων φωσθῇ**, “when figs are toasted with grapeseeds” at Hsch. λ 1506) is apparently another name for the same dish (or another garbled rendering of the name), and see above s.v. **λολλοῦν**; Poll. 6. 76 seems to regard it as a cake of some sort.

**λώπη** is a Homeric *hapax* at *Od.* 13. 224 **δίπτυχον ἄμφ’ ὤμοισιν ... λώπην** / (worn by Athena disguised as a shepherd boy) and is picked up from there at Theoc. 25. 254 **δίπλακα λώπην** /; A. R. 2. 32 **δίπτυχα λώπην** / and repeatedly in the Sibylline oracles (always **λώπη**

<sup>32</sup> The gloss is preserved only in Vat. Gr. 23, an antistoecharium that seems to contain some material from Hesychius. Latte was convinced of its value, Cunningham is not. The gloss seems likely to be borrowed from the next item in the *Lexicon*, with appropriate adjustment for the genders of the different words.

<sup>33</sup> The intended sense of “[see **λωγας**?]” (*sic*) as an etymology of the word is unclear. The *Dictionary* is apparently uncertain about how to handle Latte’s **λωισμόν** (which will not do for a lemma) at Hsch. λ 1500; the options are **λωϊσμόν** (as in LSJ), **λωσμόν**, and **†λωισμόν†**, and one must choose between them.



ἀμφειμένος ὄμοις /). There seems to be no evidence that the garment was “made of skin” beyond the fact that the word is apparently cognate with λέπω (“peel”). **λώπιον** (glossed “*small cloak*”) is formally a diminutive of the word but seems to mean simply “garment resembling a λώπη”, i.e. a ἱμάτιον of some sort.<sup>34</sup> For λώπη meaning “cloak”, cf. **λωποδύτης** (lit. “one who puts on a λώπη”, *sc.* that belongs to another person), a mugger who specialized in stealing his victims’ robes; there is no reason to think that the word has the alleged extended sense “*thief, robber*” at Cratin. fr. 220; Ar. *Ra.* 772; D. 4. 47.<sup>35</sup> **λωποδυτέω** likewise means “steal clothing” at e.g. Ar. *Pl.* 165, and there is no reason to posit an extended general sense “*steal* (items of other sorts)”. **λωπιστός** at Hsch. λ 1511 = adesp. tr. fr. 591 c is glossed “wearing a patched cloak”; Hesychius actually defines the word ὁ Παλαμήδης ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἱματίων ἐπρίψεως (“Palamedes, from his throwing cloaks over himself” *vel sim.*; obscure).

**λωροτομέω** (cognate with **λῶρος**, “*strip of leather, belt*”) is glossed “*cut leather, be a tanner*”. But tanners cure leather rather than cutting it into strips, and the latter is the work of the βυρσοπώλης (“leather-seller”), with whom the Triclinian *scholion* on Ar. *Eq.* 768 associates the verb (κατατμηθεῖν τε λέπαδνα· ὥς βυρσοπώλης εἶπεν εἰς μέρη διατμηθεῖν καὶ λωροτομηθεῖν, “‘might I be cut up into yoke-straps!’: as a leather-seller, he said ‘may I be split into pieces and cut into straps!’”). **λωροτόμος** (“strap-cutter”) is likewise glossed “*tanner*”, despite the fact that ancient sources (e.g. Hsch. σ 1203) repeatedly describe it as a synonym for **σκυτοτόμος** (“leather-cutter, leather-worker”).

**λῶταξ** is included at *Cap* 8. 32. 11 in a list of undesirable persons and occupations along with various sorts of magicians, amulet-makers, and the like. The -αξ suffix suggests a colloquial term of abuse: cf. **πλούταξ** (‘rich guy’), **στόμφαξ** (‘bombastic ranter’), **φέναξ** (‘cheat’), **ψίλαξ** (‘bald guy’), etc.<sup>36</sup> There is no reason to think the word means “*procurer*” there, nor does this translation sit easily with

<sup>34</sup> See Petersen 1910, 95, citing Aristotle.

<sup>35</sup> The authors are oddly cited in alphabetical order, as if Cratinus was not a generation older than Aristophanes and thus properly listed before him.

<sup>36</sup> In all these cases the *alpha* is long; thus better **λώταξ**?

the proposed etymology < λῶτος (“lotos”). Zonar. p. 1324 offers the gloss ὁ ληστής ἢ ὁ πόρνος ἢ ὁ μύρα ἀλειφόμενος ἢ ὁ καταδαπανῶν ἐν τοῖς αἰσχροῖς τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ, ὡς ὁ πόρνος καὶ ὁ ἀνδρόγυνος, ἢ ὁ αὐλητής (“a bandit, or a male prostitute, or someone who covers himself with perfume, or someone who wastes his life on shameful activities, like a male prostitute or an effeminate, or a pipe-player”). LSJ s.v. condenses this into “flute-player” (apparently taking the word to be < λῶτος in the sense “pipe made of lotos-stalks”, and preferring to ignore the rest). Here, as at other points where λῶτος is connected with the *aulos*, the reference is to a tree identified with *Zizyphus lotus*, one of several species of the plant called jujube in the buckthorn family (*Rhamnaceae*). According to Theophrastus, it thrives in Libya (*Hist. plant.* 4. 3. 1), and its wood is dark, solid, and beautiful (*Hist. plant.* 4. 2. 5) and used to make a variety of objects, including pipes, statues, and furniture (*Hist. plant.* 4. 2. 5, 4. 3. 4).

Something has gone badly wrong at the end of s.v. λῶτος, which contains numerous repeated references, garbled glosses, confused abbreviations and the like.<sup>37</sup>

S.v. λωφάω (glossed “*stop, cease, interrupt*”), the initial three glosses are too condensed and distant from the Greek to be comprehensible. For “with gen.: χόλου to be subject to anger Aeschl. *Pr.* 376; πόθου to desire Aeschl. *Pr.* 654; τοῦδε ... φόνου from this massacre Soph. *Ai.* 61”, read e.g. “with gen.: χόλου λ. to cease from anger Aeschl. *Pr.* 376; πόθου λ. to cease from desire Aeschl. *Pr.* 654; τοῦδε λ. φόνου<sup>38</sup> to cease from this slaughter Soph. *Ai.* 61”. So too X. *An.* 4. 7. 6 ὅταν λωφήσωσιν οἱ λίθοι means not “once the stone-throwing stops” but “when the stones stop”.

S. Douglas Olson  
University of Minnesota  
sdolson@umn.edu

<sup>37</sup> If Λωτοφάγοι is glossed “*Lotophagoi, Lotus-eaters*”, Λωτοφαγία (their country) should be glossed “land of the Lotophagoi, land of the Lotus-eaters”, not “*land of the Lotophages*”.

<sup>38</sup> Or πόνου; the manuscripts are divided.

## Bibliography

- A. V. Bulloch (ed., tr., comm.), *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 26 (Cambridge 1985).
- W. S. Hett (ed., tr.), *Aristotle: On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath* (Cambridge, Mass. – London <sup>2</sup>1957).
- G. Martin (ed., comm.), *Euripides, Ion*, Texte und Kommentare 58 (Berlin–Boston 2018).
- W. Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -iov; a Study in Semantics* (Weimar 1910).
- R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones*, Hypomnemata Heft 45 (Göttingen 1975).

Part IV. Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9<sup>th</sup> edition of the monumental Liddell–Scott–Jones *Greek-English Lexicon* (1940) as supplemented by Barber and his fellow editors (1968). These notes on the letter *lambda* in the new *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* are offered in a similar spirit.

Часть IV. Полвека тому назад Роберт Ренеган опубликовал ряд дополнений, уточнений и поправок к девятому изданию монументального словаря Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon* (1940), и к дополнению к нему группы издателей во главе с Барбером (1968). Настоящие заметки к леммам на букву *лямбда* призваны сыграть аналогичную роль по отношению к новому *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*.

# CONSPECTUS

NICHOLAS LANE	
Two Conjectures on Pindar .....	5
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Eur. <i>IT</i> 819: A Parallel .....	10
CAROLUS M. LUCARINI	
In <i>Pindari Scholia</i> adversaria .....	17
ELIA SCHNAIBLE	
Varia epigraphica .....	35
ELENI AVDOULOU	
Sardanapal(l)us in Cicero and Philodemus' <i>On Rhetoric</i> Book 3 ....	48
MARIA N. KAZANSKAYA	
The Expression <i>longus Hellespontus</i> in Ovid .....	56
HEIKO ULLRICH	
Eine vergessene Konjektur J. G. Frazers zu Ov. <i>Fast.</i> 5, 74 .....	77
DENIS KEYER	
“Waxing the Knees of the Gods” in Juvenal (10. 55) and Prudentius ( <i>Apoth.</i> 457) .....	102
GRIGORY BELIKOV	
Maximos von Tyros und Apologie des Sokrates .....	131
GIOVANNI ZAGO	
Per il testo e l'esegesi di Aviano, <i>Fab.</i> 40. 1–4 .....	155
S. DOUGLAS OLSON	
Philological Notes on the Letter <i>lambda</i> in a New Greek-English Dictionary. IV. λογοςκόπος – λωφάω .....	161
Keywords .....	188
Guidelines for contributors .....	190