

S. Douglas Olson

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE LETTER
LAMBDA IN A NEW GREEK-ENGLISH
DICTIONARY*

II. ΛΑΣΙΟΚΝΗΜΟΣ – ΛΗΜΨΑΠΟΔΟΣΙΣ

A κνήμη is a “shank”, i.e. the part of the leg between the knee and the ankle, and **λασιόκνημος** (a *hapax* at [Opp.] *Cyn.* 2. 186; of hares) is accordingly not “furry-pawed” but “hairy-legged” (thus LSJ s.v.). Cf. on **λεπτόκνημος** below.

As the *Dictionary* notes expressly, **λασιόκωφος** (“shaggy-deaf”, taken to mean “deaf owing to hair growing in one’s ears”) is a f.l. (attested nowhere else) at Pl. *Phdr.* 253 ε περὶ ὧτα λάσιος, κωφός (“shaggy around the ears, deaf”; of the problematic left-hand horse), and the word ought not to have been lemmatized.

Poll. 7. 73 cites not only Theopomp. Com. fr. 37 λάσιον ἐπιβεβλημένος for **λάσιον** in the sense “hairy fabric”, but also Sapph. fr. 100 ἄμφι δ’ ἄβροις’ ... λασίσις’ εὖ ἐπόκασσε several centuries earlier.¹

S.v. **λάσκω** (poetic), the *Dictionary* discriminates between (C) “of men, cry out, yell, shout”, including “with internal accusative”, as at A. *Ag.* 596 ὀλολυγμὸν ... / ἔλασκον, and (D) “with acc. say, announce,

* See *Hyperboreus* 29 : 1 (2023) 143–166. Thanks are due Benjamin Millis and David Sansone for criticisms and comments on an earlier draft of this material. In addition, I gratefully acknowledge support for my research in 2021–2023 carried out under an agreement for the provision of grants from the federal budget of the Russian Federation in the form of subsidies No. 075-15-2021-571, project “Digital commentaries to classical texts: Greek comedy” (IWL RAS, Moscow, Russia).

¹ Luc. *Prom.* 12 γῆ ... ὕλαις ἅπασα ... λάσιος (“a land completely covered with forests”; awarded a special sub-section “with dative”) tells us nothing about the meaning of λάσιος but is merely a common, unremarkable bit of Greek syntax.

proclaim”, as at A. *Ag.* 1426 περίφρονα δ’ ἔλακες, or “with double accusative”, as at E. *Andr.* 671 τοιαῦτα λάσκεις τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους;. But ὀλολυγμόν, περίφρονα and τοιαῦτα are all internal accusatives, and the sense of the verb is more or less identical in all three cases.

The manuscripts offer **λασταυροκάκαβον** in Chrysipp. xxviii fr. 9 *ap.* Ath. 1. 9 c (a section of the text preserved only in the *Epitome*, which is full of crude, simple errors). But Eustathius and the *Suda* – the latter probably drawing on the complete version of the *Deipnosophists* – have **λασταυροκάκκαβον** (thus LSJ s.v.), which is obviously correct, since the second element in the word is < κάκκαβος (“casserole pan”). **λάσταυρος**, the first element, is glossed “*catamite*” (meaning a teenage boy kept by an older man for sexual purposes); Phryn. *Ecl.* 168 says that it actually means καταπύγων, i.e. any man who allows himself to be used sexually by other men. **λασταυροκάκαβον** is glossed “*catamite’s pot*, aphrodisiac”. The word is not a noun, however, but an adjective (τὸ παρὰ πολλοῖς **λασταυροκάκαβον** καλούμενον βρῶμα), and the sense is ~ “stewed in depravity”, which Athenaeus glosses οὗ ἡ κατασκευὴ περιεργότερα, “(food) the preparation of which is over-elaborate”.

According to Dicaearchus of Messene fr. 95 Wehrli = 106 Mirhady (*ap.* Ath. 15. 666 b–c), **λατάγη** – more often **λάταξ** (glossed “*drop of wine*”; often plural) – is τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκποθέντος ποτηρίου ὑγρόν (“the liquid that remains after a cup is drained”), i.e. “wine lees”, a sludgy combination of wine and grape- and stem-fragments. It was thrown at a target, which might be either a small disk balanced on top of a pole (= the game of κότταβος κατακτός) or small vessels floating in a basin of water (= the game of κότταβος ἐν λεκάνῃ); see in general Olson on Ar. *Pax* 343/4. It was not thrown “into a bowl”. **λαταγέω** (glossed “*set ringing*”) is a *hapax* at Luc. *Lexiph.* 3 ἀγρόνδε ὀχρόμην ψύττα κατατείνας· ... ὑμεῖς δὲ ἴσως ᾤεσθέ με λαταγεῖν κοττάβους (“I hurried rapidly off to the countryside; ... but you perhaps thought I *latagein kottabous*”), where με λαταγεῖν κοττάβους patently means “I was throwing *latages* in a game of *kottabos*”.

The high-style *hapax* **Λατογένεια** (“born of Leto”) at A. *Th.* 146 ὦ Λατογένεια κόυρα (“O maiden born of Leto”, i.e. Artemis; lyric) is not a noun (lemmatized Λατογένεια -ας, ἡ) but an adjective of a type used for goddesses in place of a combined masculine/feminine form in -γενής (e.g. ἀφρογένεια, ἡριγένεια, Τριτογένεια).

λατομία (“stone quarry”), cited from Strabo, is well-attested in the epigraphic record already in the 4th century BCE, e.g. *SEG* XXXX 263 (Attica); *IG* IV², 1. 102. 3, 15, 17 (Epidaurus); *FD* III 5. 19. 14 (Delphi).

At *IG* II² 13218. 5 Οὐαλέριος Ἀνδρόνεικος ... ἐποίησατο λατόμιον ἐμαυτῷ (“I, Valerius Andronicus, made a *latomion* for myself”; 2nd/3rd c. CE), λατόμιον (omitted) must mean “rock-cut tomb”, as also at e.g. *IK Byzantion* 381. 2 Αὐρηλία ... κατεσκεύασε τὸ λατόμιον ... ἐμαυτῇ.

λατομικός at D. S. 3. 12. 4 λατομικῷ σιδήρῳ is not “for carving stone” but “for cutting stone, for quarrying stones” (thus LSJ s.v.), in reference to an implement used to break soft rock in a gold-mining operation. Cf. Agatharch. 25, where a λατομικός σίδηρος is used to break rocks into smaller pieces (again as part of a mining operation), showing that this is a hammer rather than a pry-bar or the like. Agatharch. 29 mentions λατομίδες χαλκαῖ (“*latomides* made of bronze”) left behind in ancient mines, along with the bones of countless workers killed by cave-ins. LSJ glosses **λατομής** as “stone chisel” (i.e. a stone-carving tool), which is certainly wrong, while the *Dictionary* opts for the safely vague “tool for cutting rock”. The simplest conclusion is that this is another word for some variety of hammer.

πολύχρυσα ... **λατρεύματα** at E. *IT* 1275 (lyric) are not “golden cults of Apollo” but the “hired services that bring much gold (*sc.* as payment)”, in reference to the cult at Delphi and the rewards offered for prophecies.²

λάτρις is elevated poetic vocabulary (favored in particular by Euripides); not attested in prose until the late Roman period. Thgn. 302 seems to distinguish between λάτριδες and δμῶες, while Thgn. 486 references a κακὸς λάτρις ἐφημέριος (“bad *latris* employed for a single day”) and thus similarly appears to mean “hired servant” rather than “slave”;³ cf.

² S.v. λάτριος, Pi. N. 4. 54–56 λατρίαν Ἰαολκόν ... παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσιν means not “he subjugated Iolkos and gave it over to the Haimones” but “he handed over Iolkos to the Haimones in a state of servitude”, the additional verbal ideas in the translation being drawn from the omitted Pindaric πολεμία χειρὶ προστραπών.

³ It is disturbing to find words such as this still glossed “servant”, suggesting voluntary paid service by free persons; cf. δοῦλος, glossed “servant, slave”, in that order. For all their talk of freedom and the like, the Greeks had slaves, and large numbers of them, and they often did not treat them well. This is a conspicuous black

Solon fr. 13. 49 εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν / λατρεύει (“he is a *latris* for a year”, of an agricultural laborer); A. *Supp.* 1011 **λάτρων** ἄτερθεν (“without compensation, free of charge”); Pi. *O.* 10. 28–29 **λάτριον** ... μισθόν (what Heracles should have got from Augeas). At E. *Hec.* 609, on the other hand, the word clearly means not “*hired servant*” but “*slave*” (of an anonymous old woman sent to fetch water), as routinely in Euripides. How one is to understand Hermes’ self-identification as δαιμόνων λάτρις at E. *Ion* 4 (stressing his similarity with and thus his sympathy for Ion?), or Lyssa’s as τὴν θεῶν λάτριν at E. *HF* 823 (stressing her lack of personal agency?), is unclear. But λάτρις is used with surprising frequency of slaves belonging specifically to gods, as at e.g. S. fr. **269 c. 35 Διὸς ... λάτρις; E. *Tr.* 450 τὴν Ἀπόλλωνος λάτριν; *Ion* 1343 ὁ θεὸς ἐβούλετ’ ἐν δόμοις <σ> ἔχειν λάτριν (“The god wanted to have you as a *latris* in his house”; addressed to the hero); *Ph.* 221 Φοῖβῳ λάτρις; fr. 955 Δήμητρος λάτριν; *IG* II² 3464. 13 ἐλάτρευσα θεῶι (3rd c. BCE).

λατυπικός (< λᾱσ + τύπτω) means not “*sharp, for cutting*” but “*having to do with stone-cutting*”, as at Aristoxen. fr. 51 = Timae. *FGrH* 566 F 15 (omitted), where Socrates is said to have practiced πατρῶα τέχνη ... τῇ λατυπικῇ (“his paternal stone-cutting trade”), i.e. sculpture. At Hsch. ε 7191, the word is not used “of a knife” but of a σμίλη (“chisel”).

A **λαύρα** is normally an “*alley*” *vel sim.* (including at Ar. *Pax* 99, 158, where the fact that people defecate in them does not mean that the word means “*latrine, sewer*”; see Olson on 99–100). Nothing suggests that it means “*covered street, bazaar*” at Clearch. fr. 44 Wehrli (where a red-light district is in question⁴).

λαῦρος (glossed “*violent*”) and **λαύρως** (glossed “*violently*”) are not lemmatizable words but simply late misspellings – less judgmentally put, ill-attested alternative spellings – of **λάβρος** and **λάβρως**, respectively.

Arist. *EE* 1232 a 16 defines a **λαφύκτης** not as a “*glutton*” but as a subcategory of ἄσωτος (“*wastrel, profligate*”), specifically ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀτάκτως ἀναλίσκειν (“the type who spends recklessly”).

mark on their record as a civilization – which is not to say that our own is likely to win any prizes – and lexicographic white-washing of this sort does no service to anyone.

⁴ Mistaken at LSJ s.v. for “an *alley* or *bazaar* at Samos, where women sold delicacies of all kinds”, whence perhaps the odd definition in the *Dictionary*.

λαφυραγωγία is an abstract noun (hence the ending in -ία) which at Eriph. *Haer.* 55. 9. 5 μετὰ τῆς πάσης σκυλεύσεως καὶ λαφυραγωγίας means not “booty” but “plundering”. The same is true at [Caes.] *Erato-pokriseis* 208. 11 εἰς καταπάτημα καὶ λαφυρία. S.v. **λάφυρον**, Plb. 4. 26. 7 τὸ λάφυρον ἐπεκήρυξαν κατὰ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν is translated “they decreed the sack of the Aetolians”, but the sense is really “they issued a decree of sacking against the Aetolians”, i.e. “they decreed that anyone who wished to raid Aetolian territory might do so with impunity”.⁵ While a **λαφυροπώλης** is properly a “seller of booty”, the real sense is “dealer in booty”, since the business involved buying prisoners and anything else that was captured from the enemy and then reselling the goods elsewhere. Despite LSJ s.v. (followed by the *Dictionary*), X. *Lac.* 4. 1. 26 ἦν δὲ λήϊδα ἄγων, πρὸς λαφυροπώλας (“if (someone comes to the king) with booty, (he sends him) to the *laphyropôlai*”) does not show that there were Spartan officials called λαφυροπῶλαι “in charge of supervising booty”, but only that dealers in booty followed the Spartan army on campaign, which is unsurprising.

P.Fam.Tebt. 49 is a list of simple household goods, and **λαχανάρ[ιον]** in fr. B. 2. 1 must accordingly mean not “vegetable market” but ~ “basket for vegetables”.⁶ Cf. **λαχάριον** (omitted) in fr. A. 2. 1.

Hippiatr. 130. 171 is from a section entitled περὶ **λαχανισμοῦ** that discusses how to get one’s horse to eat greens of some sort in the winter: one stews them, rolls them into a ball, adds oil and salt and cumin, etc., meaning that this is not a matter of “pasturing”. ἐὰν ... **λαχανίσαι** θέλης ζῶον accordingly means not “if you want an animal to pick vegetables” but “if you want an animal to consume greens”. At Th. 3. 111. 1, λαχανισμός is an activity parallel to looking for firewood that can be used as an excuse for leaving a city and wandering about in the open country, and the word thus means not “gathering, picking of vegetables” (as if work in a garden were in question) but “gathering greens”.

λαχανοθήκη (glossed “dish of vegetables”; better “vegetable case, vegetable storage vessel”; cf. LSJ s.v. “dish or pot for vegetables”) is not a “v.l.” but the paradosis at Ath. 11. 784 b (preserved only in the

⁵ Cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπικηρύσσω “issue letters of marque”, i.e. “open up to privateering”.

⁶ LSJ Supplement s.v. suggests “vegetable pan”.

Epitome), where this is an item in a list of fantastic gold and silver symposium vessels apparently confiscated from a Persian royal residence by Alexander's men. Kaibel emended to λαγυνοθήκη ("flagon-stand"), which is unattested (and omitted from the *Dictionary*) but at least makes tolerable sense, as the manuscript reading does not.

λάχανον is an umbrella term that covers "vegetables, herbs", both wild and cultivated, but seemingly not "legumes", which are instead a type of ὄσπριον ("pulse"; contrasted with λάχανα at e.g. Gal. 11. 238. 2–3 Κ. τῶν ὀσπρίων τινὰ μετὰ λαχάνων ἐνόμενα).

λαχανοπωλικός at *POxy.* lii 1416. 5–6 ἀπογράφομαι ἔχειν ἐργαστήριον λαχανοπωλ(ικόν) ("I attest that I have a *lachanopôlikos* workshop") means not "pertaining to a vegetable merchant" but "related to selling vegetables".

λαχανόσπερμον is attested repeatedly in papyri, and there is no reason to believe that it means "grass seed" (as in a modern garden store) rather than "vegetable seed" (LSJ s.v.).

A γυῖον is a "limb", and **λαχνόγυιος** – a high-style nonce-word at *E. Hel.* 378 (of wild beasts; lyric) – is accordingly not "that has a body covered with fur, hirsute, shaggy" but "with shaggy limbs" (LSJ s.v.).⁷

Whatever one makes of ἐν προτέροισι πόδεσσι (lit. "in its forefeet") at *Od.* 19. 228–229 ἐν προτέροισι πόδεσσι κύων ἔχε ποικίλον ἐλλόν, / ἀσπαίροντα **λάων** (translated "a dog had (between its paws) a dappled fawn, holding it fast while it struggled"; from the disguised Odysseus' description of the brooch he wore when he left for Troy), 19. 230 ὁ μὲν λάε νεβρὸν ἀπάγχων makes it clear that the dog is not holding the fawn with its paws, although it might be standing on it. Instead, its jaws are around the fawn's neck and strangling it. *h. Merc.* 306 οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸν / αἰετὸς ὁξὺ λάων ἐσκέψατο, where the sense of the verb could be "to see" ('catch, hold with eyesight', < λαμβάνω?) or even "to yell, make noise", may be relevant; see Chantraine, *Dict. étym.* s.v.

⁷ S.v. λαχνώδης (a *hapax*), ground that is covered with flowers or luxurious vegetation, as at *E. Cyc.* 541 λαχνῶδές γ' οὐδας ἀνθηρᾶς χλόης, is not "hairy" – an appallingly misguided image – but might reasonably be described as "downy" (thus LSJ s.v.) or "fleecey".

λεαίνω at Hdt. 4. 122. 1 τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυόμενα λεαίνοντες (of the Scythians, who have camped one day's march ahead of the invading Persian army) is not appropriately glossed “uproot”. Instead, the verb is factitive and the sense of the Greek is ~ “they removed everything that grew from the earth and thus made it smooth”, i.e. “they stripped the country of vegetation”.

Str. 2. 3. 6 ~ 3. 53. 2 claims that “some people” refer to “earth-digging leverets”, i.e. rabbits (see Part I s.v. **λαγώς**), as **λεβηρίδες**, and Erot. p. 93. 10–15 (citing the grammarian Polemarchus) says specifically that the Massaliotes – Greek colonists settled on what is today the southern coast of France – referred to rabbits this way. Cf. Latin *lepus*, on the one hand, and French *lapin* < Middle French *laperiau*, on the other. Varro RR 3. 12. 6 claims that **λεπορίς** (whence *lepus*, which he uses as a generic term for hares and rabbits), which must be the same word, is an old fragment of Aeolian Greek vocabulary. But it certainly looks like he is wrong and this is another Iberian loanword.

The **λεβίας** or **λεβίη** is not a “freshwater fish” but a sea-fish (e.g. Archestr. fr. 28 Olson–Sens = SH 158 καὶ λεβίην λαβὲ ... ἐν περικλύστῳ / Δήλῳ καὶ Τήνῳ, “Buy a *lebiê* in sea-washed Delos and Tenos!”).

Poll. 7. 63 ὅα δὲ τὸ ἐξωτάτω τοῦ χιτῶνος ἐκατέρωθεν, λέγνα δὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱματίῳ ἐκατέρου μέρους, οὐχ ὅπου ἢ ὅα (discussing terms for various parts of garments) is obscure, but seems to be saying that *ôia* is a word for the hem of a tunic, whereas **λέγνα** (glossed “edge, colored hem”; cf. LSJ s.v. “coloured edging or border of a garment parallel to the ὅα or selvage”) is the term for the edge of a himation, since a himation lacks an *ôia*. Cf. Erot. p. 127. 3–4 λέγνα ... ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τὰς τῶν ἱματίων ὅας ... τὸ λέγνον τὴν ὅαν σημαίνει καὶ οἷον τὸ πέρας (“the ancients used the term *legna* for the *ôiai* of himations ... *legnon* means ‘*ôia*’ and as it were the edge”); Hsch. λ 493 λέγνη· τὸ παρυφαινόμενον τῇ παραστροφίδι, ὅπερ ἦν παχὺ περὶ τὴν ὅαν ἐκ ῥάμματος (“*legnê*: the portion that is edged with hemming, which was thick around the *ôia* due to the stitching”). Call. H. 3.12 ἐς γόνυ μέχρι χιτῶνα / ζώννυσθαι **λεγνωτόν** (“to wrap myself in a *legnôtos* tunic that extends to my knee”, glossed “that has a colored edge”) does not support the distinction between himation and tunic, and how the idea that a *λέγνα* is necessarily colored (i.e. decorative) has got into the lexica, is unclear.

λεγωνάριος (*Iaphrodias* 1 168. 6; 2nd/3rd c. CE) is omitted.

S.v. **λέγω**, *Od.* 24. 108 οὐδέ κεν ἄλλως / κρινάμενος λέξαιτο ... ἄνδρας ἀρίστους (Agamemnon in the Underworld reacts to the sight of the Suitors) means not “he could not have chosen the best men in any other way” but “if someone were selecting the best men, he would not do so otherwise”, i.e. “it is as if someone selected the best men in the city (for death)”. Pl. *Lg.* 737 d οὐκ ἄλλως ὀρθῶς γίγναιτ’ ἂν λεχθεὶς ἢ πρὸς τὴν γῆν does not mean “the only way to make the right choice was based on land” but “the choice could not be made properly except with reference to the land”. λέγεται at X. *Cyr.* 1. 2. 1 πατὴρ μὲν δὴ ὁ Κῦρος λέγεται γενέσθαι Καμβύσου is not impersonal, and the sense is thus not “it is said that Kambyses was Cyrus’ father” but “Cyrus is said to have been the son of Kambyses”.

ληλασία is an abstract noun that means not “*pillage*” but “pillaging” at X. *Hier.* 1. 36 τὸ δὲ ἀκόντων παιδικῶν ἀπολαύειν ληλασία ... ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ εὐκέναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀφροδισίοις (“to make sexual use of a boyfriend who does not want it appears to me more like pillaging than romance”). S.v. **ληλατέω**, Long. 3. 2. 1 ἀγροὺς μὲν οὐκ ἐλεηλάτει τῶν Μηθυμναίων means not “he was not plundering the territory of the Methymnians” but “he was not plundering the fields of the Methymnians”.⁸

The *alpha* in **λειμαῖ** (glossed “meadow, grassland”) is marked long but is actually short, as the accent makes clear.

λειμών is clearly a figurative term for female genitalia at E. *Cyc.* 171 ψαῦσαι χεροῖν λειμῶνος (“to touch a meadow with my hands”; something the satyrs aspire to, along with “a handful of breast”). But “‘graces’ of women” is a strange and misleading translation, and the most obvious, basic connection between tenor and vehicle would seem to be a soft, smooth covering of grass ~ hair.

LSJ – followed elsewhere by the *Dictionary* – consistently treats adjectives in -παλης as barytone (e.g. δυσπαλῆς), but accents nouns on the penult (e.g. μονοπάλης). Either Doric **λειοντοπάλας** (glossed “adj. lion-wrestler” [*sic*]) ought to be defined as a noun (as in LSJ s.v.), therefore, or the lemma should be λειοντοπαλάς.⁹

⁸ The lemma λειβηθριάς (glossed “from Mt. Leibethrion”) should be printed Λειβηθριάς.

⁹ S.v. λείος, for “[Xen.] 2. 12” read “[Xen.] *Ath.* 2. 12”.

λειπογνώμων is glossed “toothless, of indeterminable age” but in fact means “that has lost its γνώμονες”, i.e. the teeth that allow one to determine the age of a horse or another domestic animal (X. *Eq.* 3. 1; *SEG* XXXIII 147. 34 αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα (early 4th c. BCE); Poll. 1. 182; 7. 184; Phryn. *PS* pp. 85. 19 – 86. 2). Lexiphanes’ use of the word at Luc. *Lexiph.* 6, along with its presence in Phrynichus, Pollux and others, leaves little doubt that it was regarded as an Attic colloquialism.

S.v. **λείπω**, E. *Hipp.* 1244 ὑστέρω ποδὶ / ἐλειπόμεσθα means not “as we slowed our steps, we were left behind” (of Hippolytus’ friends when his horses bolt) but ~ “we were left behind, since our pace was too slow”. Hdt. 8. 113. 2 οὗτος γὰρ οὐκ ἔφη λείψεσθαι βασιλέος (of the general Hydarnes, when Mardonius was choosing troops to take with him in 480 BCE) means not “indeed, he denied that he would have abandoned the king” but “for this man refused to leave the king’s side” (indirect discourse; what Hydarnes said was οὐ λείβομαι βασιλέος). The translation of S. *Ai.* 543 ἔρποντι φωνεῖς, ἧ λελειμμένω λόγου; (Ajax expresses puzzlement as to why his son has not been brought to him immediately in response to his wife’s command), “Do you speak to the one who is arriving, or to the one who has not understood your words?”) is so awkward as to be almost incomprehensible; what Ajax means is ~ “Is the man you summoned on his way? Or did he miss your order?”. Hdt. 9. 66. 1 οὐκ ἠρέσκετο ... λειπομένου Μαρδονίου ἀπὸ βασιλέος means not “he was not happy that the king had left Mardonius in Greece” (thus approximately Godley in the Loeb, as if the text read ὑπὸ βασιλέος) but “he was unhappy that Mardonius was left in Greece apart from the King”. σφι is a plural form, and Hdt. 9. 45. 2 ὀλιγέων γὰρ σφι ἡμερέων λείπεται σιτία accordingly means not “he has only a few days’ supply of food left” (thus again approximately Godley in the Loeb) but “they have only a few days’ provisions left”.

λειριοπολφανεμώνη is a comic nonce-word at Pherecr. fr. 137. 8. Poll. 6. 61 (citing Ar. fr. 701) thinks that πολφοί (normally plural) are something resembling pasta (πολφοὶ δέ τι ἐκαλεῖτο, μηρύματα ἐκ σταιτός, ἃ τοῖς ὀσπρίοις ἐνέβαλλον, “there was something referred to *polphoi*, which were strands of dough, which they added to pulse”, *sc.* when they were stewing it; cf. Hsch. π 2953 = Phot π. 1071 πολφοί· τὰ ἐκ τῶν χίδρων καὶ τῆς ἐρικ(τ)ῆς ἐψόμενα, “*polphoi*: a stewed dish made from wheat-groats and barley meal(?)”), while Erot. p. 111.13 believes they are bulbs. But nothing suggests that an “*omelet*” of any sort is in question in Pherecrates.

λειτορεύω (glossed “*make sacrifices*”) is not Attic vocabulary but seems to be restricted to Thessaly (attested in inscriptions already in the 4th c. BCE).

S.v. **λείτωρ** (glossed “*priest*”), the reader is referred to s.v. **λήτωρ**, but no such lemma exists.

λειψανδρία at Cyr. *Is.* 2. 678 e is not “*scarcity of people*” but “*scarcity of men*”, as what follows makes clear (seven women will seek to attach themselves to a single man, if he will only let them call themselves his wives). Cf. the gloss at Hsch. λ 563 λεῖψις ἀνδρῶν (“*a lack of men*”).

λείψανδρος at Σ E. *Or.* 249 is rightly lemmatized as a two-termination adjective but is glossed as a noun (“*she who abandons her husband*” rather than “*husband-abandoning*”, i.e. “*adulterous*”).¹⁰

λεκανίδιον and **λεκάνιον** are both formally diminutives of **λεκάνη** (glossed “*dish, bowl, pan*”). But Petersen suggests that the former is equivalent to its primitive (cf. s.vv. **λίσγον/λισγάριον** below), while the latter is sometimes a true diminutive and sometimes means “*a kind of λεκάνη, a λεκάνη-like object*”.¹¹

λεκανοσκοπία (a *hapax*) at Man. 4. 213 is literally “*examination of a bowl for purposes of divination*”. But the preceding line (σαφεῖς θ’ ὕδρομάντιας ἔρξε, “*he carried out reliable acts of water-prophecy*”), along with occasional references elsewhere to **λεκανομαντεία** and **λεκανομάντεις**, make it clear that what was actually looked at and manipulated was water that was poured into the bowl.

λέκιθος (glossed “*pureed beans*”) is actually a thick soup or porridge made of barley, beans, lentils or the like; cf. Arnott on Alex. fr. 260. 2. ἔτνος (glossed “*legume puree*”) appears to be very similar, and pureeing – i.e. mechanical reduction of the food in question to a paste – is again not obviously in question there. There is no reason to believe that the word is related to **λεκάνη** (“*dish, bowl, pan*”). A **λεκιθόπωλις** (glossed

¹⁰ Cf. **λεκτέος**, which is similarly lemmatized as a verbal adjective < λέγω but is nonetheless glossed as a noun (“*that which should be said*”). It is unclear why such forms require separate lemmata in any case.

¹¹ Petersen 1910, 83, 89, 92, 228.

“*woman who sells bean flour*”) is a woman who sells such soup/porridge on the street (Ar. *Lys.* 427, cf. 562); Poll. 7. 198 also knows masculine λεκιθοπώλης (omitted).

λεκτικός is glossed “*capable of speech, skillful at talking*”; but at Pl. *Pol.* 304 d τῆς πειστικῆς καὶ λεκτικῆς (τεχνῆς), the third passage cited as an example of this, the sense is in fact – as properly – “associated with speech”. The second definition offered of the adjective (“*suitable for discourse*”) is merely another way of expressing this in English rather than a separate sense of the word.

λελογισμένως ὅπως ἔσονται at Hdt. 3. 104. 1 ἐλαύνουσι ἐπὶ τὸν χρυσὸν λελογισμένως ὅπως καυμάτων τῶν θερμοτάτων ἐόντων ἔσονται ἐν τῇ ἀρπαγῇ is translated “figuring out how they might be”. But the crucial word is an adverb, and the Greek actually says “they drive out to gather the gold in a way calculated to ensure that they will be snatching it when the temperatures are at their height”.

At NT *Mark*¹² 15:34 ~ *Matt.* 27:46, the dying Jesus is reported to have said in Aramaic “My god, my god, **λεμα σαβαχθανι**,” which the Evangelists translate **ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες**; “Why did you abandon me?” Aramaic **λεμα** ~ Hebrew לָמָּה, “for what reason?”; Jesus does not say “*because* you abandoned me”.

λέμβος at D. 32. 6–10 is glossed “*boat, dinghy that follows a ship*”; the text there, combined with Anaxandr. fr. 35. 7 ὀπισθεν ἀκολουθεῖ κόλαξ τῷ, λέμβος ἐπικέκληται (“a flatterer follows someone – he’s nicknamed *lembos*”) makes it clear that the vessel in question is what LSJ terms a “*cockboat*”, i.e. a small boat towed behind a larger ship and used (when untied) e.g. to get people or cargo back and forth to shore (cf. Lycurg. *Leocrat.* 17). There is no reason to believe that this is specifically a felucca (as in s.v. **λεμβώδης**), which is defined *inter alia* by its use of a triangular (“lateen”) sail of a sort seemingly first employed in the Mediterranean in the Imperial period. The **λιβυρνικά** (“Liburnian vessels”; better **Λιβυρνικά**) mentioned at Plu. *Cato min.* 54. 5 are likewise small ships of some sort, but there is no obvious reason to believe that they are specifically feluccas.

¹² Mistakenly abbreviated “Mar.”, as also s.v. **λαμά**.

The name used at Str. 4. 6. 6 for what is today called Lac Leman (glossed “*Lake Geneva*”, an English calque of a term used in Geneva but – unsurprisingly – unpopular elsewhere in Switzerland) is not ἡ **Λεμέννα** λίμνη but ἡ Λημέννα λίμνη.

Pumpkin is a New World crop, and σικύης **λέμματα** at Hp. *Mul.* 2. 117 is accordingly not “pumpkin rind” but “gourd rind”.

The adjective **λέμφορ** seemingly means “*inept*” at Men. *Epitr.* 561 λέμφορ, ἀπόπληκτος, οὐδαμῶς προνοητικός, and there is no reason to believe that it means anything different at Men. fr. 383 γέρων ἀπεμέμυκτ’ ἄθλιος λέμφορ (“a wretched, *lemphos* old man had wiped their/our/your nose”, i.e. “made a fool of them/us/you”; cf. Kassel–Austin 1998 *ad loc.*), where the word is glossed “*snotty, catarrhal*”.

For **λέξεις** meaning ~ “vocabulary items, glossed terms”, note in Athenaeus alone not just 11. 485 e Μόσχος δ’ ἐν ἐξηγήσει Ῥοδιακῶν Λέξεων (“Moschos in the explanatory notes to his *Rhodian Lexeis*”) but e.g. 3. 76 f Φιλήμων δ’ ἐν Ἀττικάῃς Λέξεσι (“Philemon in his *Attic Lexeis*”); 11. 494 f Πάμφιλος ἐν Ἀττικάῃς Λέξεσι (“Pamphilus in his *Attic Lexeis*”); 14. 619 b Ἀριστοφάνης δ’ ἐν Ἀττικάῃς ... Λέξεσιν (“Aristophanes in his *Attic Lexeis*”).

λεοντέη/λεοντή (glossed “*lion skin*” and lemmatized as a noun, following LSJ s.v.) is actually a substantive use (*sc.* δορά) of the adjective **λεόντειος**. Likewise, **λεοντήνη** (glossed “*the territory of Leontinoi [sic]*” and lemmatized as a noun) is a substantive use (*sc.* χώρα) of the adjective **λεοντῖνος** (“of Leontini”).

λεοντηδόν (glossed “*like lions*”) at *II Macc.* 11:11 is a normal adverbial formation, as in e.g. ἰππηδόν, κυνηδόν, ταυρηδόν; the word is also attested in two late lexicographic notes, presumably referring to this passage. The v.l. **λεόντινον**, by contrast, is nonsense (and is therefore not printed by editors of *II Macc.*) and should not have been lemmatized.

Λεοντίς at *AP* 5. 201. 1 is correctly lemmatized as feminine but is nonetheless misdescribed as a “male name”.

LSJ s.v. **λεοντοβάμων** (glossed “*standing on lion’s feet*”; of a basin at A. fr. 225. 2) rightly notes that the second element in the adjective is

< βῆμα, not βαίνω; the *Dictionary*'s reference to Poll. 10. 77 is unnecessary, this merely being the place where the fragment is preserved (without comment). **λεοντόβασις** at *IG* II² 1425. 349 σκάφη λεοντόβασ[ις] is glossed “*pedestal in the form of the lion*”, which appears to represent a misunderstanding of LSJ s.v. “*base in form of a lion*” with reference to the same line of the inscription and others. But λεοντόβασις is clearly an adjective equivalent in sense to λεοντοβάμων there (thus “a basin with lion’s feet”), as also at e.g. *ID* 1417 face B. 11 ἐσχάραν λεοντόβασιν ἐπίπυρον ἔχουσιν π[υ]ρφόρον. Elsewhere, it seems to be a noun meaning ~ “lion foot”, as at e.g. *IG* II² 1544. 64]κρον λεοντοβάσεις ἔχων, or in the singular “base featuring lion feet”, as at e.g. *ID* 1441 col. II. 58 τρίποδα περιηργυρωμένον λεοντόβασιν ἔχοντα. See below on **λιθόβασις** (a seeming parallel but actually a ghost word).

Str. 16. 1. 24, 16. 4. 9 refers to various places as “nourishing lions”, i.e. “breeding lions”, and λεοντοβότος rather than **λεοντόβοτος** (unhelpfully glossed “*pertaining to food for lions*”) is accordingly printed there (despite LSJ s.v., which glosses “fed on by lions”). The proparoxytone form of the word (attested nowhere else) should be struck as a lemma.

λεοντοκόμος (glossed as a noun, “*one who raises lions*”) and **λεοντομάχος** (glossed as a noun, “*one who fights with a lion*”) are both adjectives and mean “lion-rearing” and “lion-fighting”, respectively. **λεοντοφόνος** is likewise not “*lion-killer*” but “*lion-killing*”.¹³

Despite the implication of “Stratt. fr. 87 etc.”, **λεπάζω** (glossed “*cook*”) is a *hapax*,¹⁴ hence the widespread sense among editors that the word (or the glosses on it) may be corrupt; see Orth 2009 *ad loc.* Part of the problem is that **λέπασμα** (glossed “*covering, skin*”) has a sense that does not match that of the verb from which it ought to be derived.

S.v. **λεπαῖος**, E. *IT* 324 φυγῇ λεπαίας ἐξεπίμπλαμεν νάπας appears to mean not “we hurled ourselves in flight along rocky crags” but “we filled rocky crags by means of flight”, i.e. “we fled and made the rocky crags crowded with our presence”.

¹³ S.v. λεοντόχοτος, the reference should be to “A. fr. 330” (unhelpfully cited by a Mette number).

¹⁴ Hsch. λ 604 λελεπασμένον· εἰς πέσιν ἦκον is merely another reference to the same fragment (cited at Phot. λ 174 λελεπασμένον· πεπεμμένον. οὕτως Στράτις).

Hsch. λ 661 = Phot. λ 192 maintains that the rare **λέπαργος** (glossed “white, whitish”) can mean not just “with an entirely white hide” but also “with white flanks” (τοῦ λαπάρας λευκάς ἔχοντος ἢ ὅλον τὸ δέρμα). The lemma there, **λεπάργου βοός**, = adesp. tr. fr. *231, the reason for the identification being that the adjective is otherwise attested only in poetry – but note that “A. fr. 304. 5” is a Nauck number, and that in modern editions this is S. fr. **581. 5 (of a hawk; corrected in the LSJ Supplement, which is ignored by the *Dictionary*). The word is in any case applied only to animals.

A **λεπαστή** (glossed “cup, jar, shaped like a λεπάζ”, i.e. like a limpet or more precisely a limpet shell) is certainly a cup rather than a jar and must be cognate with **λέπω** (“peel”), **λοπίς** (“fish-scale”), **λοπάς** (“stewing pan”) and **λεπάζ**. Beyond this, the word is obscure; see Olson–Seaberg 2018 on Cratin. fr. 468.

λέπιδι is mentioned only at Ath. 3. 119 b κόττα καὶ λέπιδι, 9. 385 a κόττανα ἡμᾶς καὶ λέπιδιν; in the latter passage these are referred to by the speaker (a Syrian) as τὰ πάτριά μου νόμιμα βρώματα (“the traditional foods of my native country”). Neither word seems to be Greek, and there is accordingly no reason to believe that it is equivalent to **λεπίδιον** (glossed “pepperweed, medicinal plant” – scarcely a “traditional food”).¹⁵

S.v. **λεπιδόομαι**, “[B] subst. λεπιδωτός *lepidotos*, large scaled fish of the Nile, Hdt. 2. 72 | precious stone, Orph. *L.* 287” is out of place (repeated where it belongs below s.v. **λεπιδωτός**).

For “accusative of relation” s.v. **λεπρώω** as an explanation of Hp. *Epid.* VI 17 ἐλέπρα τὴν κύστιν, read “accusative of respect”.¹⁶ Herod. 3. 51 τὴν ῥάκιν λελέπηκε is likewise an accusative of respect and means not “he took the skin off his back” (i.e. in the course of a beating, and as if the verb were a secondary tense), but ~ “his back has grown rough, grown scaly” (of a boy who spends his time in the woods rather than in school).

Λεπρεῖτις (lemmatized as a noun and glossed “territory of Lepreon”) is in fact in that sense a substantive (*sc.* χώρα) of an exclusively feminine adjective comparable in form to Τεγεᾶτις and Σπαρτιαῖτις. Cf. **Λευκαδία**

¹⁵ This nonetheless seems to be the logic behind the claim at LSJ s.v. that pepperweed (i.e. *Lepidium latifolium*) is a specifically “Syrian plant”, which does not appear to be the case.

¹⁶ So too s.v. **λεπρώω**.

(lemmatized as a noun glossed “territory of Leukas” but in fact merely a substantive use of the adjective **Λευκάδιος**, “*Leukadian*”).

λεπταλέον at Call. *H.* 3. 243 ὑπήεισαν δὲ λίγεια / λεπταλέον σύριγγες is described as an “adverbial neuter” but is actually an internal accusative (“sing delicate accompaniment”) that can be translated adverbially (“sing delicately in accompaniment”). Ar. *Av.* 235 ἀμφιτιτυβίζεθ’ ... λεπτὸν and Bion *Adon.* 9 λεπτὸν ἀποψύχων (both quoted s.v. **λεπτός** and similarly described as “adverbial neuters”) are additional examples of internal accusatives that can be understood adverbially.

As LSJ s.v. – comparing **παππεπίπαπος** (“grandfather’s grandfather”) and **φανλεπίφανλος** (“bad-upon-bad, as bad as can be”) – notes, **λεπτεπίλεπτος** (clumsily glossed “*very subtle, very light*”) is literally “*thin-upon-thin*, i.e. *as thin as thin can be*”. Although the word is cited at Nicar. *AP* 11. 110. 1, it is also found at [Hero Mechanicus] *Mens.* 60. 1, suggesting that it and the formation strategy it represents are not poetic but colloquial. Cf. **πολλὰ** ... (ἐ)πὶ πολλοῖς (lit. “many upon many”, i.e. “again and again”) at e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 411 with LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ B. I. 1. d.

λεπτίτιδες κριθαί at *Gp.* 3. 3. 12 is reasonably translated (following LSJ s.v.) “very fine variety of barley”. What the note fails to make clear is that **λεπτίτις** (attested nowhere else) is an adjective (exclusively feminine).

ἡ λεπτή Γένεσις (“*Little Genesis*”), not ἡ **Λεπτογένεσις**, is the standard way of referring to the *Books of Jubilees* in the Greek Church Fathers. The latter appears as a variant in one manuscript of Epiphanius of Salamis *Haer.* 39. 6, which is insufficient reason for lemmatizing it, particularly without reference to the standard reading.

Arist. *PA* 657 b 2 ὁ ἄνθρωπος ... λεπτοδερμότατος is translated “man has very thin skin”, but **λεπτοδερμότατος** is a true superlative here: in comparison to other animals, human beings allegedly have skin around the pupils of their eyes that is the thinnest there is, and they accordingly blink more often.

λεπτοκάρυον is misleadingly glossed “*nut*”. This is instead a term for some specific variety of nut, presumably one with a thin shell. Gal. VI. 609. 14–15 K. claims that it is an alternative name for the **κάρυον Ποντικόν** (probably “hazelnut”).

λεπτόκνημος is glossed “*fine- or weak-legged*”, but the word means “thin-shanked” (LSJ s.v. “*spindle-shanked*”); cf. above on **λασιόκνημος**.

λεπτοποιητικός is an adjective (“thinning”) but is glossed as a noun (“*that which makes one thin*”).

Although the root-sense of **λεπτοσχιδής** at Cephisod. fr. 4 is patently “*with narrow slits*” *vel sim.*, Poll. 7. 85, 87 (quoting the fragment) reports that this was used as the name of some otherwise obscure style of fashionable, expensive sandals worn by women. Dioscurides uses the word repeatedly of leaves (2. 139. 1, 2. 176. 1; 3. 24. 1), presumably those in which the blade is dissected into multiple leaflets.

λεπτοτομέω at Str. 15. 2. 14 is used in the context of a description of how the Carmani eat tongues cut from the heads of their dead enemies. The verb must thus mean “*cut into small pieces*” rather than “*break into small pieces*” there.

λεπτότρητος (glossed “*that has small holes, perforated by small cavities*”) is used once by Dioscurides, of sponges (5. 120. 1). But the adjective is far more common in Galen (ignored), who applies it repeatedly to sieves (e.g. XIII. 635. 4 K. **λεπτοτρήτοις κοσκίνους**).

λεπτόφυλλος in botanical descriptions (e.g. Thphr. *HP* 3. 12. 7) probably means “*narrow-leaved*” (i.e. with long, thin leaves) rather than “*thin-leaved*” (i.e. with leaves that lack substance, that are not thick).

A husk (**λέπυρον**) is by its very nature – from a human perspective – a small and trivial thing, and there appears to be no difference in meaning between the primitive and its formal diminutive **λεπύριον** (glossed “*small husk, pellicle*”¹⁷); cf. Petersen 1910, 166.

λεπόχανον is used of the skin of an onion at Theopomp. Com. fr. 34. 3, which does not mean that this is “usually” the case (e.g. of a pomegranate husk at Dsc. 1. 74. 2; of lupine pods at Gal. XII. 445. 9 K.; of a nutshell at Gal. XIII. 256. 5 K.). There is no reason to believe that the word is cognate with **λάχανον** (“vegetable”).

¹⁷ But “*pellicle*” implies a membrane or skin, rather than a hard wrapper like a nutshell, eggshell, or beanpod, which is how both words seem to be used.

λέπω is normally “*husk, shell, peel*”, and Arnott on Alex. fr. 50. 3 argues that the idea at Antiph. fr. 133. 3 μάζης μελαγχρῆ μερίδα λαμβάνων λέπει (“he takes a swarthy piece of barley-cake and *lepei*”) must be that the subject “first removes the crust”, perhaps to save it for another meal. But barley-cake was not baked, so perhaps the man tears his food apart or the like. In any case, Casaubon’s claim (adopted by LSJ s.v., followed by the *Dictionary*) that **λέπω** has the unique meaning “eat” in the passage is merely a context-driven guess responding to the difficulty of getting the verb to mean what it should there.

Λεσβιάζω – unhelpfully, if in a very basic sense accurately, glossed “act like Lesbians” (see above s.v. **Λακεδαιμονιάζω**) – means “give blow jobs”.¹⁸

Λεσβιάς is glossed “from Lesbos, Lesbian” but without noting that this is an exclusively feminine form of the ethnic, like e.g. Ἀχαιῖάς (“Achaean woman”) or **Λημνιάς** (glossed “from Lemnos”, but with the restriction of the adjective to women similarly ignored).¹⁹ Cf. below s.v. **Λευκανίς**.

λεσχηνεύω (“be a chatterbox”; attested already in Hippocrates) assumes the existence of **λεσχὴν** (“chatterbox”; first attested at Timo SH 820. 2); neither word is derived from **λέσχημα**, a dubious variant at [Hp.] Ep. 17. 294 (IX. 378. 7 Littré) that ought not to have been lemmatized. **λεσχηνεία** at [Pl.] Ax. 369 d²⁰ (an abstract, and thus “chattering” rather than “chatter”) is likewise not from **λέσχημα**.²¹

λευγαλέος is poetic and, despite the impression created by the note, is attested not just in Homer but in Hesiod (*Op.* 525, 754), Theognis (1174)

¹⁸ The *Dictionary*’s unwillingness to define the word further even via the use of euphemism seems odd in early 21st-century America. LSJ s.v. was at least brave enough to add “Latin *fellare*”.

¹⁹ S.v. Λέσβιος, the substantive use of the adjective to refer to some specific type of cup or jug (not “cup, jug”) at Hedy. HE 1840 requires an initial capital.

²⁰ The *Axiochus* is today universally regarded as spurious; failure to acknowledge this distorts the history of the word and its cognates implicitly presented in these entries. The same is true of the Roman-era pseudo-Hippocratic *Epistles*.

²¹ Λευγαία (the name of one of the regiments of the Macedonian cavalry; mentioned at Arr. An. 2. 9. 3) is lemmatized. The name of the other regiment, Ἀνθεμουνσία, is nonetheless ignored.

and Sophocles (fr. 785; 1062), and is subsequently picked up not just by Philotas but also by Aratus (1. 108), Timo (*SH* 840. 7), Apollonius Rhodius (e.g. 1. 295), and Oppian (e.g. *Hal.* 1. 375).

λευκάλφιτος at Sopat. fr. 3 is an epithet of Eretria and means not “*made of white flour*” but “*where the barley is white*” *vel sim.*

S.v. **λευκανθής**, the adverb ἄρτι is used specifically of time (“just now”) and not to express limitation generally. S. *OT* 742 χνοάζων ἄρτι λευκανθὲς κάρα thus means not “his hair was scarcely turning gray” but “he was just now getting the first sprinkles of gray on his head”.

The adjective **Λευκανίς** (glossed “*belonging to Lucania*”) is exclusively feminine, like e.g. Δαρδανίς.

λευκαντής is glossed “*person who dyes white, fuller*”. But fuller and λευκαντής appear to be separate occupations (specifically distinguished at e.g. *PGenova* 1 24. 5–7), and *POxy.* LIV 3743. 19 makes it clear that the latter handled linen, whereas the former dealt with woolen garments.

λευκανγής (glossed “*shining white*”) is used of the body of a cuttlefish (not “a fish”) at Antiph. fr. 216. 20 (miscited by the old Kock-number as fr. 217. 20) and is a bit of mock-dithyrambic blather.

“*white fig*” is not a translation but a calque of **λευκερινεός**, and precisely what sort of tree is in question was obscure already in antiquity (Ath. 3. 76 c). An ἐρινεός is in any case a wild fig tree rather than a domesticated one.²² So too “*whitefish*” is a calque rather than a translation of **λευκίσκος** (seemingly a generic term for various gray mullet varieties) in Hicesius *ap.* Ath. 7. 306 d–e.²³ The latter gloss is particularly unfortunate given that English “whitefish” refers generically to a group of mild-flavored fish that includes e.g. salmon, trout and bass, but not mullet.

²² English “bough” refers to one of the main branches of a tree, and D. 18. 260 ἐστεφανωμένους ... τῇ λεύκη (cited s.v. λεύκη) accordingly means not “crowned with poplar boughs” but “crowned with poplar”, i.e. with poplar twigs woven into garlands.

²³ Cf. s.vv. λιθίασις and λιθιάω, where LSJ’s dated “*disease of the stone*” and “*suffer from the stone*” (referring to kidney stones and the like) are replaced by the even more obscure calques “*lithiasis*” and “*suffer from lithiasis*”.

ἡ λεύκη (lemmatized as **Λεύκη** and glossed “*Leuke*, place at Athens”) at And. 1. 133 (something beneath which Agyrrhius and his friends met) is clearly a recognizable spot in the city. The easiest explanation of the passage would seem to be that this was simply a well-known poplar tree.²⁴ “**Λευκή -ῆς ἡ** Demosth. 7. 40, see *Λευκή*” immediately after this appears to represent a garbled attempt to suggest that the place referred to in Demosthenes is the same as the one mentioned at Hdt. 7. 25. 2 (= **1. Λευκή, ἄκτῃ, ἡ** [*sic*]).

The high-style *hapax* **λευκήρετος** at E. *IA* 283 (of war and thus of warships; lyric) means not “*white-branched*” but “with white oars (*ἑρετμοί*)”.

λευκίππος (glossed “*of the white horses, who has or rides or guides white horses*”) is elevated poetic vocabulary attested already at Stesich. *PMG* 256; Ibyc. *PMG* 285. 1 (both omitted). The word modifies “streets” at Pi. *P.* 9. 83 *λευκίπποισι Καδμείων ... ἀγνυαῖς*, and the *Dictionary* accordingly glosses it “*full of white horses*” there. As Slater 1969 s.v. observes, however, the intended sense is *λευκίππων Καδμείων ἀγνυαῖς* (“the streets of Cadmeians mounted on white horses”; hypallage).

λευκογραφίς is glossed “*chalk, for writing*” with reference to Plin. *Nat.* 27. 103. In fact, this is a plant which Pliny reports can be used as a drug against spitting up blood and excessive menstrual flows and as part of a salve for various conditions (*utilis proditur sanguinem excreantibus tribus obolis cum croco, item coeliacis, trita ex aqua et adposita profluvio feminarum, oculorum quoque medicamentis et explendis ulceribus quae fiant in teneris partibus*). **λευκογραφία**, drawn from Plin. *Nat.* 37. 162, where the Loeb editor Eichholz glosses “white chalk”, has been omitted from the *Dictionary*, suggesting that portions of the two entries have been carelessly run together.

Α διφθέρα is a “skin” in the sense “piece of leather”, and **λευκοδίφθερος** (attested only in Hesychius, who offers the gloss **λευκοδέρματος**) thus probably means “covered in white leather” rather than “*white-skinned*”

²⁴ For a similar landmark, cf. Cratin. fr. 372 (an αἴγειρος – a different variety of poplar, a λεύκη generally being taken to be a white poplar rather than simply a “poplar” – located somewhere above the Theater of Dionysus) with Olson–Seaberg 2018 *ad loc.*

(as in “craftsmen tend to be white-skinned, in contrast to farmers, who are tan”; see below on λευκοπληθής).

λευκοθρακία at *Gp.* 5. 17 is not a “white vine” but a particular variety of vine that bears white grapes with a reddish blush; the vines themselves are said to be red (αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ κλήματα ἐρυθρὰ ἔχει).

λευκομήλινος is glossed “yellow”. But λευκέρυθρος is “pale red” (of a person’s complexion), i.e. “pink”;²⁵ λευκομέλας is “pale black” (i.e. “gray”); λευκόχλωρος is “pale green” (generally of complexions); and λευκόχρυσος is “pale gold” (of a stone); so λευκομήλινος must be “pale yellow”. Note also λευκορόδιος (omitted), which must mean “a pale rose color”, at *PPrinc.* II 82. 37; and the problematic λευκόσπανος (βέλος).

The Λευκὸν Τεῖχος in Memphis (some sort of citadel occupied by Persian troops) at *Hdt.* 3. 91. 3 is not the “White Rock” but the “White Wall”.

With reference to an individual item of clothing, “dress” is used in English only of female costume;²⁶ since λευκοπάρυφος refers to a man at *Plu. Mor.* 180 e, it cannot be glossed “with a white-hemmed dress”. In addition, the word is contrasted with ὀλοπόρυφος – in response to admiring comments about Antipater’s austere style of life, Alexander comments drily that he is λευκοπάρυφος on the outside, but “100% purple on the inside” – and the real sense of “white-bordered” is clearly that Antipater does not have a fancy purple border on his robe, i.e. he is not εὐπάρυφος/φοινικοπάρυφος.

λευκοπληθής at *Ar. Ec.* 387 means not “full of people dressed in white” (cf. *LSJ* s.v. “full of persons in white”) but “full of people with white complexions” (in reference to the women who have infiltrated the Assembly).

²⁵ Contrast λευκόπυρρος (of hair), which seems to mean ~ “ginger-colored”. Prefixes based on μέλας are used in a similar fashion to mean “dark-” (thus e.g. μελάγχλωρος, μελαμπόρυφος, μελανόφαιος, μελανόχλωρος).

²⁶ This is not to say that a man cannot wear a dress, but only that this is by definition an act of transvestism. Contrast the generic use of the word in “He wore formal dress for the occasion”.

λευκόπρωκτος at Call. Com. fr. 14. 2²⁷ is properly “with a white asshole” not “*white-bottomed*”.²⁸ The sense is patently abusive, combining notions of femininity (since white skin was ideally characteristic of women; see above on λευκοπληθής) and passive sexuality (see Part I on λακκόπρωκτος). Cf. λευκόπυγος (glossed “*white-buttocked*”) at Alex. fr. 322 (expressly identified by Eustathius, presumably relying on an older authority such as Suetonius, as meaning ἀνανδρος, “unmanly”). Contrast the heroic μέλαμπυγος Myronides at Ar. *Lys.* 802.

λευκόπτερυξ is not “dubious” at Ion *PMG* 745. 3 – unhelpfully cited as fr. 10 Bergk – but a conjecture by Bentley for the paradosis λευκῆ πτέρυγι (printed with Doric *alpha* by e.g. Page).

At Q. S. 12. 414, λευκαῖ ... ὀπωπαί are not “*eyes afflicted with glaucoma*” but “*eyes afflicted with cataracts*” (medically an entirely different phenomena and one that makes the eye seem to be covered with a large white spot). To “*know τὸ λευκόν*” (unhelpfully glossed “*white, the color white, whiteness*”) is apparently a colloquial expression ~ “*know up from down*” (thus Σ^{VEΓΘ} Ar. *Eq.* 1279); cf. Matro fr. 1. 35 Olson–Sens = *SH* 534 τὸ λευκὸν καὶ μέλαν οἶδε (“*she knows white and black*”, i.e. “*white from black*”).

LSJ s.v. (followed by the *Dictionary*) takes λευκόσπανος – patently a color-word meaning “*pale [something]*”; see above s.v. λευκομήλινος – at *PHamb.* 1 10. 17 to mean “*pale grey*”. The text at that point in the papyrus is problematic, and a better reference would be to *PHamb.* 1 10. 19–20 φαινόλην λευκοσπανὸν τέλειον λακων[ό]σημον. LSJ’s reasoning is obscure, but the word is in any case not < σπάνις (“*scarcity, dearth, lack*”) but apparently < LSJ’s “σπᾶνός = Lat. *pullus*”.

λευκοσώματος (glossed “*white*”; of loaves of bread and thus conveying the idea “*made with the finest flour*”) at Antiph. fr. 174. 3 is another bit of para-dithyrambic language (cf. s.v. λευκανυγής above) that is intended to bear its full – openly absurd – sense “*having a white body*” there, as if e.g. a beautiful woman were being described. The obscure λευκόσωμοι at *CCA* 11(2) 136. 23 (in a list of personal physical characteristics) ought probably to be emended to λευκοσώματοι.

²⁷ Often regarded as corrupt; see Kassel–Austin 1983 *ad loc.*

²⁸ Cf. the similarly evasive “*having wide or broken buttocks*” (*sic*) s.v. εὐρύπρωκτος. Note also that cognate εὐρυπρωκτία (glossed “*having wide buttocks*”) is a noun.

λευκότης, first attested at Hdt. 4. 64. 3 (omitted), is not “white” but “whiteness”.

As Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* observes, **λευκότροφα** (obscurely glossed “that grows white”) at Ar. Av. 1100 “may be either passive, ‘white-fed’, i.e. berries grown from the fragrant white blossom ..., or active (λευκοτρόφα) ‘white-feeding’, i.e. the white and nourishing berries”.

λευκουργέω is cited (following LSJ) by reference to CIG 2749; the proper modern reference is *Iaphrodisias* 12 914. 5. The verb is better translated “fit with white marble, face with white marble” than “furnish with white marble”. A **λευκουργός** (glossed “stone-cutter”) is distinguished from a **λατόμος** (glossed “quarry man, stone cutter”) at *IDidyma* 102. 61; a more specialized craft (“marble-worker”)?

λευκοφλέγματος is rightly lemmatized as an adjective but is translated as a noun (“patient suffering from leukophlegmatia”;²⁹ read “suffering from leukophlegmatia”). The condition **λευκοφλεγματία** itself is translated “dropsy” (following LSJ s.v.); this is an archaic term for what is today called “edema”, i.e. generalized swelling of the body due to retention of water (often resulting from congestive heart failure).

λευκόψαρος is a color-term for a donkey³⁰ at *Hippiatr.* 14. 5. The *Dictionary* glosses “grayish”, following LSJ s.v. “whitish grey”. But ψαρός appears to mean “with markings like a starling (ψάρ)” (of a horse at Ar. Nu. 1225; glossed “dapple grey” by LSJ s.v.), and **λευκόψαρος** ought thus to mean “with light markings like a starling” (cf. above on **λευκομήλινος** etc.), i.e. ~ “colored a light dapple gray”.

S.v. **λευκόω**, the ὅπλα in question at X. HG 2. 4. 25 ὅπλα ἐποιοῦντο are not “weapons” but “shields”, as what follows makes clear (some were of wood, others of wickerwork), and the shields are not the subject of the verb in the next clause (ταῦτα ἐλευκοῦντο) – unacceptable in Attic – but the object: “they were painting them white”.

²⁹ For the *Dictionary*’s tendency to translate by means of transliteration or obscure calques in such situations, rather than effectively explaining the term in question, see above s.vv. λευκερινεός/λευκίσκος.

³⁰ The *Dictionary* translates “asses”, a word used in colloquial American English almost exclusively to mean “buttocks”, and is thus unnecessarily confusing when the more common term is available.

Λευκτρίδες – which ought to mean “daughters of Leuktris” – at Plu. *Pel.* 20. 5 is confusingly glossed “*daughters of Skedasos*”. What Plutarch actually says is “The graves of the daughters of Skedasos are located in the Leuktros plain; they call them *Leuktrides* because of the place”.³¹

λευκώλενος (“white-armed”; always of women) is epic language, attested not just in Homer but in Hesiod (e.g. *Th.* 314), the *Hymns* (e.g. *hAp.* 95), Empedocles (31 B 3. 3 D.–K.), and Matro’s mock-epic *Attic Dinner-party* (fr. 1. 38 Olson–Sens = *SH* 534. 38), and found a number of times in both Pindar and Bacchylides (e.g. 5. 99).³² But the elegiac, iambic and other lyric poets never use it, nor does tragedy – making it out of place in Lucian’s mock-tragic *Podagr.* 93 – or comedy. It likewise never appears in Apollonius Rhodius. Nonnus has it, but only twice (4. 19; 15. 241).

Λεύκωμα is not a “*white tablet of gypsum*, used as a public register” but a piece of wood – generally referred to as a *πίναξ* or *πινάκιον* – painted white and used for posting public notices, maintaining public records, and the like (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 450; [Arist.] *Ath.* 48. 4; Poll. 8. 104).

λευκωματίζω (glossed “*to suffer from leucoma*”, i.e. from a white spot on the eye) is attested only once, in the aorist passive in a *scholion* on [A.] *PV* 499 τὰ λευκωματισθέντα, where the reference is metaphorically to sight and the sense is “made white” and thus “afflicted with cataracts”. Either the word must be defined “cause to suffer from cataract”, therefore, or it must be lemmatized as middle-passive λευκωματίζομαι, as in LSJ s.v.

λεύκωσις at Olymp. Alch. ii p. 88. 21 is not “*whiteness*” but “*whitening*”.

S.v. **λεύσσω**, *Od.* 9. 166 Κυκλώπων δ’ ἐς γαῖαν ἐλεύσσομεν means not “we looked toward the land of the Cyclops” but “we looked toward the land of the Cyclopes (pl.)”. μάταια at S. *Tr.* 407 εἰ μὴ κυρῶ λεύσσω μάταια is an internal rather than an external accusative, and the words mean

³¹ ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τῷ Λευκτρικῷ πεδίῳ τὰ σήματα τῶν τοῦ Σκεδάσου θυγατέρων, ὡς Λευκτρίδας καλοῦσι διὰ τὸν τόπον.

³² LSJ Supplement s.v. notes in addition a 6th-c. BCE inscribed finger-ring from Argos with the word (used of Hera) published by Tracy 1986.

not “if I don’t turn out to be looking at nothing” but “if I’m not looking in vain”, i.e. “unless I’m blind”. *Od.* 10. 30 πυρπολέοντας ἐλεύσσομεν means not “we saw fires being lit” but “we saw people tending fires”.

λεῦω (“pelt with stones, stone”) is attested already at Hippon. fr. 37 ἐκέλευε βάλλειν καὶ λεύειν Ἰππώνακτα and A. fr. **132 c. 1 λεύσουσι τοῦμὸν σῶμα (both ignored).

The Λεωκόρειον was not a “temple of the daughters of Leos, at Athens” but a shrine to them in the Agora; see Hornblower on Th. 1. 20. 2.

S.v. λέων, NT *Rev.* 5:5 ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα means not “the lion of the tribe of Judah” but “the lion from the tribe of Judah”.

λήθαιος/ληθαῖος is rightly lemmatized as an adjective but is glossed as a noun (“*that which makes one forget*”; read “causing forgetfulness”).

ληθαργία (glossed “*sleepiness*”) at *adesp.* com. fr. 910. 2 is part of a catalogue of diseases and thus probably a disease itself (~ “stupor, lethargic fever, depression”).

S.v. λήθη, Jos. *BJ* 4. 31 ἐν λήθῃ τοῦ καθ’ αὐτὸν ἀσφαλοῦς γενόμενος means not “forgetting their own safety” but “forgetful of his own personal safety” (of Vespasian in the Battle of Gamala).

ληϊᾶς is glossed “*prisoner*” (following LSJ s.v. “*taken prisoner, captive*”). But the sense of the Greek is much darker than this (“taken as plunder, taken as a slave”), and the fact that the word is exclusively feminine is ignored. A Homeric *hapax*, picked up insistently by Apollonius Rhodius (4 x) and Quintus Smyrnaeus (8 x).³³

³³ S.v.v. ληϊβότειρα and ληϊβότηρ, read instead ληϊβότειρα and ληϊβότηρ. Why the words are lemmatized separately is unclear, the former simply being the feminine form of the latter (as LSJ is aware), even if seemingly treated as a noun, although without a definite article (ληϊβότειρα -ης). S.v. ληϊδῖος (glossed “*captured as booty, prisoner*”, for which read “taken as booty, taken prisoner”), the translation of Jul. *AP* 6. 20. 1–2 Ἑλλάδα ... θῆκεν ἐφ’ ἀλλεῖ ληϊδῖν as “she captured Greece with her beauty” catches the sense of the Greek but not in a way that makes sense of the vocabulary (better “she took Greece captive with her beauty”). ληϊζω is in the imperfect at Th. 1. 5. 3 ἐλήζοντο δὲ καὶ κατ’ ἡπειρον ἀλλήλους (not “they plundered one another on dry land as well” but “they used to

ληκάω at Pherecr. fr. 253 and Ar. *Th.* 493 does not mean “*practice fellation*” (*sic*; better “perform fellatio”) but is a crude colloquialism for “have intercourse”; see Bain 1991, 70–72; Austin–Olson 2004 *ad loc.*

If **λήκημα** at Epic. fr. 414 Usener means “*din*”, it is < ληκέω rather than ληκάω. If it is in fact < ληκάω, it means not “*obscenity*” but “obscene behavior”.

The metrical term **ληκόθιον** is described as “trochaic dimeter catalectic” (i.e. the sequence – ◡ – × – ◡ –), “(name derived from the parody of Ar. *Ra.* 1200–47)”. But the term *lekythion* is also used for the unit – ◡ – × – ◡ – in iambic trimeter, as in the section of Aristophanes referred to, where what is meant is “name derived from the parody at Ar. *Ra.* 1200–1247”, the lines in question all being absurd reworkings of Euripides.

Photius λ 258 = *Suda* λ 437 in fact glosses S. fr. 1063 **ληκυθιστής** (a *hapax*) not “*who speaks or declaims in an emphatic or deep voice*” (actually a noun, “one who ...”) but ὁ μικρόφωνος (“one who speaks in a small voice”, whence LSJ s.v. “*one who declaims in a hollow voice*”). Meineke wanted to emend to μακρόφωνος, which must be the source of the error.

S.v. **λῆμα**, E. *Med.* 348 ἥκιστα τοῦμόν λῆμ’ ἔφν τυραννικόν means not “to be sure, my will is not tyrannical” but “my will/spirit is not tyrannical at all” (ἥκιστα adverbial). At Ar. *Ra.* 602 παρέξω ’μαυτὸν ἀνδρεῖον τὸ λῆμα, ἀνδρεῖον modifies not τὸ λῆμα (translated “manly courage”) but ἐμαυτόν, with τὸ λῆμα as an accusative of respect (lit. “I will furnish myself courageous in will”, i.e. “I’ll act brave”).

plunder one another etc.”), and in the perfect at E. *Hel.* 475 οὐ τί πον λελήϊσμεθ’ ... λέχος; (not “surely I am not robbed of my wife?” but “surely I have not been robbed of my wife?”). D. S. 11. 88. 4 Τυρρηῶν ληζομένων τὴν θάλατταν means not “the Etruscans practiced piracy at sea” but literally “the Etruscans plundered the sea”, with the place where this was done specified in the immediately preceding phrase (κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν, “around Sicily”). That the imperfect active appears twice in Thucydides (3. 85. 2; 4. 41. 2) as a v.l. for the middle-passive is a point of no significance, since the verb is never used in the active except in very late sources, hence LSJ’s more sensible lemmatization as ληΐζομαι.

ληματίας is treated as an adjective at Ar. *Ra.* 494 ληματίας κἀνδρεῖος εἶ (thus e.g. Wilson's OCT). The *scholia ad loc.*, by contrast, take the text to read ληματιᾶς κἀνδρεῖος εἶ (thus Dover), as if from ληματιάω (omitted).³⁴

λήμη is a prosaic term for what in colloquial English is often referred to as an “eye booger”. The advice – attributed to Pericles at Arist. *Rh.* 1411 a 15–16, and to Demades at Ath. 3. 99 d, but in any case clearly to be understood as a lively, memorable image – Αἴγιναν ἀφελεῖν ... τὴν λήμην τοῦ Πειραιέως thus means not “to get rid of Aegina, which is an eyesore to the Piraeus (*sic*)” but ~ “to get the booger Aegina out of the Piraeus’ eye”. The more polite (because more oblique) alternative English word is “sleep” (by extension, this being something that occasionally accumulates in one’s eye while one is sleeping), which is what the *Dictionary* seems to be attempting to communicate by glossing **λημίον** as “*piece of sleep*”. **λημότης** (a *hapax*) at Σ^{Ald} Ar. *Nu.* 327 is glossed “*pain in the eyes*” but ought presumably to mean ~ “condition in which one has λήμη in one’s eye”.

For **Λημνιάς** (glossed “from Lemnos”, but used only of women), see above s.v. **Λεσβιάς**. **Λημνίς** (a *hapax* at Nic. *Th.* 865), **ληστρίς** (often used substantively of pirate ships), **Λοκρίς**, **λοξότροχis** and **λουτρίδες** are similarly restricted to use with feminines.

λημψαπόδοσις at *PLond.* I 77. 50 τὴν πᾶσαν λημψαπόδοσιν ὑπὲρ ἔμο(ῦ) ποιήσασθαι is the equivalent of a gerund that means not “*receipts and payments*” but “receiving and giving away”, i.e. “taking in money and paying it out”.

To be continued.

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

³⁴ A peculiar omission, given the *Dictionary*’s seemingly firm and systematic ideological commitment to valorizing variant readings of all sorts even when they have no chance of being correct (e.g. s.vv. **λεόντινον**, **λέσχημα** and **ληϊζω** above).

Bibliography

- C. Austin, S. D. Olson (edd., comm.), *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford 2004).
- D. Bain, “Six Verbs of Sexual Congress”, *CQ* NS 41 (1991) 51–77.
- N. Dunbar (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford 1995).
- R. Kassel, C. Austin (edd., comm.), *Poetae comici graeci*. IV. *Aristophon – Crobylus* (Berlin – New York 1983).
- R. Kassel, C. Austin (edd., comm.), *Poetae comici graeci*. VII. *Menecrates – Xenophon* (Berlin – New York 1989).
- R. Kassel, C. Austin (edd., comm.), *Poetae comici graeci*. VI 2. *Menander: Testimonia et Fragmenta apud auctores servata* (Berlin – New York 1998).
- S. D. Olson, “Firewood and Charcoal in Classical Athens”, *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 411–420.
- S. D. Olson, R. Seaberg (edd., transl., comm.), *Kratinos frr. 299–514. Translation and Commentary*, *Fragmenta comica* 3. 6 (Göttingen 2018).
- C. Orth (ed., comm.), *Strattis. Die Fragmente. Ein Kommentar*, *Studia comica* 2 (Berlin 2009).
- W. Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -iov; a Study in Semantics* (Weimar 1910).
- W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969).
- S. V. Tracy, “An Early Inscribed Gold Ring from the Argolid”, *JHS* 106 (1986) 196.

Part II. Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9th 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 II. Полвека тому назад Роберт Ренеган опубликовал ряд дополнений, уточнений и поправок к девятому изданию монументального словаря Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon* (1940), дополненного группой издателей во главе с Барбером (1968). Нестоящие заметки к леммам на букву *лямбда* призваны сыграть аналогичную роль по отношению к новому *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*.

CONSPECTUS

GAUTHIER LIBERMAN

Petits riens sophocléens : *Antigone* IV (v. 773–777, 795–802, 857–861, 883–888, 902–903, 925–928, 955–961, 970–976, 1019–1022, 1029–1030, 1033–1039, 1039–1043, 1074–1076) 173

ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

Plato's Last Word on Naturalism vs. Conventionalism in the *Cratylus*. I ... 196

SOFIA EGOROVA

How Ancient Were Vitruvius' *veteres architecti* (*De arch.* 1.1. 12–13)? 234

DENIS KEYER

Trimalchio's Superstitions: Traditional Customs or Their Distortion? I ... 241

TOMMASO BRACCINI

Sulla rotta di Taprobane: nuove allusioni geografiche nelle *Storie vere* 265

JAN SHAVRIN

Bemerkungen zum Kondolenzbrief *P. Ross. Georg.* III 2 293

S. DOUGLAS OLSON

Philological Notes on the Letter *lambda* in a New Greek-English Dictionary. II. λασιόκνημος – λημψαπόδοσις 299

Keywords 326