

Philological Notes on the Letter *alpha* in a New Etymological Dictionary of Greek, with Particular Attention to Material from Hesychius*

S. Douglas Olson

University of Minnesota

sdolson@umn.edu

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0253-990X>

Notas filológicas sobre la letra *alfa* en un nuevo diccionario etimológico del griego, con especial atención al material de Hesiquio

Until recently, the two standard Greek etymological dictionaries were Frisk 1960 and Chantraine 1968 (second edition: 1999, third edition: 2009), although Frisk was not in a position to consider the evidence of Linear B, and neither author took account of laryngeal theory. By contrast, laryngeals are central to many entries in Beekes 2010, which has accordingly become a fundamental research tool in the field of classical studies. The detailed philological notes offered here focus instead on Beekes' handling of the Greek language itself, with special attention to material drawn from Hesychius. The implicit argument is that the handling of Greek in the new dictionary is often unreliable, and that readers should treat its handling of ancient texts, in particular the lexicographers, and thus many of its individual conclusions, with caution.

Keywords: etymology; dictionary; Greek; lexicography; Hesychius.

Hasta hace poco, los dos diccionarios etimológicos griegos estándar eran Frisk 1960 y Chantraine 1968 (segunda edición: 1999, tercera edición: 2009), si bien Frisk no estaba en condiciones de tomar en consideración la evidencia del Lineal B, y ninguno de ellos tuvo en cuenta la teoría laringal. Por el contrario, las laringales son fundamentales para muchas entradas en Beekes 2010, que se ha convertido en una herramienta de investigación fundamental en el campo de los estudios clásicos. Las notas filológicas detalladas que se ofrecen aquí se centran en cambio en el manejo de Beekes de la lengua griega en sí, con especial atención al material extraído de Hesiquio. El argumento implícito es que el manejo del griego en el nuevo diccionario es a menudo poco fiable, y que los lectores deben tomar su manejo de los textos antiguos, en particular los lexicógrafos, y por lo tanto muchas de sus conclusiones individuales, con precaución.

Palabras clave: etimología, diccionario, griego, lexicografía, Hesiquio.

* I gratefully acknowledge support for my research in 2021-2022 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).

Citation / Cómo citar este artículo: Olson, S. Douglas (2023): «Philological Notes on the Letter *alpha* in a New Etymological Dictionary of Greek, with Particular Attention to Material from Hesychius», *Emerita* 91 (1), pp. 1-25.

Etymological dictionaries of Greek are extremely important for serious philological research on the language, but are also rarely produced. This is due in large part to the enormous breadth and depth of knowledge required for such projects, including the ability to work with practical aspects of linguistic theory, on the one hand, and obscure ancient lexicographic sources, on the other. Until recently, the two standard works were Frisk 1960 and Chantraine 1968 (second edition: 1999, third edition: 2009), although Frisk was not in a position to consider the evidence of Linear B, and neither author was able to take account of laryngeal theory, which has enormously expanded our understanding of numerous ancient Greek words and their affiliations with cognates in other Indo-European languages. By contrast, laryngeals are central to many individual entries in Beekes 2010, which forms part of the Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series published by Brill. Despite its lack of detailed attention to Mycenaean Greek, Beekes' dictionary has accordingly become a fundamental research tool in the field of classical studies, and the history of the discipline suggests that no replacement for it is likely to be produced for a generation or more.

Like standard scholarly research tools of other sorts—lexica and encyclopedias, for example—dictionaries have an implicit authority, especially when they are produced by major academic publishing houses. The reader is almost by definition not an expert on the topic at hand, and in the case of Greek in particular, may well lack sufficient training e. g. to read difficult texts at sight or to track down material that is cited imprecisely. Instead, the reader generally comes to an etymological dictionary or similar reference work in search of accurate, reliable information that can be treated as standard and used as a basis for other projects of some sort. Put another way, it is a legitimate assumption that basic research tools of this type should represent a combination of overall intellectual balance and scrupulous accuracy in matters of detail.

Vine (2012, pp. 1-6) offers a series of critical comments regarding the editing and structure of De Vaan's *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* (part of the same Brill series), all of which can be

applied *mutatis mutandis* to the *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*¹. Meissner (2013) and de Decker (2016) concern themselves primarily with Beekes' problematic conception of 'pre-Greek'². The notes that follow, by contrast, focus on his handling of the language itself, with particular attention to lexicographic material drawn mostly from Hesychius. One general aim of this article is to improve our understanding of a number of rare or difficult words handled in the *Dictionary*. But I simultaneously wish to suggest that Beekes' handling of the Greek language is not always to be relied upon in matters of detail, and that readers should accordingly treat his quotations and translations, in particular of the lexicographers, and the conclusions dependent on them, with considerable caution³.

S. u. ἀβαλιῆ, Hsch. α 62 first glosses the word ἀχρεῖον Λάκωνες («the inhabitants of Laconia (use this to mean) 'worthless'») and then comments

¹ «No one will deny the author's talent and industriousness, among other laudable qualities this book makes evident ...; and few will deny the utility of the end product, at least in certain respects. But the work is characterized by a number of unfortunate flaws, not all of them to be laid at the author's doorstep, which in my view render this project deeply unsatisfying and in large part a lost opportunity ... The doorstep at which many of these flaws must be laid is that of the publisher. ... This is, in short, one of the most poorly-edited works of scholarship that I have ever seen—and the atrocious quality of the editing is all the more galling in view of the outrageously high cost of the book ... It is difficult even to know where to begin; but let us start with typographical errors, which are legion ... The repeated failure to provide textual references ... is often acutely frustrating, especially with hapax legomena and other rare material ... One is thus grateful when, all too rarely, textual citations are provided—yet these are not reliable ... The language of the text is English, but only in a manner of speaking. ... The sorry catalog of slipshod editing sketched in this and the preceding sections ... ought to be deeply embarrassing for Brill, and cannot be excused—indeed, was no doubt partly caused— by the haste to put this book into print». Simkin (2011, p. 1) claims that «The English» of Beekes' dictionary «is excellent» and «The typographical standards are equally high». In fact, both are just as poor as Vine notes is the case with the sister volume devoted to Latin, and Simkin's observation that a «generous feature is the decision to translate the sometimes baffling definitions from Hesychius» —the vast majority of which are in fact left untranslated—also suggests disengagement from the actual work under review. George (2011) is generally more appreciative, but concludes (p. 52): «a missed opportunity».

² In general, Beekes is concerned to rehabilitate the findings and approach of Furnée (1972).

³ The discussion that follows is confined to the letter *alpha* for reasons of length; there is no reason to believe that a more comprehensive study would produce results of a notably different character.

οἱ δὲ νωθρόν. Beekes translates the last three words «others (use it to mean bastard)», as if the word in question were νόθος rather than νωθρός, which means ‘sluggish, stupid’ and makes better sense as a rough parallel for ἀχρεῖον.

ἄβαξ is glossed ‘board for calculating or drawing’, with reference to Cratinus and Aristotle. Cratinus (fr. 93) in fact uses the word to refer to a serving-platter (for nuts), while at [Arist.], *Ath.* 69.1 it is a board of some sort used for physically counting voting tokens.

Cunningham gives Hsch. α 84 in the form ἄβαρύ· ὀρίγανον Μακεδόνες, in which the gloss does indeed mean ~ «the Macedonians (use this to mean oregano)». But Beekes prints instead ὀρίγανον (τὸ ἐν) Μακεδονία, ‘the variety of oregano found in Macedon’, which *inter alia* fails to identify this specifically as a Macedonian term.

The final two glosses at Hsch. α 109 ἀβέρβηλον (obscure) are printed by Beekes as ἀχάιστον, μάταιον and glossed «empty, rash». The text in fact reads ἀχάριστον, μάταιον and is better translated ~ ‘clumsy, useless’; cf. Hsch. α 229 ἀβύρβηλον· πολύ, μάταιον. οἱ δὲ δασύ και συρφετῶδες, ἢ ἀναίσχυντον, ἐπαχθές (miscited as s. u. ἀβύβηλον).

The first gloss at Hsch. α 112 ἀβήρ· οἴκημα στοὰς ἔχον, ταμεῖον Λάκωνες is translated «house provided with storehouses». But οἴκημα here patently means ~ ‘structure’, in reference to a public building. Cf. below on ἄργελλα.

ὑπότριμμα βαρβαρικόν, the definition of ἀβυρτάκη offered at *Suda* α 103, is glossed «a foreign dish». But ὑπότριμμα is much more specific than this and refers to a pesto (< τρίβω ‘grind’) of some kind; cf. Pherecr. fr. 195 ἀβυρτάκην τρίψαντα (‘grinding an *abyrtakē*’). Theopompus Comicus fr. 18 (miscited as «Suid. 17 Kock», with the author’s name given simply as «Theopompus») ἴξει δὲ Μήδων γαῖαν, ἔνθα ... ποιεῖται ... ἀβυρτάκη) is cited from Meineke’s edition of the comic fragments, with the paradosis ἴξει in place of Bekker’s ἴξει, and translated «he will arrive in Media, where the ἀβυρτάκη is made»; read ‘you will come to the land of the Medes, where ἀβυρτάκη is produced’.

S. u. ἀγάλλομαι, Hsch. α 258 offers not ἀγαλλιάζομαι· λοιδορεῖσθαι but ἀγαλλιάζει· λοιδορεῖται (= gloss. Ital. 52 Kassel–Austin), and the final word means not «slander» (i. e. ‘speak badly of someone to others’) but ‘abuse verbally’ (i. e. ‘speak nastily to someone to their face’).

S. u. ἀγείρω, the gloss at Hsch. γ 411 γέργερα· πολλά means «lots» (i. e. ‘numerous’) but not «often».

S. u. ἀγέτρια, the gloss at Hsch. α 4250 reads not ἡ ταῖς τικτούσαις ὑπηρετοῦσα γυνὴ παρὰ Ταραντίνοις but ἡ ταῖς τικτούσαις ὑπηρετοῦσα γυνή, παρὰ Ταραντίνοις οὕτως λεγομένη, and means not «woman who watches over the midwives in Tarentum» but ‘the woman who attends those who are giving birth, referred to thus among the people of Tarentum’.

For the incomprehensible gloss «weaving stones» offered s. u. ἀγνύς, read instead ‘loom weights’, as in LSJ.

S. u. ἀγορά, ἀγοράσις at Pl., *Sph.* 219d means not «purchase» but ‘purchasing’ (a verbal noun, i. e. a gerund)⁴.

S. u. ἄγος, the gloss τεμένη at Hsch. α 407 means not «consecrated piece of land» but ~ ‘specially allotted piece of land’ (< τέμνω ‘cut’; not restricted to public land carved out for deities). Note also that ἐναγίζω is generally intransitive and thus means not «sacrifice to the dead» but ‘make sacrifice to the dead’.

S. u. ἀγοστός, the obscure Homeric ἔλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῶ (e. g. *Il.* XI 425) may in fact have led some Hellenistic poets to take the word to mean «arm, elbow», but note A.R. III 120 χειρὸς ἀγοστόν (‘palm of the hand’).

S. u. ἄγριππος, Zenob. 1.60 cites the proverb ἀκαρπότερος ἀγρίππου (‘less fruitful than an *agrippos*’) and adds a claim that this was a Spartan term for the wild olive (Λάκωνες γὰρ τὴν ἀγρίαν ἐλαίαν ἄγριππον καλοῦσιν). Hsch. α 814 offers ἄγριφος instead, glossing the word not γένος τι ἀγρίας ἐλείας, as Beekes would have it, but γένος τι ἀγρίας ἐλαίας (‘a type of wild olive’) and adding Ὀλυμπίασιν (‘at the Olympic games’); the reference is apparently to the material for the victor’s crown at the contests, which is elsewhere referred to as the κοτίνου στέφανος (e. g. Ar., *Pl.* 585-6).

As glosses of ἀγχοῦρος, Hsch. α 922 offers first ὄρθρος· Κύπριοι (‘the time just before dawn: the inhabitants of Cyprus [use this word]’) and then φωσφόρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῶ, obscurely translated «bringer of light and what comes with him» by Beekes (who writes ὄρθρός). Hesychius must be referring to the morning-star (LSJ s. u. φωσφόρος I.1.b), i. e. the planet Venus, and thus presumably in the second half of the gloss to the other stars ‘that accompany it’. For ὄρθρος, see Burnett (1924), on Pl., *Cri.* 43a1; Gow (1952), on Theoc. XVIII 14; Wallace (1989) (all ignored s. u.). For an exten-

⁴ Immediately before this s. u. ἀγορά, correct the unfortunate «do shoppings» as a gloss of ἀγοράζω to ‘do one’s shopping’.

ded sense of the word ('close to'), note Lyc. 418 Ἀψυνθίων ἄγχουρος ἡδὲ Βιστόνων; A.R. III 1386 ἀγχούροισιν ἐγειρομένου πολέμοιο.

S. u. ἄγω (glossed «squeeze, strangle»), Galen (not cited by Beekes) repeatedly contrasts ἀγκτήρ (glossed «tool for sewing up wounds» by Beekes) with ῥαφή ('suture' or 'stitching') (e. g. X 190.1, 12; X 230.7-8; XI 127.15 K.). That fact, combined with the etymology, suggests that the object in question is not a needle or the like but e. g. a sort of compression bandage (cf. LSJ s. u. «instrument for closing wounds»).

S. u. ἄγω, Hsch. α 629 glosses ἄγμα with σύντριμμα and κάταγμα (both understanding ἄγμα as being < ἄγνυμι 'break'; = LSJ s. u. I), and then with κλέμμα (< κλέπτω 'steal'). Beekes follows LSJ s. u. in accepting the reading, which he glosses «theft», the point then apparently being that an ἄγμα can also be something 'carried off', i. e. stolen (cf. LSJ s. u. ἄγω I 3). Cunningham in his edition of Hesychius replaces the manuscript's κλέμμα with κλάσμα (< κλάω 'break'); cf. Hsch. α 603 ~ *Synag.* α 74 ἄγμασι· κλάσμασιν; *Synag.* Β α 77 ἄγμα· σύντριμμα, and for the confusion Hsch. δ 2355 δρέμμα· κλέμμα. οἱ δὲ κλάσμα. Hsch. α 629 might be a mixed set of glosses, although ἄγμα < ἄγω is attested nowhere else. But κλέμμα is in any case just as likely to mean 'stolen object' (LSJ s. u. I.1) as «theft» (LSJ s. u. I 2)⁵.

S. u. ἀδευκής (a seemingly unfavorable adjective), Σ A.R. I 1037 and a number of other late authorities (e. g. *Et.Gen.* α 65) gloss δεῦκος not as γλεῦκος ('must, new wine') but as τὸ γλυκὺ ('that which is sweet'). Beekes' attempt to dispose of the gloss («most improbable») by suggesting that ΓΛΕΥΚΟΣ might be a majuscule error for ΓΔΕΥΚΟΣ thus runs so wide of the primary evidence as to be irrelevant.

Following LSJ Supplement, Beekes glosses ἀδουσιάσασθαι at *IG* II² 553.15 καὶ φυλῆς καὶ δήμ[ο]υ κ[α]ὶ φρατρ[ί]ας εἶναι / [α]ὐτῷ ἀδουσιάσασθαι ἧς ἂν β[ο]ύληται ('that he have the right ἀδουσιάσασθαι whichever tribe, deme and phratry he likes') as «to accept the membership of». But he also notes Hsch. α 1177 ἀδουσιασάμενοι (glossed ὁμολογησάμενοι, which Beekes translates «agreed») and 1179 ἀδούσιον (glossed ἐραστόν· σύμφωνον, which Beekes translates «pleased, harmonious, agreed», with «harmonious» and «agreed» both seemingly intended to gloss σύμφωνον). ὁμολογησάμενοι is middle rather than passive (thus 'in agreement', not 'agreed upon'); Hesy-

⁵ S. u. ἀδευκής, ἐνδουκέως is not the adjective «careful» but the adverb 'carefully'.

chius also offers *διελόμενοι* (ignored by Beekes), which seems to mean ~ ‘determining for themselves’ at *α* 1177; and *ἐραστόν* is ‘beloved, appealing’ rather than «pleased». While the basic point is that the individual in question may become a member of whichever tribe, deme or phratry he likes (thus LSJ’s gloss), therefore, the cognates suggest that the specific sense of *ἀδουσιάσασθαι* is something more like ‘opt for’⁶.

S. u. *ἀέρω*, Hsch. *α* 1401 glosses *Ἀέροπες* as *inter alia ἐν Μακεδονία γένος τι*, which must mean not «lineage in Macedonia» but ‘a clan in Macedonia’, doubtless to be connected with the various kings of Macedon by that name.

Hsch. *α* 1544 glosses *ἀθέλγειν* as *ἀμέλγειν* (‘to milk’), and Erot. p. 48.18-19 claims that a certain Baccheios took *ἀθέλγηται* somewhere in Hippocrates to mean *θηλάζηται ἢ ἐπισπᾶται*. Beekes translates the latter phrase «is suckled, drawn after one», although the latter is incoherent. But ‘suck (milk)’ (in reference to infants) is a sense of the middle of *ἐπισπᾶω* (LSJ s. u. I 6), and Erotian appears to be offering two words that mean either ‘nurses/suckles’ (if these are middles) or ‘is nursed upon’ (if they are passives).

S. u. *ἀθερίζω* (glossed «disparage, neglect»; better Cunliffe’s ‘slight, be indifferent to, think little of’; Homeric), Beekes first compares Hsch. *α* 1561 *ἀθέριστος· ἀφρόντιστος* (‘*atheristos*: heedless’) and then notes Hsch. *α* 1556 *ἀθερές· ἀνόητον· ἀνόσιον· ἀκριβές* (where he translates the glosses as «stupid, not in order, precise») and *α* 1562 *ἀθερής· ὁ σίδηρος ἀτειρής ὅταν θερίζῃ* (where he translates the gloss «indestructible iron when it is heated»). The latter two passages «seem unrelated», he argues, «in view of their meaning». The first gloss in Hsch. *α* 1556 is in fact relevant to the Homeric word, if it is taken to mean ~ ‘paying no attention’. The second means nothing like what Beekes suggests but must instead be translated ‘iron is stubborn when it harvests’ (i. e. when used to mow down crops or men), and the entry is associated with a set of others in the lexicographers that appear to represent a series of baffled attempts to make sense of A. fr. 128 *χαλκὸν ἀθήρητον ἀσπίδος ὑπερτενῆ* (‘*atherêtos* bronze extending over a shield’; in reference to a spearhead?): Hsch. *α* 1541 *ἀθερής· ἦτοι ἀτειρής· ἢ ὁ ἄγαν θεριστικός· ἢ ὑπέροπτος· ἢ θαυμαστός*; *Synag.* B *α* 482 ~ Phot. *α* 474 *ἀθηρής· ἴσως μὲν ὁ ἀτειρής· ἢ*

⁶ Cf. *DGE* s. u. «*acceptar ser miembro de, inscribirse por propia voluntad en*». S. u. Ἄδωνις, the name of the Armenian general and the Phrygian pipe-player requires an accent (Ἄδων rather than Ἀδων).

ὁ ἀντεριστικός. Αἰσχύλος Μέμνονι (Lehrs : Ἀγαμέμνονι codd.; = fr. 128)· ... λαμπρός, ὁ διὰ λαμπρότητα ἀθρούμενος. ἢ ὁ ἀθερίζων καὶ οὐδένοσ ἔχων λόγον διὰ σκληρότητα. ἢ ὁ ὀξύς, παρὰ τοὺς ἀθήρας.

S. u. ἀθήρ —translated, following LSJ, with the archaic «awn», which means ‘a stiff bristle’, followed by the more helpful «plur(al) “chaff, barb of a weapon, spine or prickle of a fish”»— Beekes compares Hsch. α 5124 ἀνθήριξ, glossing the latter word «ear». This definition too is drawn from the older lexicon, but abbreviated in a way that obscures the sense (LSJ «*beard* of an ear of corn, the *ear* itself»).

S. u. ἀθρέω, the gloss at Hsch. α 1621 ἀθρήματα· δῶρα πεμπόμενα παρὰ τῶν συγγενῶν ταῖς γαμουμέναις παρθέναις means not «gifts having been sent by kinsfolk to maidens being given in marriage» but ‘gifts sent by relatives to girls who are marrying’ (this being the normal sense of the middle of γαμέω).

S. u. αἰγίλιψ, the second gloss at Hsch. α 1713 ὑψηλὴ πέτρα καὶ πόλις καὶ ἰτέα does not mean «a citadel» but is a reference to the city called Aigilips at Hom., *II*. II 633 καὶ Αἰγίλιπα τρηχεῖαν.

S. u. αἰγίς, the combination of the repeated use of the word in the sense ‘heart-wood of a πεύκη [“pine”]’ at Thphr., *HP* III 9.3, 7 with its appearance at *IG* I³ 386.99; 387.109 (late 5th-century building accounts from Eleusis) αἰγίδος χσύλ[α], makes it clear that this was an established specialized term. What Theophrastus means at *HP* III 9.8 οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀρκαδίαν ἀμφοτέρα καλοῦσιν αἰγίδα καὶ τὴν τῆς πεύκης καὶ τὴν τῆς ἐλάτης is thus not that the word was an Arcadianism, but only that his Arcadian informants extended it to refer to the heart-wood of the fir (properly λοῦσσον, at least in Attic)⁷.

S. u. αἶγλη 2, the gloss ἀμφιδέας, καὶ ψέλια τὰ περὶ τὴν ὕνιν τοῦ ἀρότρου at Hsch. α 1729 αἶγλας is translated «iron rings, anklets, things around the plow-share» by Beekes. It actually means ‘anklets/bracelets, and the rings around the share of a plow’. For the first meaning, cf. Hsch. α 1730 αἶγλη· χλιδῶν, Σοφοκλῆς Τηρεῖ (fr. 537) (*aiglê*: an ornament; Sophocles in *Têreus* (fr. 537)).

Beekes glosses αἰκάλλω «flatter, fondle» and identifies this as tragic vocabulary. The first definition is correct; the second is not; and the word is far more common in comedy (Ar., *Eq.* 48, 211; *Th.* 869; Pl.Com. fr. 248) than it is in tragedy (only E., *Andr.* 630, in an author fond of occasional colloquialisms).

⁷ For αἰγίς meaning ‘speck in the eye’ in Hippocrates, the reader is directed to s. u. ἀγλίη, a misprint for αἰγίς.

αἴκλον (glossed «evening meal at Sparta») is identified as first attested in Epicharmus (early 5th century). But it is already found in the 7th century in Alcman (*PMG* 95b); note also συναικλίας in *PMG* 95a.

S. u. αἰόλος, the cognate αἰολίζω means not «trick with words» (i. e. ‘deceive’) but ‘trick out with words’ (i. e. ‘render verbally appealing’).

S. u. ἄκαινα, the gloss of Σ A.R. III 1323 μέτρον δεκάπουν, Θεσσαλῶν εὔρεμα means not «a ‘ten foot rod’ in Thessaly» but ‘a unit equivalent to ten feet, invented by the Thessalians’.

S. u. ἀκή 2, Hsch. α 2378 ἀκὴν ἦγες· ἠσυχίαν ἦγες represents two different ways of saying not «you were bringing quiet/calm» (external accusative) but ‘you remained quiet / calm’ (internal accusative).

S. u. ἀκκῶ, the sense of the cognate ἀκκίζομαι at Pl., *Grg.* 497a οἶσθα, ἀλλὰ ἀκκίζῃ (‘you know, but *akkizēi*’) is not «adorn oneself» but ‘affect ignorance’ (cf. Ast’s “*dissimulo*”). Likewise *Suda* α 946⁸ γυνὴ ἐπὶ μωρία διαβαλλομένη, ἣν φασιν ἐνοπτρίζομένην τῇ ἰδίᾳ εἰκόνι ὡς ἕτερα διαλέγεσθαι is not «woman slandered to be crazy» [*sic*] but ‘a woman disparaged for stupidity, who they say saw her own image in a mirror and spoke to it as if it were another person’⁹.

The gloss of ἄκμων at Hsch. α 2457 reads οὐρανός, ἢ σίδηρον (translated by Beekes «heaven, iron»). The first gloss ought probably to be printed Οὐρανός and interpreted as a garbled allusion to the fact that the father of the primordial deity Sky was said by some to have been named Ἄκμων (e. g. Alcman. *PMG* 61). Additional material in Cyril’s lexicon (from manuscript S) makes it clear that the obscure second gloss refers to an anvil made of iron: ἐφ’ ᾧ ὁ χαλκεὺς χαλκεύει (‘upon which a bronze-worker forges bronze’)¹⁰.

S. u. ἀκροάομαι, the well-attested cognate ἀκρόασις (normally ~ ‘lecture’) appears to have the alleged sense ‘lecture hall’ only once, at Plu., *Mor.* 58c

⁸ Unhelpfully cited as «*Suda* 1, 87». The material appears to be drawn from Suet. *περὶ Βλασφ.* p. 7.51-52 (also excerpted in the paroemiographers), which adds a story about how Akkō took a half-finished garment off a loom and tried to wear it. She is mentioned already by the philosopher Chrysippus (3rd century BCE) and was the subject of a comedy by Amphis (4th century BCE).

⁹ Cf. *Suda* σ 953 φασι τὴν Ἀκκῶ μωρὰν οὔσαν σπόγγῳ πάταλον κρούειν (‘they say that Akkō, who was a fool, tried to drive a stake with a sponge’).

¹⁰ Cunningham compares Hom., *Od.* III 434 (of the equipment of a human craftsman); note also Hom., *Il.* XVIII 476; *Od.* VIII 274 (both of the equipment of the divine blacksmith Hephaistos).

ἔδρας τε τὰς πρώτας ἐν ἀκροάσεσι καὶ θεάτροις καταλαμβάνοντας ('taking front-row seats in *akroaseis* and theaters'); probably better explained as a mild *zeugma*.

ἄκτηρίς is glossed (following LSJ) as «bar of wood supporting a chariot pole», with reference to Poll. X 157, which reports καλεῖται δὲ οὕτως καὶ τὸ τὸν ῥυμὸν τοῦ ἄρματος ἢ τῆς ἀμάξης ἀνέχον ξύλον, ὅταν ἄζευκτος ᾖ ('this is a term for the piece of wood that supports the bar of a chariot or wagon when the team has been unhooked'). Pollux adds that Lysias (fr. 508) referred to the same object as a στήριγξ, a term for which Plu., *Mor.* 280f reports that the Roman (i. e. Latin) equivalent was φοῦρκα. Cf. Hsch. σ 1830 στήριγγες· ἐρείσματα. οἱ δὲ τὸ δίκρουν, ὅπερ ὑποτιθέασι τῷ τῆς ἀμάξης ζυγῷ ('*stêringes*: supports. Others (define it as) the forked object they place beneath the wagon pole'). An ἄκτηρίς was thus not the rough equivalent of a horizontal modern hitching-post, but a Y-shaped piece of wood driven into the ground, allowing the wagon pole to be set between the two arms.

ἀλαζών is attested first not in Arist(otle) but in Ar(istophanes) (e. g. *Ach.* 109).

S. u. ἀλάομαι, cognate ἀλήμων (glossed by Beekes «roving») is not an adjective but a noun ('vagrant'; Hom., *Od.* XVII 376; XIX 74 πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες).

S. u. ἀλέα ('warmth'), the nominal cognate preserved at Hsch. α 3295 is not ἀλυκτρὸν but ἀλυκρὸν (glossed εὐδινόν, which LSJ treats as roughly equivalent to εὐδιος, -ον, 'calm, fine, clear, of air, weather, sea'; Beekes «splendid (of weather)'). The *hapax* ἀλεῖς is the *paradosis* reading at S., *Ph.* 859, where the chorus tells Neoptolemos (with reference to Philoktetes, who has momentarily drifted off to sleep) 'The wind is at your back, child, at your back. The man has no eyes, he has no defense and is wrapped in night, an excellent ἀλεῖς sleep', which would have to mean 'in the warmth of the sun'. But the weather and the temperature are not at issue here; the point is instead that now is the time for Neoptolemos to act to seize the bow, while Philoktetes is momentarily beyond any fear of evil being done to him. Despite Beekes, Reiske's ἀδεῖς (a simple majuscule error, ΑΛΕΗΣ written for ΑΔΕΗΣ) is thus almost certainly correct.

S. u. ἀλείτης, the gloss at Hsch. α 3227 ἀλοιταί should be printed not κοιναί, ἀμαρτωλαί, ποιναί but ἀλοιταί· κοιναί ἀμαρτωλαί, ποιναί, and thus means not «common, faults, requitals» but 'common faults, requitals'.

S. u. ἀλείφω ('anoint with oil'), the ἀλειφατίτης (ἄρτος) mentioned in Epich. fr. 46 is not «bread baked with oil» but —as suits the etymology—

‘bread with oil poured over it’. Beekes glosses ἀλειφάς (attested only in papyri) «spreading [of ointment], shaving» [*sic*]. It seems instead to be part of a formular legal phrase καθαρὸν ἀπὸ ἀλείφατος καὶ ἐπιγραφῆς *uel sim.* (e. g. *BGU* II 666.31) that attests that a document has not been altered or added to in any way (cf. *LSJ* s. u. «*blotting out, erasure*»; *DGE* s. u. «*cualquier tipo de corrección mediante raspadura o tachadura en un documento escrito sobre papiro o tablilla encerada*»).

S. u. ἀλέω (‘grind’), Beekes glosses ἀλητός with the non-word «mealing»; read ‘grinding’, i. e. ‘work in a mill’. Cognate ἀλίνω in S. fr. 995 is glossed λεπτόνω at Phot. α 952 = *Synag.* B α 974. Beekes follows *LSJ* in taking this to mean «pound», which he then pronounces «unclear». But λεπτόνω suggests instead ‘make thin, reduce’, which is a reasonable description of the result of the process of milling.

S. u. ἀλίνειν —glossed at Hsch. α 2838 τι ἐπαλειῖναι τοίχῳ, ‘to smear something on a wall’ — Beekes notes *IG* IV² 102.39 (Epidauris, ca. 400-350 BCE) ἄλινσιν τοῦ ἐργαστηρίου (in a catalogue of construction jobs various individuals have contracted to perform). But the task is actually a double one, the second part of it being κονίασις (‘plastering’), confirming that Hesychius’ general sense of the meaning of the cognate verb is correct.

Hipponax fr. 86.17 mentions an ἀλλᾶς (‘sausage’). Beekes compares Hsch. α 3137, which he prints as ἄλλην· λάχανον. Ἰταλοί, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀρτυνθέντος περικόμματος, ἐξ οὗ ἀλλαντοπώλης; cites Kretschmer (1909, p. 323) for the claim that ἀλλᾶς might then be an Oscan word, «cf. Lat(in) *alium*, ‘garlic’»; but ultimately concludes (citing Szemerényi (1971), p. 653) that «origin in southern Italy is implausible for a word from Hipponax». The logic of the argument is difficult to untangle. But the problem seems to begin with the entry in Hesychius, which ought to be punctuated ἄλλην· λάχανον Ἰταλοί. καὶ κτλ (‘*allên*: the Italians (use this term for) a vegetable. Also ...’). There is thus no suggestion in the lexicographer that ἀλλᾶς (‘sausage’) is originally a South Italian word, although ἄλλη = *alium* seems likely enough.

S. u. ἀλοσύδνη, the first gloss ἔγγονοι at Hsch. υ 64 ὕδναι means not «born inside» but ‘members of the same family’, i. e. ‘descendants’ or the like. It is accordingly a good match for the second gloss σύντροφοι (lit. ‘brought up alongside’, and thus often e. g. ‘foster-brothers’). Note also Hsch. υ 65 ὕδνεϊν· τρέφειν, κρύβειν. αὔξειν (ignored).

S. u. ἄλπνιστος, the lemma at Hsch. α 7393 is not ἀπάλιμα but ἀρπάλιμα, and the initial gloss ἀρπακτά means not «robbed» but ‘stolen’¹¹. Beekes comments that the second gloss, προσφιλῆ, «shows the double meaning», for which he compares Hsch. α 7399 ἀρπαλίζομαι· ἀσμένως δέχομαι; the point is apparently that ~ ‘to snatch’ can also mean ~ ‘to be delighted to get one’s hands on’, and thus that something ἀπαλέον can also be described as ἀγαπητόν (Hsch. α 3267; not «amiable», as in Beekes, but ‘desireable’, as in LSJ s. u. II 1; cf. s. u. ἀρπαλέος). Note also Hsch. ε 5026 †ἐπιποραντές· τερπνόν· ἀρπαλέον (ignored).

S. u. ἄλις, ἀλιάς (glossed «fishing boat» by Beekes) is —despite the confused entry in LSJ, where the word is lemmatized as a noun but glossed «*of or belonging to sea*: ἀλιάς (sc. κύμβα)»— an adjective used substantively. ἀλίευμα at Str. XI 493 τὰ πλεῖστα ἀλιεύματα τῶν εἰς ταριχείας ἰχθύων likewise means not «fishery» but ‘catch’ (cf. LSJ «*draught of fish*» [archaic]; *DGE* «*pescas*»), while ἀλυκίς at e. g. Str. IV 181 means not «salt mine» but ‘brine’ or ‘brine pool’ (cf. LSJ s. u. «*salt spring*»; *DGE* s. u. «*manantial de agua salobre*»).

S. u. ἄλυσις, cognate ἀλυσιδωτός (of a breastplate) at D.S. V 30.3 does not mean «consisting of chains» but ‘in chain fashion’, in reference to what today would be called ‘chain-mail’. Cf. Ath. V 194d Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἔχοντες καθοπλισμὸν ἐν θώραξιν ἀλυσιδωτοῖς.

S. u. ἀλύω, the initial gloss φοβεῖσθαι at Hsch. α 2575 ἀλαλύσθαι means not «to put to flight» but ‘to be afraid’.

S. u. ἀλώη, ἀλωεύς at A.R. III 1401 and Arat. 1045 means not «farmer» but ‘one who works in a threshing floor’ and thus only by extension ‘agricultural laborer’.

S. u. ἀμαλδύνω, Beekes comments on a possible «connection with μέλδομαι ‘to smelt’». The verb in question is actually μέλδω and means ‘melt’ (e. g. Hom., *Il.* XXI 363, of fat).

Beekes suggests that ἀμαμηλῖς may mean «(plant) which blossoms at the same time as the apple tree» (i. e. < ἄμα + μηλέα). Cf. Hsch. α 3477 ἀμασुकάδες· ἄμα τοῖς σύκοις γινόμενοι ἄπιοι (‘*hamasykades*: pears that bear at the same time as the figs’).

¹¹ See n. 19 below.

S. u. ἀμαρτάνω, Beekes refers to «secondary ἀμαρτωλός ‘sinner’ (Arist(otle) Hell(enistic authors)¹²» —i. e. a noun— «whence ἀμαρτωλός ‘erroneous, erring’». The word is instead an adjective sometimes used substantively (although never in that way by Aristotle).

S. u. ἀμαρύσσω, the gloss βοστρύχια at Hsch. α 3468 †ἀμαρυγκυσία, charmingly but unhelpfully translated «curly things» by Beekes with the comment «(rather unclear; mistake?)», seems in fact to mean ‘vine-tendrils’ (Aristotle and Theophrastus).

S. u. ἀμαυρός, cognate ἀμαύρωσις is misleadingly glossed «obfuscation»; read ‘darkening’ (a verbal noun), as in LSJ s. u. I 1. ἀμαύρωμα is said to have the same meaning, but actually means ‘dimming’ or ‘dimness’ (a concrete noun), as at Plu., *Caes.* 69.4 τὸ περὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἀμαύρωμα τῆς αὐγῆς.

S. u. ἀμβλίσσω, Beekes translates the glosses τὸ ἀτελὲς γεννῆσαι, τὸ φθεῖραι βρέφος at *Suda* α 1525 as «unaffected birth, miscarriage of a foetus», as if these were nouns rather than substantivized verbs; read ‘miscarry, abort a fetus’. For the gloss «abortive child» (drawn from LSJ) for ἀμβλωθρίδιον, read ‘aborted fetus’¹³ (contrasted by e. g. Philo and the lexicographers with an ἔκτρομα or ἠλιτόμηνον, both of which denote a non-viable child that is born premature).

S. u. ἀμέργω, glossed «‘to pluck’, of flowers ... , also of olives = ‘squeeze out?’» (seemingly intended to suggest ‘press for oil’), «*Comic Adesp.* 437» is cited in support of the second definition. This is now Ar. fr. 406 Kassel–Austin, where the text reads ὁ μὲν τις ἀμπέλους / τρυγῶν ἄν, ὁ δ’ ἀμέργων ἐλάας (‘one man would be gathering the fruit from grapevines, while another would be *amergôn* olives’) and there is no obvious reason to think that any activity other than ‘picking’ is in question; cf. Ar., *Eq.* 326 ἀμέργεις τῶν ξένων τοὺς καρπίμους (figurative); E., *HF* 397 χερὶ καρπὸν ἀμέρξων (of apples). Beekes translates ἀμοργεύς (attested only at Poll. I 222) as «squeezer of olive oil», by which he once again apparently means ‘presser of olive oil’. But the words in this section of Pollux have to do almost entirely with the planting, reaping, picking and harvesting of crops, and the easiest assumption is thus ἀμοργεύς means ~ ‘harvester of fruit’.

¹² «Hell.» does not appear in Beekes’ list of Abbreviations and Symbols, although it is difficult to believe that it means anything other than this.

¹³ This seems to be the meaning of ἄμβλωμα as well, although LSJ glosses the word «*abortion*» (followed by *DGE* «*aborto*»).

S. u. ἀμεύσασθαι (glossed «to surpass, go beyond»), the gloss ἀλαζόνας at Hsch. δ 1158 διαμευστάς means not «vagrants», as if the word were ἀλήμων < ἀλάομαι, but ‘braggarts, bullshit artists’, i. e. ‘those who go beyond (the truth)’.

The gloss δεινά at Hsch. α 3631 ἀμήκωα means not «fearful» but ‘fear-inspiring, terrible’.

Hsch. α 3659 glosses ἄμιθα (thus the manuscript; ἀμιθάς Reitzenstein, followed by Cunningham and Page at Anacr. *PMG* 467¹⁴) ἔδεσμα ποιόν, καὶ ἄρτυμα, ὡς Ἀνακρέων, which Beekes translates «kind of meat, condiment»; read ‘type of food; also a condiment, according to Anacreon’. The lexicographic note cited by Beekes as a parallel as «Photius 86 R.» is Phot. α 1112 ἀμαμιθάδες· ἡδυσμά τι σκευαστὸν διὰ κρεῶν εἰς μικρὰ κεκομμένων (‘*amamithades*: a condiment prepared from meat minced into small pieces’) and is also preserved at Hsch. α 3690.

Beekes follows LSJ in translating συγκομιστὸς ἄρτος, the gloss at Hsch. α 3662 ἄμμιξ, with the archaic «bread of unbolted meal»; read ‘bread made from unsifted meal’.

S. u. ἀμορβός (glossed «follower, shepherd»), Beekes notes that the cognate adjective ἀμορβαῖος is applied by Nicander (*Th.* 28 = 489) to χαράδρα, which he glosses «gravel», concluding that the sense of the adjective is «unclear». χαράδρα actually means ‘ravine’, hence the gloss τὰς βουκολικὰς ἢ ποιμενικὰς (‘those associated with cowherds or shepherds’) in the *scholia*.

S. u. ἄμπελος, the papyrologically attested ἀμπελιτις (γῆ, χέρσος) is not «viniculture» (i. e. ‘the cultivation of grapes’) but ‘land that is good for growing vines’.

LSJ (followed by Beekes and *DGE*) takes the ἄμπρον at *IG* I³ 386.24 = 387.30 (building accounts from Eleusis, final decade of the 5th century) to be a «rope for drawing loads». As there are no other contemporary examples of the word or its cognates, *IG* I³ 386.128 = 387.145 σιδερίο ὑπάμπρο (‘an iron *hypampron*’; from a portion of the list seemingly dedicated to tools) deserves notice.

Beekes glosses ἄμπυξ as *inter alia* a «horse’s bit», and cognate χρυσάμπυξ as «with a golden bit». The former actually means ~ ‘horse’s headband’ (LSJ

¹⁴ This is apparently the point of Beekes’ mantic «for Anacr. see 467 Page».

s. u.), the latter ~ ‘with frontlet of gold’ (Cunliffe s. u.), hence the additional sense of ἄμπυξ, ‘woman’s diadem’.

S. u. ἀμύνω, cognate ἀμυντήριον in e. g. Plato is an example of a substantive use of the adjective ἀμυντήριος (LSJ s. u. I «*defensive*») and thus means ~ ‘means of protection’ (= LSJ s. u. II). The *hapax* ἀμυνίας (of the subject’s heart) at Ar., *Eq.* 570, by contrast, appears to be a complicated play on the personal name of a prominent political / social figure that suggests ‘prepared to defend itself’.

S. u. ἀμύσσω, the gloss τὸ ξέειν τὰς σάρκας τοῖς ὄνυξιν at Hsch. α 3880 ἀμύσχεσθαι means not «the laceration of the flesh with claws» but ‘to lacerate one’s flesh with one’s fingernails’; cf. E., *Andr.* 826-827 σπάρραγμα κόμας ὀνόχων τε / ... ἀμύγματα (a description of mourning).

S. u. ἀμυσχρός, the lemma at Hsch. α 3764 is not ἀμουσρά but ἀμουσγρά, and the gloss καθαρεύουσα means not «clean or pure» but ‘cleansing’.

S. u. ἀμφικέλεμον, the sense of the gloss at Hsch. α 4037 οἱ δὲ τὸν βασταζόμενον ὑπὸ δύο ἀνθρώπων δίφρον is likely not «some authorities claim it means a chariot-board borne¹⁵ by two men» but ‘some authorities claim it means a chair carried by two people’, i. e. a sedan-chair with only two bearers, hence the first gloss ἀμφιβαρές (‘heavy on both ends’). Hsch. α 4036 glosses the apparent cognate ἀμφικελεμνίς as κατ’ ὀβελῶν περικρέμασις ἰσορρόπως, which Beekes translates «hanging down from a bar in equipoise»; better ~ ‘balanced suspension from spits’ (i. e. with an equal amount of weight resting on each spit or from either end of a single spit).

S. u. ἀμφίπολος, Beekes takes the ἀμφιπολεῖον referenced at *IG IV* 39.13-14 (Aegina, final quarter of the 5th century) to be a «servant dwelling». But this is a cult-building that contains a variety of sacrificial implements, and the ἀμφίπολος in question is most likely a priest (LSJ s. u. I 3).

S. u. ἀμώσας, the gloss κρεμάσας at Hsch. α 4181 means not «hung up» (passive) but ‘hanging’ (active).

S. u. ἀναλίσκω, the cognates ἀνάλωσις and ἀνάλωμα do not have the same sense: the former means ‘expenditure, consuming’ (i. e. the process of expending or consuming), whereas the latter means ‘cost, expense’ (a concrete noun).

¹⁵ S. u. ἀμφορεύς, correct the gloss «born on two sides» for ἀμφοφορεύς (explaining the etymology of the contracted form) to ‘borne on two sides’, i. e. ‘with two handles’.

S. u. ἀναλτος, the gloss μισθός at Hsch. α 3280 ἄλτρον means not «reward» but ‘wage’.

S. u. ἀνασταλύζω (glossed «burst into tears»), Beekes observes that «The suffix is also in other words for crying¹⁶ etc.: γρύζω, ἰύζω, ὀλολύζω, ὀτοτύζω». But these are all examples of a standard —here seemingly irrelevant— word-formation strategy, in which -ζω is added to a word used to represent an inarticulate sound of some sort so as to produce a verb that denotes the production of that cry. Thus γρύζω is ‘produce a γρῦ’, i. e. ‘a peep’; ὀλολύζω is ‘produce an ὀλολυγή’, i. e. a ritual scream; and ὀτοτύζω is ‘cry out ὀτοτοῖ’, an expression of grief, pain or the like. Cf. ἀράζω (‘make the sound *arrh*’, i. e. ‘growl’; of a dog) and βαύζω (‘make the sound *bau*’, i. e. ‘bark’; also of a dog).

S. u. ἀνήρ, Beekes proposes translating ἀνδρεών/ἀνδρών, ἀνδρώνιον and ἀνδρωνῖτις as «men’s room». That term is reserved in colloquial English for ‘toilet, WC’; better ‘men’s quarters’ (also acknowledging that a single room is not necessarily in question, but instead the portion of a house to which men generally had access but women did not).

S. u. ἄνθος, ἀνθήλη at Thphr., *HP* IV 10.4 refers not to a «crown of flowers» but to «the silky flower-tufts of the reed» (LSJ s. u.; cf. *DGE* «*penacho o cabeza del junco*»). ἄνθεμον likewise means «flower» but not «rosette» (i. e. a rose-shaped decoration). While ἀνθεμόδης means ‘rich in flowers’ *uel sim.*, ἀνθεμοτός at *IG* II² 1627.306, 310 (in both cases modifying καλυπτήρ, ‘cover’) seems to mean instead ~ ‘decorated with floral designs’. ἄνθησις at Thphr., *HP* IV 10.1, finally, is not «blossom» but ‘flowering’ (a verbal noun, as in LSJ).

S. u. ἀνθραξ, the cognate verb ἀνθρακεύω is glossed with the ambiguous «burn charcoal, carbonize»; read ‘produce charcoal’.

S. u. ἀνθηδών (glossed «hornet»), Beekes suggests that Hsch. τ 343 τεθηδών· πρωρεύς (‘*tethrédōn*: bow-officer’) is «a joking formation from the language of sailors, modelled after animal names». This may be so. But the task of the πρωρεύς was to keep an eye out ahead of the ship, and the combination of Hsch. τ 522 τερθρεύειν· τηρεῖν· σκοπεῖν (‘*terthreuein*: to keep watch, to look’), τ 526 τέρθρον (glossed *inter alia* ‘foresail’) and τ 527 τερθρωτήρ· ὅπου ὁ πρωρεύς προορᾷ τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει (‘*terthrōtēs*: where

¹⁶ Part of the problem here appears to be a confusion of two senses of English ‘cry’: (1) ‘weep’ (as with ἀνασταλύζω) and (2) ‘shout, cry out’ (as with the other verbs Beekes lists).

the bow-officer looks forward at the situation in the sea’) suggests that Voss was right to emend to *τερθηρῶν*.

ἀνώγειον (< *ἄνω* + *γῆ/γαῖα*) makes good sense as a word for e. g. the second floor of a house, but very little sense as a word for a prison, the obviously preferable alternative being to throw the malefactor in a hole. Beekes (following LSJ) notes that *ἀνώγειον*¹⁷, *ἀνάγειον* and *ἀνόκειον* are all offered as variant forms of the word in manuscripts and inscriptions. But so is *ἀναγκαῖον*, i. e. ~ ‘place of *ἀνάγκη* [necessity]’ and thus ‘place where one is forced to remain’ (Is. or. 9 fr. 1; cf. Harp. α 108 *ἀντὶ τοῦ δεσμωτήριον*, citing in addition «Xenophon in the *Hellenika*», although the word is not preserved in the version of the text that has otherwise come down to us). It is tempting to think that these are two different words that have become hopelessly confused in the lexicographic and manuscript tradition.

S. u. *ἄορ*, Beekes notes that the word has traditionally been taken to be < *ἄειρω* «with the original meaning ‘what hangs’». But on this etymology the word must actually mean ‘something raised’, sc. to one’s belt or the like, from which it accordingly ‘hangs’.

S. u. *ἀπέλλαι*, Beekes begins with Hsch. α 5944, where the word is glossed *σηκοί. ἐκκλησίαι. ἀρχαιρεσίαι*; notes that *σηκοί* there seems to mean «pen, fold»; and cites in support of the latter interpretation Hsch. σ 86, which he quotes in the form *σάκωσε· ἀπέκλεισεν*. The text actually reads *σάκωσε· κατέκλεισεν*, meaning that there is no connection to *ἀπέλλαι*.

The Homeric *harpax ἀπόθεστος* at Hom., *Od.* XVII 296 clearly means ‘cast aside, neglected’ (thus Cunliffe) or the like. Beekes misses the use of the word at Euph., *SH* 413.15 (from a papyrus unknown in the time of LSJ, on whom he depends), but does note «the opposite ‘much desired’» at Call., *Hymn to Demeter* 47. But neither passage tells us anything about the word’s original sense in Homer. Instead, these are examples of learned Hellenistic poetic practice —pointedly reusing an epic rarity, in the first instance, and even more pointedly reworking it, in the second— and demonstrate only that the word was of interest to learned Greek authors in the 3rd and 2nd centuries and thus already obscure by that point¹⁸. See below on *ἄχειον*.

¹⁷ LSJ cites *GDI* 1581.4 for this sense of the word, but the meaning there is in fact ‘upper room (of a house or the like)’.

¹⁸ Cf. Beekes on the obscure Homeric *ἀφουγετός* (Hom., *Il.* XI 495) echoed at Nic., *Al.* 342: «Nicander did not understand the meaning any longer, and connected it with *ἀφύσσω*»,

S. u. ἀπόκυνον (the name of a poisonous plant), Beekes cites Hsch. α 6416 μάζα μεμαγμένη φαρμάκῳ, πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν κυνῶν, which he translates «cake mixed with a drug against the killing of dogs». The gloss actually means ‘a barley-cake mixed with a drug, intended to kill dogs’ (sc. when it is thrown to one and it gobbles it down).

ἀπόμελι is glossed «kind of mead, made from the water used to wash honeycombs» (cf. LSJ «*honey-water*, an inferior kind of mead»), with reference to Dsc. V 9.2. But mead is fermented and thus alcoholic, whereas this is simply water lightly flavored with honey.

ἀποφράς is glossed «unlucky, wicked», with reference to Eup. fr. 309. This is fr. 332.2 Kassel–Austin (= fr. 309.2 Kock), and the word means not «wicked» but «*not to be mentioned, unlucky*» (LSJ; cf. DGE «*innombrable, nefasto*») and thus ‘to be avoided’.

S. u. ἀποφώλιος, Beekes compares Hsch. φ 252, which he quotes in the form παύφοροι· Αἰολεῖς ἰέρεια. What ought actually to be read is φαύφοροι· Αἰολεῖς, ἰέρεια (cf. SH 1042).

S. u. ἀρά (‘prayer, curse’), the Homeric compound Beekes compares is not πολυάρατος but πολυάρητος (Hom., *Od.* VI 280; XIX 404). Likewise at Plu., *Thes.* 35.5, the word Beekes glosses «place for praying» is not ἀρητήριον but ἀρατήριον; means ‘place for cursing’; and is referred to as the proper name of the spot and accordingly capitalized by Ziegler (κατὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρὰς θέμενος, οὗ νῦν ἔστι τὸ καλούμενον Ἀρατήριον, ‘cursing the Athenians in the place today referred to as Aratêrion’).

S. u. ἄρακις, Beekes compares Hsch. ε 3603 ἐξ ἀρακίων· ἐκ φιαλῶν, where the gloss means not «of bowls» but ‘from bowls, out of bowls’.

S. u. ἀρασχάδες, Beekes compares Hsch. ο 1166 ὄρεσχάς· τὸ σὺν τοῖς βότρυσιν ἀφαιρεθὲν κλῆμα, where the gloss means not «twig with bunches of grapes taken off» but «vine-twig removed along with the grape-clusters».

For the meaning of ἄργελλα, Beekes cites *Suda* α 3762, where the gloss οἶκημα Μακεδονικόν, ὅπερ θερμαίνοντες λούονται means not «Macedonian dwelling-place, where [men] bathe while warming up», but ‘Macedonian building, which they warm up and use for bathing’ (cf. LSJ s. u. «*vapour bath*», i. e. ‘steam bath’; DGE «*baño de vapor*»). Cf. above on ἀβήρ.

and on the use of the similarly Homeric ἄφοροι (*Od.* XII 89) at Philem. fr. 133.1 (cited by the old Kock number as «Philem. 145»), «The meaning in Philemon may be artificial».

S. u. ἀργιλπής, Beekes cites *DGE* for a comparison with ἀργέτι δημῶ (Hom., *Il.* XI 818), which however means not «with a white greasy shine» but ‘with your shiny white fat’.

S. u. ἄργυρος, Beekes, reproducing the key portion of LSJ s. u. ἀργυρεύω, cites D.S. V 36.2 and Str. III 2.9 for the verb. These are actually two overlapping citations of Posidonius (fr. 19 and 89 Theiler) from a century or so earlier. Note also that ἀργυρευτική, although treated as a noun in LSJ («silversmith’s art»; so too *DGE* «ἀργυρευτική, -ῆς, ἡ *platería*»), is better understood as a substantive use (*sc.* τέχνη, as Beekes himself acknowledges) of the otherwise unattested adjective ἀργυρευτικός.

S. u. ἄρδω (glossed «irrigate, water»), the gloss λειμῶνες at Hsch. α 7458 ἄρσεια means not «humid meadows», which would seem to support Furnée’s attempt to connect the two words, but ‘meadows’, which does not.

S. u. ἀριστερός, Beekes suggests that «the plant name ἀριστερέων (Plin., *Nat.* XXVII 21 *aristereon*) = περιστερέων ‘dovecoat’ [*sic*] was perhaps reshaped after the latter form». περιστερέων is in fact both a word for ‘dovecote’ (e. g. Pl., *Thet.* 197c; = LSJ s. u. I) and the name of a plant (Dsc. IV 59; = LSJ s. u. II), but the former meaning is of no help in explaining any influence the latter may have had on ἀριστερέων. Note that ἀριστερέων is attested not just in transliterated form in Latin but also in Greek at Paus.Gr. α 150 ἀριστερέων· φυτὸν ἐπιτήδειον εἰς καθαρμόν (reconstructed from Hsch. α 7261, Phot. α 2811 and Eustathius); Ael., *NA* I 34.

S. u. ἀρέσκω, cognate ἀρέσκεια —not ἀρεσκεία, as Beekes prints the word— at Arist., *EE* 1221^a8 does not mean «flattering person», but is the quality exhibited by a flatterer (LSJ s. u. «*obsequiousness*»).

That ἄρκηλος means «young panther, kind of panther» is not apparent from Callix. *FGrH* 627 F 2 *ap.* Ath. V 201c, which merely has ἄρκηλοι τρεῖς (‘three *arkêloi*’) in a long list of exotic animals paraded in a great public show in Alexandria in the mid-3rd century. The definition comes instead from Ar.Byz. fr. 174B Slater, which appears to be lacunose and in which the word may actually mean ‘bear-cub’; cf. Poll. V 15 τὰ δὲ τῶν ἄρκτων ἄρκτύλοι (‘the *arktyloi* of bears’).

The rare ἄρμα perhaps means «food» at Hsch. ν 760 νογαλεύματα ἢ νογαλίσματα (both ‘symposium snacks’ *uel sim.*), where the manuscript offers τρυφερά ἄρματα as one of the glosses. But 17th-century editors had already emended to τρυφερά ἀρ(τύ)ματα (‘dainty condiments’), which is printed by Cunningham and makes easy, obvious sense.

S. u. ἀρνευτήρ, Σ^{AT} Hom., *Il.* XII 385 παρὰ τοὺς ἄρνας. οὗτοι γὰρ κυβιστῶσιν, ὥσπερ τὸν ἀέρα κυρίττοντες means not «ram (for they tumble while butting with their horns)» but ‘by reference to lambs; because they tumble about, as if butting the air’. See Zon. p. 292 ~ *Et. Gen.* α 1206 (citing earlier authorities) for a more complete, although still opaque version of the note.

S. u. ἀρπάζω, the cognate noun ἄρπαγμα means «booty» but not «robbery». Likewise, the adjective ἀρπάγιμος means «stolen» but not «robbed»¹⁹, while the adverb ἀρπάγιον means not «snatching» but ~ ‘greedily, in a snatching fashion’. Beekes also mis-glosses the adjective ἀρπαγμαῖος «robbed, stolen»; Phryn., *PS* 6.6-9 calls the word ‘rare but useful’ and says that it is applied to a person δι’ ἔρωτα ἢ δι’ ἄλλην τινὰ πρόφασιν ἀρπασθεῖς (‘abducted on account of love or some other motive’) or to τὰ εἰς ἀρπαγὴν ἔτοιμα καὶ τὰ ἀρπαζόμενα (‘objects liable to theft or that tend to be stolen’).

S. u. ἀρπαλέος (glossed «devouring, greedy, consuming»), the gloss ἀγαπητόν at Hsch. α 3267 ἀπαλέον means not «amiable» but ~ ‘desirable’; see above s. u. ἄλπιστος. Note also ἀρπάλιμος (lemmatized by LSJ and *DGE*, but ignored by Beekes) at Hsch. α 7393 ἀρπάλιμα· ἀρπακτά. προσφιλή, which might alternatively be a majuscule error (Λ for Γ) for ἀρπάγιμος (above s. u. ἀρπάζω).

Beekes follows LSJ in glossing ἄρπεζα²⁰ as «hedge» with reference to Nic., *Th.* 393, 647, both of which are obscure, and then compares the glosses at Hsch. α 7402 ἀρπέζας· τοὺς αἰμασιώδεις τόπους. οἱ δὲ τείχη καὶ περιβόλους. οἱ δὲ τὰ κλιμακώδη χωρία (‘places that resemble rough stone walls²¹, others say walls and enclosures, others terraced areas’); α 7407 ἄρπισαι· αἰμασιαί. ἢ τάφρους (‘*arpisai*: stone walls made without mortar, or ditches’); α 7408 ἄρπιξ· εἶδος ἀκάνθης. Κύπριοι (‘*arpix*: a type of thorny plant; thus the inhabitants of Cyprus’); 7394 ἀρπάναι²²· μάνδραι βοσκημάτων (‘*harpanai*: folds for cattle’). As Beekes (citing Chantraine) notes, the word appears to refer to

¹⁹ In English, ‘robbery’ focuses on the experience of the victim, e. g. ‘He robbed me, i. e. ‘took my wallet’, or ‘My house was robbed’, i. e. ‘burglarized’. ‘Theft / stealing’, by contrast, focuses on the object taken: a book or an election can be ‘stolen’, but it cannot properly be ‘robbed’.

²⁰ LSJ gives the word a rough breathing, while Gow and Scholfield in their edition of Nicander (followed by *DGE* and Beekes) make the reading smooth, as in Hesychius. Theodoridis on Phot. α 2858 notes that the compound ὑάρπεζος favors the smooth breathing.

²¹ Not «hedged in», as in Beekes.

²² Printed by Beekes as ἀρπάναι, more closely approximating ἄρπεζα.

«something in the terrain functioning as a boundary». But nothing other than the supposed sense of Cyprian ἄρπιξ suggests that it is specifically a hedge (i. e. a border formed by closely growing bushes or shrubs) rather than walls of one sort or another produced by roughly stacking rocks.

S. u. ἀρτάω (glossed «bind to, hang upon, attach to»), ἀείρω (from which the word is generally derived) means not «bind, hang» but ‘lift, raise up’.

Poll. V 97 says that ἀρτίαλα (‘earring’ *uel sim.*) is not Doric but Aeolic (κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Αἰολέας).

S. u. ἀρύω (‘draw water’), Beekes asserts that ἀρυσᾶς in the Delos inventories (*IG* XI,2 110.25; 111.35; 112.12; 113.17; 116.19; etc.) «probably denotes the profession ‘water drawer’». In fact, this is an item in a list of silver vessels from a temple inventory and patently means ‘ladle’ *uel sim.*²³.

S. u. ἀσίαρος, the gloss at Hsch. α 7666 is ἐπισκάζων (‘limping upon’), whereas ἡ ἀσίδαρος (‘or without iron’) looks like not an alternative gloss but a majuscule variant for the lemma (ΑΣΙΔΑΡΟΣ for ΑΣΙΑΡΟΣ).

S. u. ἄσιλλα (‘transport yoke’), Beekes fails to mention the cognate verb ἀσιλλοφορέω (‘carry an *asilla*’) and adjective ἀσιλλοφόρος (‘yoke-carrying’). For what the object was and how it functioned, cf. Alciphr. I 1.4 (as emended by Hemsterhuys) τὰς ἀσίλλας ἐπωμίους ἀνελόμενοι καὶ τὰς ἐκατέρωθεν σπυρίδας ἐξαρτήσαντες (‘taking up their *asillai* onto their shoulders and hanging the baskets that go on either side from them’; of fish-dealers transporting goods from the shore to the market, and likely inspired by the epigram for an Olympic victor preserved at Arist., *Rh.* 1365^a25-26 πρόσθε μὲν ἄμφ’ ὄμοισιν ἔχων τραχεῖαν ἄσιλλαν / ἰχθῦς ἐξ Ἄργους εἰς Τεγέα ἔφερον, ‘formerly I used to transport fish from Argos to Tegea, carrying a rough *asilla* about my shoulders’); Varro II 2.9 *ut iugum continet sirpiculos*.

S. u. ἀσκέρα (glossed «winter shoe with fur lining»), the diminutive at Hippon. fr. 42b.2 καὶ σαμβάλισκα κάσκερίσκα is not masculine ἀσκερίσκος but neuter ἀσκερίσκον.

S. u. ἀσκόλια, Arist., *IA* 706^a1 ἀσκολιάζουσι ῥᾶον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀριστεροῖς (‘they hop up and down more easily on their left feet’; in reference to quadrupeds) provides a very shaky basis for the claim that the verb can mean not

²³ *DGE* s. u. offers «*cazo*» (‘saucepan’), which does not obviously match the etymology. *IG* XI,2 110.25 (the inscription cited by *LSJ* s. u.) allegedly reads nominative ἀρυσᾶς, while the parallel inscriptions all have ἀρυσᾶν, although it is difficult to see how this explains Beekes’ specific error.

just ‘hop on one leg’ but also «jump up and down with the legs held together» (implicitly in reference to human beings). Why LSJ s. u. claims that the Ἀσκώλια was the «second day of the rural Dionysia», is unclear; Σ Ar., Pl. 1129 (which it cites for the information) merely insists that Ἀσκώλια ἑορτὴ τοῦ Διονύσου (‘the Askolia was a festival of Dionysus’).

S. u. ἀσπίς, the cognate adjective ἀσπιδόεις at Opp., H. I 397 ἀσπιδόεσσα χελώνη (‘*aspidoessa* turtle’) means not «consisting of shields» but ‘resembling a shield’.

The obscure ἄστραβδα or ἀστραβδά (printed without an accent by Beekes) is attested not at Herodotus III 64 but at Herodas III 64.

S. u. ἄστν, the cognate noun ἀστίτης at S. fr. 92 means not «fellow citizen» but ‘city-dweller’ (cf. DGE s. u. «*ciudadano*»).

S. u. ἄσφαλτος (glossed «asphalt, bitumen»), the cognate verb ἀσφαλτοδεύομαι means not «cover with ἄσφαλτος» but ‘be covered with’ or ‘be soaked in ἄσφαλτος’.

ἄσχν is specifically identified at Hdt. IV 23.3 as a local Scythian term for the strained juice of the bird cherry²⁴. It is not Greek and therefore cannot be described as a loan-word.

S. u. ἀταβυρίτης (bread of some sort, perhaps called after Ἀταβυρία, supposedly an ancient name for the island of Rhodes [Hsch. α 7991]; mentioned only in Sopat. fr. 9), Beekes suggests that «The suffix -ίτης is common for kinds of bread». This is technically correct but also misleading. This is a common way of forming adjectives, including adjectives based on place-names, and cakes are sometimes called by the place where they supposedly originate. But that does not suggest that words of this sort are somehow associated specifically with cakes.

S. u. ἀταλός (glossed by LSJ «*tender, delicate*, of youthful persons, as of maidens ...; of fillies»), in the second gloss at Hsch. α 8003 ἀτάματα· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄλματα (‘*atalmata*: in place of skips’, i. e. those of playful joy; < ἀτάλλω, ‘skip in childish glee’), παίγνια likely means not «toys» but ‘play, sport’ (= LSJ s. u. I).

²⁴ Beekes follows LSJ in offering the archaic «inspissated juice of the fruit of the bird-cherry».

S. u. ἀταρτηρός (glossed by LSJ «*mischievous, baneful*»), the second gloss at Hsch. α 8021 ἀταρτᾶται· βλάπτει· πονεῖ· λυπεῖ means not intransitive «labors» but transitive ‘afflicts’ (= LSJ s. u. B II).

ἄτρακτος is (1) said to be both masculine and feminine; (2) glossed «‘spindle’ ... also ‘arrow’»; and (3) called «Laconian acc(ording) to Th. 4.40». In fact (1) the word is always masculine except at Plu. *Mor.* 271f αὐτὴ δ’ εἰσφέρει μὲν ἠλακάτην καὶ τὴν ἄτρακτον, where the feminine definite article looks like a careless error after feminine ἠλακάτην. (2) Use of the word in the sense ‘arrow’ is almost entirely confined to tragedy, where it is consistently used in ways that make it clear that this sense rather than ‘spindle’ is intended (A. fr. 139.2 ἀτράκτω τοξικῶ; S., *Tr.* 714 βαλόντ’ ἄτρακτον; *Ph.* 290 νευροσπαδῆς ἄτρακτος; [E.], *Rh.* 312 ἀτράκτων τοξόται). (3) The only exception is Th. IV 40.2, where a Spartan captured at Sphakteria comments that πολλοῦ ἂν ἄξιον εἶναι τὸν ἄτρακτον ... εἰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς διεγίγνωσκε (‘the *atraktos* would be a valuable one, if it could recognize the good’, *sc.* by sparing bad men; the point is that when missiles are involved, death or survival in battle proves nothing about moral worth or courage). This is a mantic, riddling comment that Thucydides feels the need to gloss (λέγων τὸν οἰστόν, ‘as a way of referring to an arrow’), and there is no reason to think that the historian intends to signal that this is a particularly Spartan image²⁵. Beekes’ extension of the characterization «Laconian» to the lemma generally, rather than to the figurative use ‘arrow’, represents in any case a careless misunderstanding of LSJ s. u. II «*arrow* ... In this sense specially Lacon(ian), Th. 4.40».

S. u. ἀτταλίζομαι, the gloss πλανῶμαι at Hsch. α 8185 is glossed «cause to wander». But this is the sense of the active of πλανᾶω, and the passive means instead ‘wander, stray’.

S. u. ἀττάραγος (‘morsel, crumb’), the second gloss at Hsch. α 8189, τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτων φλυκταίνας, means not «blisters on cakes or loaves of wheatbread» but simply ‘blisters on loaves of bread’.

S. u. αὐλός, the instrument in question bears little resemblance to a modern «flute» (a wind instrument); read ‘pipe’ (a reed instrument) throughout.

²⁵ Hornblower (1996) *ad loc.* calls this «One of the few jokes in Th.,» suggesting that «part of the point of ‘spindle’ is that it is a female instrument» and thus denigrates the archer who employs it.

S. u. ἀυέω, cognate κενεαυχής means not «idle boasting» (a noun) but ‘idly boasting’ (an adjective; LSJ s. u. «vain-glorious»).

S. u. ἀυχμός (‘dirt, squalor’), Beekes follows LSJ in citing a cognate noun ἀυχμωσις supposedly meaning «dirt» and «probably an enlargement of ἀυχμός» at [Gal.] XVI 88 K. ἀυχμώσει κνοιζονται (in a list of things that can go wrong with one’s hair). The text is difficult, and another version of the same material at [Gal.] XIV 778.2 K. τριχες ... ρέουσι, λεπτόνεται, θραύονται, σχίζονται, ἀυχμῶσι, χνοιζονται, ὑπόξανθοι γίνονται, πολιοῦνται shows that it is corrupt. This is thus a ghost-word (also included in *DGE*) which should be struck from the lexica.

S. u. ἀφαιεύς (‘belly-fin of the female tuna’), the gloss πτηναί at Hsch. α 81 ἀβαρταί²⁶ is translated «flying, wings». The word appears in fact to be a feminine nominative plural form of the ill-attested adjective πτήν, πτηνός (‘winged’).

S. u. ἄχθομαι, Beekes compares Hsch. α 8869 ἀχθίσας (Latte : ἀχθήσας ms.)· γομώσας, ἦγουν πληρώσας and translates the glosses «stuffed, filled»; read ‘loading, i. e. filling’ (participles).

S. u. ἀγλύς, Beekes translates the cognate verb ἀγλώω at Thphr., *Vent.* 35.5 as «get dark», i. e. ‘become dark’; but it means ‘make dark’.

S. u. ἄχρειον, as parallels for the problematic Homeric ἀχρεῖον ἰδών (*Il.* II 269) and ἀχρεῖον δ’ ἐγέλασεν (*Od.* XVIII 163), Beekes notes Cratin. fr. 360.1 ἀχρειόγελως and Theoc. XXV 72 ἀχρεῖον κλάζον. Both appear to be learned allusions to the Homeric text rather than independent uses of the word that might shed effective additional light on its meaning. See above on ἀπόθεστος.

S. u. ἄωρος 2 (‘sleep’), the note τοῦ α μηδὲν πλέον σημαίνοντος on the alternative forms ὄρος και ἄωρος κατὰ πλεονασμάν (‘*oros* and also *aoros*, via a pleonasm’) at *EM* p. 117.14-16 means not «the long *alpha* does not mean anything» but ‘since the long *alpha* adds nothing more to the sense’.

S. u. ἄωτος (‘flock of wool, down; the choicest, the flower of its kind’), Raman (1975, pp. 195-205) shows that the word means not «nap, tap» but ‘nap, top’.

²⁶ Beekes fails to identify the source.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beekes, R. (2010): *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (2 vols.), Leiden.
- Burnett, J. (1924): *Plato: Euthyphro; Apology of Socrates; and Crito*, Oxford.
- Chantraine, P. (1968): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris (second edition 1999; unrevised but supplemented third edition 2009).
- de Decker, F. (2016): «Etymological and Methodological Observations on the <PG> and <PG?> Vocabulary in Robert Beekes' Etymological Dictionary of Greek», *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis* 133, pp. 149-169.
- Frisk, H. (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (2 vols.), Heidelberg.
- Furnée, E. J. (1972): *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen. Mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus*, The Hague.
- George, C. H. (2011): review of Beekes (2010), *New England Classical Journal* 38, pp. 49-52.
- Gow, A. S. F. (ed.) (1952): *Theocritus* Vol. II, Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. (1996): *A Commentary on Thucydides* Vol. II, Oxford.
- Kretschmer, P. (1909): «Zur griechischen und lateinischen Wortforschung», *Glotta* 1, pp. 323-333.
- Meissner, T. (2013): review of Beekes 2010, *Kratylos* 58, pp. 1-32.
- Raman, R. A. (1975): «Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem», *Glotta* 53, pp. 195-207.
- Simkin, O. B. (2011): review of Beekes (2010), *CR* 61, pp. 1-3.
- Szemerényi, O. (1971): review of Chantraine (1968), *Gnomon* 43, pp. 641-675.
- Vine, B. (2012): review of M. De Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, in *Kratylos* 57, pp. 1-40.
- Wallace, R. W. (1989): «ὄρθρος», *TAPhA* 119, pp. 201-207.

Fecha de recepción de la primera versión del artículo: 20/06/2022

Fecha de aceptación: 21/07/2022

Fecha de recepción de la versión definitiva: 09/08/2022

