

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 79 (2022)

Heft: 2

Artikel: Philological notes on the letter gamma in a New Greek-English dictionary

Autor: Olson, S. Douglas

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1035086>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 21.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Philological Notes on the Letter *gamma* in a New Greek-English Dictionary

S. Douglas Olson, Minneapolis

Abstract: Vor gut zwei Generationen veröffentlichte Robert Renehan eine Reihe von Artikeln, in denen er die Einträge Barbers und seiner Mitherausgeber in der neunten, 1968 veröffentlichten Ausgabe des *Greek-English-Lexicon* von Liddell, Scott und Jones (1940) erweiterte, verfeinerte und korrigierte. Die folgenden Anmerkungen zum Buchstaben “Gamma” im neuen *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* folgen diesem Geiste.

Keywords: Lexicography, Lexicon, Dictionary, Philology, Definition.

Comprehensive new lexica of the ancient Greek language rarely appear. This is a consequence of the enormous scale of such projects, on the one hand, and of the extraordinary breadth of learning and intellectual competence required to produce one, on the other. Because expectations are rightly so high – standard lexica must be as wide-ranging, precise, and accurate as possible, since almost all the rest of our work as classicists depends upon them – enormous amounts of secondary effort must also be invested in ensuring that every reference and cross-reference is accurate, that every gloss of a word is true to the original context in which it occurs, that definitions are clear and unambiguous, that translations are clear and idiomatic but also as faithful as possible to the original, and the like. Philological work of this type is in one sense never complete, but goes on constantly across linguistic, political, and cultural boundaries, with new material added to the corpus and new understandings developed of what we already have. But lexica are significant points of inflexion in this process, and their enormous authority and influence depend on the care with which they are constructed, reviewed, and used.

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).¹ In his Foreward to the latter work, Renehan acknowledges his

¹ R. Renehan, “Some Greek Lexicographical Notes”, *Glotta* 46 (1968) 60–73; “Greek Lexicographical Notes: Second Series”, *Glotta* 47 (1969) 220–234; “Greek Lexicographical Notes: Third Series”, *Glotta* 48 (1970) 93–107; “Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fourth Series”, *Glotta* 49 (1971) 65–85; “Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fifth Series”, *Glotta* 50 (1972) 38–60; “Greek Lexicographical Notes: Sixth Series”, *Glotta* 50 (1972) 156–181. These articles were subsequently collected and combined with further, similar contributions in R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (Hypomnemata Heft 45: Göttingen 1975), with three full pages devoted to words beginning with *gamma*. See also R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes, Second Series* (Hypomnemata Heft 74: Göttingen 1982), with an additional three full pages devoted to words beginning with *gamma*. A Revised Supplement by P. G. W. Glare and A. A. Thompson was added to the 9th edition of LSJ in 1996; I refer to it in what follows simply as “LSJ Supple-

enormous respect for LSJ and the manner in which it was produced.² He nonetheless scrutinizes its entries carefully, the implicit thesis being that high-quality intellectual work can not only stand up to such examination, but is strengthened by it, and that the good of the common enterprise requires that weaknesses be identified and corrected. In the end, the general quality of the *Lexicon* is apparent in how seldom Renehan catches outright errors, most of his notes being concerned with adding attestations of words or identifying overlooked senses of them.³ The following notes on the letter *gamma* in the new *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2015), edited by Franco Montanari and translated into English from the 3rd edition of the Italian version (2013) by a team of scholars associated with Harvard's Center for Hellenic Studies and led by Gregory Nagy, Leonard Muellner, Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder, are offered in a similar spirit. I have restricted myself to *gamma* because this makes the number of entries, and thus the number of pages in the *Dictionary* (36 out of 2431, approximately 1.5%), to be covered manageable.⁴ There is no reason to think that similar examination of other portions of the work would produce a notably different type or quantity of comments.

In what follows, bold-face lemmata appear in the *Dictionary*; omission of bold-face signals that the word is not glossed there but ought perhaps to have been. Italicized glosses within quotation marks represent the *Dictionary*'s definition of words (bold-face in the original), as opposed to its comments, clarifications, and the like (italicized in the original). I use LSJ's abbreviations for authors and

ment". The new *Dictionary* seems to take limited account of the seven pages of the LSJ Supplement devoted to *gamma*, not only ignoring numerous corrections, supplemental citations, and the like, but omitting from the first page alone the following additional lemmata: γαγγαλισμός, γαγγαμεύς, γαιᾶται, γαιάτης, γαιήϊας, Γαιῆος, γάλαιθος, γαλακτίτης, γαλαρίας, γαλεάριος, γαληνοποιός, γάλλαρος, γάλλεωρ (accent unknown), γαμμάτιον, γαμοστολή, γαναλός, γανίς. Most of the words discussed in what follows do not fall under the remit of the *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* (hereafter *CGL*), whose coverage of the language ends in the early second century CE and whose scope is generally comparable to that of the old "middle Liddell".

2 "The present collection has arisen, in good part, from a desire to refine my own knowledge of the diction appropriate to each several genre, rather than from a love of lexicography for its own sake. ... And lest there be any misunderstanding, let me state it plainly. *LSJ*, the product of generations of scholarly cooperation and selfless labor, is the most useful aid to Classical Greek lexicography ever published. Were anyone to think that these supplements are offered in a spirit of disrespect for that fine work, no one would be more unhappy than I" [Renehan (1968) 8].

3 Lexica are products of human hands and human minds, and thus inevitably include both errors and misjudgments. How many of the former in particular ought to be regarded as acceptable in e.g. every ten printed pages in a work of such general intellectual significance, is an interesting question. The obvious – if numerically not very precise – answer would seem to be "very few".

4 Much more could be said even on this limited section of the text, but I have restricted myself to some particularly interesting points. The comments that follow refer specifically to the English-language version of the *Dictionary* rather than to the Italian original. Tracing the precise genetic relationship between the two is beyond the scope of this article.

works throughout. Minor typographical errors and the like in the *Dictionary* are ignored unless they are actively misleading.

According to Hsch. γ 5, a Spartan word for an ἀγροῦ μισθωτής (“agricultural laborer, hired farmhand”) is not **γαβεργός** (thus also LSJ; glossed “*laborer, worker*”, missing the connection with γῆ), but γαβεργός. The manuscript of Hesychius has γαβεργός ὀρουμισθωτός. Schmidt emended to γαβεργός· οὐ μισθωτός (*sic*), and his typographical error was taken over not just by LSJ, but also by e.g. Buck.⁵ Latte (followed by Cunningham) emended instead to γαβερός· ὁ ἀγροῦ μισθωτής, whence the gloss in the *Dictionary*, but still with the wrong lemma. For the word, cf. γαβεργός in *I. Thespiæ* 55.

The **Γαιζῆται** (described as “Galatians”) and the **Γαισάται/Γαισάτοι** (described as “Celtic people”) are the same group, a “tribe” of Gauls settled in the Alps and along the Rhone. Plb. 2.22.2 claims that they got their name διὰ τὸ μισθοῦ στρατεύειν (“because they served as mercenaries”). It thus probably means “those armed with a *gaesum*/γαῖσον”; what they called themselves, and whether they were even a single people in any meaningful sense of the word, except from the Roman perspective, is unknown.

γαιώω at Tz. *H.* 1.910 γαιοῦσι ταύτας ἀκριβῶς· γαιώσαντες δὲ ταύτας / ἄνωθεν ἐπιπράινουσι μυρρίνην τε καὶ δάφνη (the final stage in Xerxes’ construction of his bridge across the Hellespont) means not “*make earth*” (cf. LSJ s.v. “*make land, make solid*”; *DGE* s.v. “*hacer de tierra, hacer sólido*”) but “cover with earth, cover with dirt”; cf. Hdt. 7.36.5 ὕλην ἐπεφόρησαν, κόσμῳ δὲ θέντες καὶ τὴν ὕλην γῆν ἐπεφόρησαν, which lies behind Tzetzes’ account. It might be easier in any case to print γεοῦσι ... γεώσαντες, this being a much better established form of the verb (even if normally found in the active) and the error being a common, simple one.

Γαῖετανά (treated as a neuter plural noun, and glossed obscurely “*aseptic ligaments*”) is actually an adjective (“from Gaeta”) which is used substantively at Gal. X.924.4 K. for bandaging material to be employed in connection with a phlebotomy. Galen claims that such material was particularly unlikely to cause infection and says it was imported from Gaul (ἐκ μὲν τῆς τῶν Κελτῶν χώρας κομιζομένων). *DGE* compares Marcellus Empiricus 8.27 *gaitano lino* (“*linen from Gaeta*”; *Gaditano Helmreich*), and takes the place in question to be Caietae portus (i. e. modern Gaeta, which lies more or less midway along the Italian coast between Rome and Naples); more likely some otherwise unknown spot north of the Alps.

γαλακτουχέω (glossed “*have milk*”, i. e. “*lactate*”; cf. *DGE* s.v. “*tener leche o amamantar*”) is attested at Poll. 3.50 in a collection of words meaning “suckle” or the like. **γαλακτοῦχος** (glossed “*having milk*”) is a variant reading in Poll.^{BC}. Although the current edition of LSJ must have used Bethe for Books 1–5 of Pollux, earlier editions would have relied on Bekker, who dealt with the discrepancy at

⁵ C. D. Buck (1955). *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago 1955) §167. LSJ Supplement likewise failed to pick up the correction.

3.50 by printing γαλακτουχεῖν· γαλακτοῦχον. The lemma (dropped by *DGE*) was nonetheless taken over from the earlier version of the *Lexicon* into the 9th edition, and from there into the *Dictionary*; the Supplement also failed to spot the problem. This is thus a ghost word, and if it is to be included anywhere, it should be clearly marked as a v.l. in Pollux. Clement of Alexandria (2nd/3rd century CE) uses the cognate abstract noun γαλακτουχία three times (*Str.* 2.18.92.4; 3.11.72.1) to mean “weaning”,⁶ with the sense of the compound in this case seemingly being ~ “withholding milk” or “depriving of milk” as something approaching a calque of Latin *ablactio*.

γαλακτόομαι is glossed “become milk”, while γαλάκτωσις is glossed “transformation into milk”. Both words are attested almost exclusively in Theophrastus, who uses them to describe a type of decomposition that takes place in seeds that are sown in ground that is too wet (*CP* 1.7.3; 3.23.1; 4.4.7, 9; *HP* 8.6.1; so too *Plu. Mor.* 968a). The reference to milk is thus figurative in such contexts, and the words actually mean ~ “turn milky” and “transformation into something milky”, respectively.

Although [Arist.] *Phgn.* 808^a31⁷ mentions individuals who are γαλεάγκων/γαλιάγκων (glossed “with short arms, properly with the elbows of a weasel”; cf. *LSJ* “weasel-armed, i.e. short-armed”; *DGE* s.v. “que tiene brazos de comadreja, e.e. bracicorto”), he does not explain what this means. *Hp. Art.* 12 is quite specific and offers a very different definition: a γαλεάγκων has a permanently dislocated shoulder, and is unable to lift and use that arm (which is sometimes shorter than the other) in a normal fashion.

γαλέη, ἡ is “weasel”, while γαλεός, ὁ is “shark”. The manuscripts of *Aret. CD* 1.4.7 offer οἱ ἐνοικάδιοι γαλεοὶ βρωθέντες (“domesticated *galeoi*, when eaten”; one of a number of unusual remedies), which is clearly a reference to weasels, since sharks are not kept in one’s house. This is more likely an error than evidence for a masculine form of the word, but it ought in any case to be lemmatized under γαλέη rather than under γαλεός.⁸ The hound fish (a type of needlefish) was not found in the Mediterranean until the cutting of the Suez Canal (opened 1869), and nothing about the description of the ἰχθὺς γαλῆ discussed at *Ael. NA* 15.11 suggests that the two should be identified.⁹

⁶ Thus also Lampe in the *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. *DGE* offers “lactancia”, but Clement is clearly referring to the point at which a lamb or human child ceases to be nursed, not when the process begins. *LSJ* omits the word.

⁷ Miscited as “803a31”.

⁸ Indeed, there are indications that it was originally lemmatized thus, but was then moved to s.v. γαλεός: *Plu. Mor.* 446, cited s.v. γαλεός for ἐνοικίδιος γαλέη (glossed “tame weasel”) in fact offers only γαλαῖ, and the gloss belongs with the reference to Aretaeus s.v. γαλεός (again glossed “tame weasel”).

⁹ Note in particular that the ἰχθὺς γαλῆ is specifically said by Aelian to have barbels, as the houndfish does not.

The *hapax* γάμβρη (glossed “bush”) is described as a v.l. at Thphr. *HP* 1.3.1. This is in fact the reading in the manuscripts, for which Wimmer conjectured θύμβρα (“savory”; cf. *CP* 3.1.4). Whatever is printed, the word in question is the name of a specific variety of plant with many stems and branches that might be described generically as φρύγανον (“brush, undergrowth”).

γαμητή for γαμετή (“wife”) is early Byzantine usage. The outdated reference *BCH* 4.199 (seemingly drawn from *DGE* s.v.) should be replaced by *MAMA* III 25.4; add e.g. *IG* II² 13547.6 (5th/6th century CE); *SGLIBulg* 102.6 (6th century CE); *Aphrodisias* 746.3 (5th/6th century CE?).

γάμνος is not attested, and the gloss “happy” for compound γαμνοφόρος (“which yields γάμνος”) in Cyril of Alexandria’s *Homily* 11 (vol. LXXXII p. 1029.39 Migne) οἱ λιμένες οἱ γαμνοφόροι (in a list of figurative havens of safety) would serve better as a translation of γανοφόρος (lemmatized separately, with no cross-references between the two). But γᾶνος (glossed “brightness, sheen”) is not something one wants or expects from a harbor, and the correct reading is clearly γαληνοφόρος (“that yields calm”; offered as a v.l. s.v. γαμνοφόρος and not lemmatized separately), particularly given ὁ λιμὴν ὁ γαληνοφόρος τῶν χειμαζομένων (“the harbor that offers calm for the storm-tossed”) in a similar figurative list at *Alex.Sal. Barn.* 438d.

γαμοδαΐσια at *Ael. NA* 12.31 θύων τὰ γαμοδαΐσια is not “wedding” but “wedding sacrifices”, and is not a noun but an adjective used substantively (sc. ἱερά) as an internal accusative.

3rd-declension γαμψώνυξ (glossed “with curved or hooked claws”; used of birds, and therefore better “with curved or hooked talons”; cf. also *LfgrE* s.v.) is poetic (already e.g. *Il.* 16.428), while 2nd-declension γαμψώνυχος – mis-lemmatized as γαμψώνυχον -ον – is its late, primarily prosaic equivalent (e.g. *Arist. HA* 563b19–20 ὁ μὲν ἱέραξ γαμψώνυχος, ὁ δὲ κόκκυξ οὐ γαμψώνυχος).¹⁰ The manuscripts of Aristotle use both (e.g. τοῖς γαμψώνυξιν at *GA* 749^b3, οἱ γαμψώνυχες at *HA* 563^b7), perhaps in error under the influence of the well-established poetic form.

γάρος or γάρων (= Latin *garum*) is not “brine with small fish” but a fermented sauce, one of the main ingredients of which was fish. See in general R. I. Curtis *Garum and Salsamenta: Production and Commerce in Materia Medica* (Studies in Ancient Medicine 3: Leiden 1991) 6–15.

γασβαρηνός (glossed “treasurer”) – preserved in the genitive form γασβαρηνοῦ at *LXX 2Esdras* 1:8 – is not a Greek word but a rough transliteration of Aramaic *gizbar*, which is cognate with γάζα (“treasure”) and like it goes back to Persian.

¹⁰ Epich. fr. 27 is preserved in the form κάστακοὶ γαμψώνυχοι at *Ath.* 3.105b, but Dindorf was probably right to conjecture γαμψώνυχες.

Hsch. γ 193 defines γάστρα as γογγυλῖς (“turnip”); cf. Hsch. γ 204 γαστραία· ἡ γογγυλῖς. Λάκωνες (“*gastraiā*: the turnip. Spartans”), which looks like another version of the same note, albeit with a variant lemma (thus *DGE* s.v.). Ath. 9.369a, citing Apollas/Apellas *On the Cities in the Peloponnese* fr. 3, *FHG* iv.307 – presumably the ultimate source of the material in Hesychius as well – offers γαστέρας instead. But Hsch. γ 193 then goes on to offer ἡ κράμβη (“or cabbage”) as an alternative gloss of γάστρα, and the latter definition is supported by Nic. fr. 132 *ap.* Ath. 9.369a (ignored) παρὰ Βοιωτοῖς γαστέρας¹¹ ὀνομάζεσθαι τὰς κράμβας (“the Boeotians call cabbages *gasteres*”). This is thus an ancient philological muddle which is beyond our capacity to clarify completely. γαστραία is not an ancient variant, and the lemma should be struck. πυργάστρην (apparently “a fire-pot”; omitted) is the reading of M (i.e. the *Mediceus*, the archetype of all surviving copies of the text) at Aen.Tact. 4.2,¹² where the precise sense is difficult but burning and fire-signals are both in question. γάστρην (< γάστρα), a simplification that only makes the sense more obscure, is not a “v.l.” there but an attempt at correction and has no authority.

γεγωνοκώμη is explained by the lexicographers (Hsch. γ 248; Phot. γ 49 = *Suda* γ 96) and Eustathius at one point, followed by the *Dictionary*, as referring to a woman “who fills the village with shouting” (= *adesp. com. fr. *194*). But Eustathius at another point (p. 1921.65 = *adesp. com. fr. *224*; ignored) – seemingly drawing on Suetonius – suggests that the word actually refers to a prostitute, either because she advertises her services loudly and publicly or because she is notorious, i.e. widely spoken of, on a local level. This is more pointed and would explain the feminine form of the word. Cf. Cratin. fr. 411 ἀνεξικώμη (*ap.* Hsch. α 4902), which Lobeck took to mean “a whore who supports an entire village” (πόρνη ἡ ὅλην κώμην ἀνέχουσα).

For γεισηποδίζω (glossed “provide the cornice with support”, i.e. “equip with a γεῖσον-support”; cited from Is. fr. 113), add *Agora* XVI 109[1].113 γεγεισηποδι[σ]-μέ[ναι], an expanded and improved version of *IG* II² 463. S.vv. γεισήπους (l. 51), γεῖσ(σ)ον (ll. 51, 54, 72) and γεισηπόδιμα (ll. 63, 114) ought also to refer to the same inscription.¹³ Despite “etc.”, the only use of γεῖσον to refer to the fringe of a garment appears to be Ar. fr. 802 (a metaphorical or extended use of the word that was taken literally by the lexicographers?). Nothing in Poll. 1.76 τὸ δὲ προὔχον τοῦ ὑπερθυρίου γεῖσον καὶ γεισώματα (“the outward jutting portion of the lintel is the *geisôn* or *geisômata*”) or anywhere else in the ancient sources suggests that

¹¹ Thus D^s B Q^s M P Eust. Mus (i.e. the Byzantine philological tradition), combining A’s problematic γαστέας with the *Epitome*’s γάστρας. Pace the *Dictionary*, γαστέρας is not an ancient variant. Cunningham in the apparatus to Hsch. γ 193 seems confused on this point as well.

¹² Actually πυργαστρήνην for πυργάστρην, ἦν (Wünsch), reflecting the scribe’s inability to make adequate sense of his exemplar.

¹³ Note in the same inscription ἀκρογείσιον (l. 64) and ἀπογείσῳσις (l. 71) (both omitted, although already included in *DGE*).

γείσωμα means “penthouse” (i.e. an apartment on the roof or top floor of a building).

Plin. *Nat.* 24.164 reports in regard to the plant he calls gelotophyllis, i.e. γελωτόφυλλις (lit. “laughter-leaf”): haec si bibatur cum murra et vino, varias obversari species ridendique finem non fieri nisi potis nucleis pineae nucis cum pipere et melle in vino palmeo (“if this is drunk together with myrrh and wine, no end can be put to seeing various visions and to laughing, until one consumes pine-nuts combined with pepper and honey in palm wine”). LSJ s.v. (followed by *DGE* and the Dictionary) takes the reference to be to *Cannabis sativa*, i.e. marijuana. If so, Pliny or his source has garbled the description of how the drug was consumed. But this section of the *Natural History* is dedicated to fantastic, exotic plants of all sorts, and it is probably better not to take the description seriously, particularly since Greek had a well-established word for hemp, κάνναβις.

Hdt. 4.26.2 reports that θυσίας μεγάλας ἐπετείους (“great sacrifices held annually”) were celebrated among the Issedones (a Thracian tribe) after a man’s father died, and that παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, κατὰ περ Ἑλλήνες τὰ γενέσια (“a son does this in honor of his father, in the same fashion that the Greeks celebrate their *genesia*”). According to [Ammon.] *Diff.* 116, the clearest and most comprehensive discussion of the point (note also Phryn. *ecl.* 75; *Synag.* γ 24 = *Suda* γ 133), γενέσια δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων· ἐν ἧ ἕκαστος ἡμέρᾳ τετελεύτηκε, ταύτῃ ἐπιτελεῖται αὐτοῦ τὰ γενέσια (“*genesia* are celebrated in honor of the dead; on whatever day an individual dies, on that day his *genesia* are celebrated”). The ritual among the Issedones – as well as among the Athenians – thus took place not on “the anniversary (of the birth) of the dead”, but on the anniversary of the deceased’s death; cf. *CAL* s.v. 1 “celebration of the anniversary of a parent’s death”. Only later on – and incorrectly, from the lexicographers’ point of view – did γενέσια come to mean “birthday celebration” (properly τὰ γενέθλια).

γενειάζω, like γενειάσκω, means not “have a beard, grow a beard” (= γενειάω) but “sprout a beard, get a beard” (of a young man just reaching maturity, as at Theoc. 11.9; cf. *CGL* s.v. γενειάσσω “begin to grow one’s first beard”); the verb does not in any case mean “become male name” (*sic*).¹⁴ γενεάσις at Plot. 4.3.13 (describing various processes of growth and development, each in its own season) likewise means not “growing a beard” but “the acquisition of a beard”, i.e. growing one’s *first* beard.

The normal Greek words for “uncle” (both maternal and paternal) are θεῖος and the less well-attested νέννος (a *Lallwort*, i.e. baby-talk). γέννας is attested in this sense only at Hsch. γ 355 (glossed μητρός ἀδελφός, “mother’s brother”). Latte (who brackets the entry) and Cunningham (who obelizes it) are following

¹⁴ This strange error and others like it elsewhere in the *Dictionary* appear to be the product of a clumsily executed universal search-and-replace (presumably in connection with personal names that were first glossed “a man” and then altered to the more appropriate “male name”).

Nauck,¹⁵ who saw that the entry was a corrupt doublet of ν 301 that was moved here to restore alphabetical order. The lemma should be deleted.

Γεννησαρέτ is not just a “lake in Palestine” but another name for the Sea of Galilee; thus NT *Luke* 5:1 τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ (omitted). At NT *Mark* 6:52 ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ (the older text; omitted) ~ *Matthew* 14:34 (the text cited), on the other hand, this is not the lake itself but a name for a portion of its shore.

The precise sense of **γέντα** (glossed “innards, intestines”) at Nic. *Al.* 62 βοὸς νέα γέντα περιφλίωντος ἀλοιφῇ (“fresh *genta* of a cow almost bursting with fat”), 556a γέντα συὸς φλιδόωντος ἀλοιφῇ (“*genta* of a pig bursting with fat”); Call. *fr.* 322 γέντα βοῶν μέλδοντες (“stewing *genta* of a cow”); 530 (“you might partake of *genta*”) is uncertain. But Ael.Dion. γ 6* glosses the word Θρακιστὶ τὰ κρέα (“Thracian for ‘chunks of meat’”); Hsch. γ 377 offers κρέα, σπλάγχνα (“chunks of meat, entrails”); *Suda* γ 155 suggests τὰ μέλη (“the limbs [sc. of the animal]”); and the *scholia* to Nicander suggest κρέατα (“chunks of meat”) and τὰ μέλη (“the limbs”), all of which leaves no doubt that “bits of sacrificial meat” is the preferred ancient explanation of the word. That sense that would fit both Nicander’s repeated reference to how fat the animal is (much less relevant in reference to entrails) and the style of cooking mentioned by Callimachus (since entrails were roasted on a spit, whereas sacrificial meat was normally boiled in a cauldron).

γεντίλιοι (taken over direct from Latin *gentilis*) is late and rare in Greek literature. But Johannes Chrysostomus *fr.* *Ier.* 9.26, LXVI 860.8 Migne (late 4th/early 5th century CE) uses the word to refer to “Saracens” – i.e. Arabs – οἱ εἰσιν οἱ νῦν λεγόμενοι γεντίλιοι (“who are those now referred to as *gentilii*”) in a way that suggests that its sense was obvious for an early Byzantine Christian audience in Constantinople, and it is also attested in an inscription from Syria from the very beginning of the 3rd century CE (*PPUAES* IIIA 2,223.3).

Γεράστιος/Γεραίστιος is attested as the name of a month not just in Sparta (Th. 4.119.1) and Troezen (Caryst. *fr.* 13, *FHG* iv.358–359), but also at Kalauria (on the Saronic Gulf) (*IG* IV 841.12; late 3rd century BC) and on the island of Kos (e.g. *Iscr. di Kos* ED 45.41, early 2nd century BC (a late winter month); 216.11 (ca. 220 BC); *SEG* XLVIII 1089bis.1–2 (ca. 150–100 BC)).

Neuter plural **γέρρα** is glossed “tortoise formation, protective formation of shields” at Plb. 8.3.3 ἐτοιμασάμενοι δὲ γέρρα καὶ βέλη καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ πρὸς τὴν πολιορκίαν (“preparing *gerra* and missiles and the other items needed for the siege”); D.H. 6.92.2 κριούς τε καὶ γέρρα καὶ κλίμακας εὐτρεπισάμενος παρεσκευάζετο μὲν ὡς ἀπάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει πειρασόμενος τῆς πόλεως (“by getting rams and *gerra* and ladders ready, he was preparing to make an attempt on the city by storm”); Arr. *An.* 1.21.5 καὶ μέρος μὲν τι τῶν πλησίον τοῦ τείχους γέρρων καὶ ἐνὸς τῶν πύργων τῶν ξυλίνων κατεκαύθη (“and a certain portion of the *gerra* close to

15 A. Nauck (ed.), *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta* (Halis 1848) 141 n. 32.

the walls and one of the wooden towers were destroyed by fire”). In each case, the word actually refers to wicker screens set up to protect troops attacking a wall from missiles. Cf. LSJ s.v. (citing the same three passages and claiming that the term is equivalent to **γερροχελώνη**, for which see below). At D. 18.169, in response to the seizure of Elateia by Philip II of Macedon, the σκηναί (“stalls” *vel sim.*) in Athens’ agora are cleared of the people in them and τὰ γέρρα (here glossed “booths, barriers in the marketplace”) are burned, seemingly as a fire-signal to call citizens in from the countryside; the first definition of the word is thus correct there. At [D.] 59.90, on the other hand, barriers or screens of some kind (= the second definition) are in question, but the location is a courtroom, where γέρρα are used to separate jurors from spectators before ballots have been cast. For γέρρα Νάξια used in an obscure sexual sense, read not “Epich. fr. 235” (= the old Kaibel number), but “Epich. fr. 226”.

The detailed instructions for constructing a **γερροχελώνη** (glossed “tortoise formation, cover formed of shields”; cf. DGE s.v. “testudo o mantelete formado por escudos de mimbre”)¹⁶ at Philo Mechanicus, *Parasceuastica* p. 99.29–37 make it clear that this is actually a large wickerwork shelter, wrapped in hides and reinforced with lengths of wood on the inside, which a group of men could get inside and carry forward with them to provide protection from missiles being hurled at them from the front and above. Cf. above on γέρρα.

Whatever a **γηθυλλίς** is, it can be stewed (Eub. fr. 88.3), and the head can grow as big as a turnip or a large radish (Polemon fr. 36). The ancient authorities – most of them collected at Ath. 9.371e–2b or dependent on that passage or its sources – are thus most likely right that this is not a “chive” but a leek of some perhaps primordial sort. Cognate **γήθιον** = **γήτειον** is glossed “onion” with reference to Ar. fr. 5 τῶν δὲ γηθύων / ρίζας ἐχούσας σκοροδομίμητον φύσιν (“and *gêthyon* roots with a garlic-like character”) and Phryn. Com. fr. 12 (merely a notice that the poet used the word). The clearest description of the plant is Thphr. *HP* 7.4.10, which reports *inter alia* that τὸ δὲ γήτειον καλούμενον ἀκέφαλόν τι καὶ ὥσπερ αὐχένα μακρὸν ἔχον (“the so-called *gêteion* lacks a head, but has a long neck, as it were”), ruling out identification with what we would call an onion; hence the appropriately far more cautious LSJ s.v. γήτειον (an onion *variety*; followed by DGE s.v. γήθιον, although confusingly not s.v. γήτειον); Arnott on Alex. fr. 132.7 n. 2 (“a now unidentifiable and possibly lost variety of onion”) with further discussion and bibliography.¹⁷

¹⁶ The intended sense of LSJ s.v. “*penthouse, mantlet*” must have been much clearer a century ago, but is in any case apparently intended to communicate something similar.

¹⁷ W. G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 31: Cambridge 1996). *Inter alia*, Arnott notes that Hort’s “horn-onion”, taken over into LSJ s.v. γήτειον, “would have been more helpful if he had explained what he meant by a term unknown to dictionaries and horticulturalists”.

For the lemma γήρανις (glossed “senescence”) at Arist. *Metaph.* 1065^b20; *Ph.* 201^a19, read γήρανσις.

γηράσας πόδα at Phil. *AP* 6.94.7 (commemorating a set of dedications to Rhea by one of her devotees) is neither an external accusative (translated “having aged his foot, i.e. now that his foot has grown old”) nor an internal one (offered as an alternative explanation of the phrase, although without a gloss), but an accusative of respect, “having grown old in respect to his foot”, i.e. “having grown too old to dance”.

Whatever γλαμυρός means at S. fr. 396 τοὺς γλαμυροὺς κατὰ φορβάν (“*glamyros* in their feeding”), the sources that cite the verse say that it is used in reference to birds, effectively ruling out the translation “bleary” there. The lexicographers in any case insist that the adjective – applied a number of times to eyes in Hippocrates – means not ~ “blurred” but “moist” (ὕγρός or ἔνυγρος), i.e. “runny, full of discharge”. Wagner suggested that what was wanted in Sophocles was λαμυρούς (“gluttonous”). But *EM* p. 232.44–45 adds the comment γλαμυροὺς ἔνυγροβίους (“*glamyrous*: that live in moist places”), and while there is no specific reference to Sophocles there, the easiest interpretation of the use of the masculine accusative plural in the note is that this was a originally a gloss on that verse, and that “*glamyros* in their feeding” is an elaborate poetic way of saying “that seek their food in the marshes” *vel sim.*

Glaucoma and cataracts are entirely different phenomena, and γλαύκωσις (glossed “blindness from glaucoma”) at Hp. *Aph.* 3.31, γλαυκώω (glossed “suffer from glaucoma”) at Hp. *Prorrh.* 2.20, and γλαύκωμα (glossed “glaucoma, cataract”) at Arist. *GA* 708^a17, are all almost certainly references to cataracts – which are readily visible as a grayish mass, i.e. a γλαύκωμα, in the eye – rather than to glaucoma.

γλαυνός (a *hapax*) is traced to Poll. 7.48 (in a discussion of words for clothing) and glossed “type of tunic”. The history of the word – if that is what it is – is complex. Lederlin and Hemsterhuis (1706) printed καὶ γλαῦνος (thus accented), with a note citing Jungermann (d. 1610) to the effect that he found this reading in an unspecified manuscript (perhaps Poll.^C), although the same hand – implicitly the first – had written κεραυνός above, seemingly as a variant or correction. Jungermann then observed that he saw little difference between the readings, in that neither was known to him as a type of clothing. Lederlin and Hemsterhuis also note that Poll.^F has κεραυνός. Bekker (1846) printed καὶ γλαυνός (now thus accented) without comment. Bethe, on the other hand, prints κεραυνός and cites as parallels Phot. κ 591 and Hsch. κ 2294. γλαῦνος/γλαυνός is attested nowhere else and looks like a manuscript error, making this a ghost word.

γλοιός 1 (a noun) is glossed “greasy dirt, fat, filth left on baths”, with reference to Semon. fr. 8 ὥσπερ ἔγχελυς κατὰ γλοιοῦ; Teles. p. 41 Hense εἰσελθὼν ἄν εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον τῷ γλοιῷ ἠλείψατο; cf. LSJ s.v. “oily sediment in baths”, citing the same passages. In Semonides, the sense is in fact “just like an eel down into the

muck” (sc. at the bottom of a river or the like; cf. *CGL* s.v. 1 “slime”). Teles, on the other hand, is describing the extraordinarily simple lifestyle of the Cynic philosopher Crates: εἰ ἀλείψασθαι χρεῖαν ἔχοι, εἰσελθὼν ἂν εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον τῷ γλοιῷ ἠλείψατο (“if he needed to anoint himself with oil, he would go into the bathhouse and anoint himself with the *gloios*”); Σ^V Ar. Nu. 449 ~ *Suda* γ 306 εἴληπται δὲ ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς βαλανείοις ἐλαίου πεπηγότος, ὅπερ τοὺς ἐπιλαμβανομένους διολισθάνειν πέφυκε (“the metaphor is taken from the oil that congeals in the bathhouses, which naturally slips through the fingers of those applying it to themselves”) makes it clear that the reference is not to “greasy dirt”, “filth” or the like, but to cakes of spilled oil (~ *DGE* “*aceite* que se echaba en el baño”), making Crates’ frugal behavior comprehensible, if not necessarily appealing to an ordinary person. γλοιός at Ar. Nu. 449 – treated as an adjective (= γλοιός 2), following LSJ and *DGE*, and glossed “slimy, slippery, elusive” – is one in a long string of colorful, seemingly colloquial abusive terms used to describe an unscrupulous rascal. All the other words are nouns, and γλοιός thus most likely is as well; cf. colloquial English “slime-ball”. This is thus better treated as a figurative use of γλοιός 1, as in *CGL* s.v. 2. The dubious standing of γλοιός 2 (the adjective) is further apparent in the fact that the only other examples offered are (1) *Stud.Pal.* XX 15.9 = *CPR* I 27.9, where the word is no longer read (although LSJ Supplement fails to withdraw the reference); (2) Hsch. γ 657 γλοιός· νωθρός· ἀσθενής (“*gloios*: sluggish, weak”; also cited by LSJ s.v.), which seems to be connected to the use of the adverb in Hippocrates/Galen (see above s.v. γλοιιάζω), but is unrelated to the supposed sense of the word in *Clouds*; (3) *Suda* γ 306 (also cited in LSJ s.v.), which is merely another version of Σ^V on the line in Aristophanes and does not in any case identify the word as an adjective.¹⁸

[Gal.] XIV.793.12 K. distinguishes between ὑδρέλαιον, οἰνέλαιον and γλυκέλαιον. The first two words are rightly defined “a mixture of water and oil” and “wine mixed with oil”, respectively, and the latter patently means not “sweet oil” (thus also LSJ s.v.) but “oil mixed with grape syrup/must (i.e. γλυκύς/γλεῦκος)”. Cf. ὀξέλαιον (“vinegar mixed with oil”) at Gal. XIII.397.6 K. (contrasted with ὑδρέλαιον).

The word Zonaras and others use for *lotos* is not γλυκυκάλαμον but γλυκοκάλαμον (omitted); cf. Gal. XIX.727.10 K. (taken by *DGE* s.v. to be a reference to sugar cane).

ὀξύς is “sour”, not “bitter” – entirely different tastes, although English-speakers in particular have difficulty telling the two apart¹⁹ – and γλυκύοξυς is thus “sweet-and-sour” (cf. *CGL* s.v. “sweet and sharp”) but not “bittersweet” (= γλυκύπικρος).

¹⁸ γλοιός· τὸ αὐτὸ δηλοῖ τῷ μάσθλης. ... καὶ μέχρι δεῦρο δὲ τοὺς τῇ γνώμῃ σκάζοντας καὶ μηδὲν σταθερὸν φρονοῦντας καὶ ἄλλα μὲν ἐπαγγελλομένους, ἄλλα δὲ φρονοῦντας καὶ πράσσοντας, διὰ τὸ τῆς γνώμης ὀλισθηρὸν καὶ ἄπιστον γλοιοῦς καλοῦμεν.

¹⁹ M. OMahony, M. Goldenberg, J. Stedmon and J. Alford, “Confusion in the use of the taste adjectives ‘sour’ and ‘bitter’”, *Chemical Senses* 4 (1979) 301–318.

Marc. Ant. 4.33 does not use **γλῶσσημα** to mean precisely “*antiquated or obsolete word*”, but instead asserts αἱ πάλαι συνήθεις λέξεις γλῶσσήματα νῦν (“words that were long ago in common use are now *glōssēmata*”, i.e. “glosses” meaning “terms that are glossed for the convenience of readers”). So too **γλωσσηματικός** as a stylistic term does not mean “*embellished with antiquated or strange expressions*” but instead regularly modifies forms of ὄνομα (e.g. Gal. XVIIIa.414.16 K.; D.H. Lys. 3) and means “that require glossing, that require explanation”, while a **γλωσσογράφος** is someone who produces “glosses” or notes of this sort.

The medical problem with a horse’s tongue for which advice is offered at Hippiatr. 130.138 πρὸς γλωσσίδα is not second-declension **γλωσσίδος -ου, ὁ**, but third-declension γλωσσίδος -ίδος, ἡ.

The concrete use of **γνώμων** to mean “carpenter’s square”²⁰ (also **γωνία**) is attested first not at Polyæn. 4.3.21 (thus LSJ s.v., from which the reference seems to have been lifted) but already at Thgn. 805 τὸρνον καὶ στάθμης καὶ γνώμονος (“compass and plumb-line and carpenter’s square”), and the sense “*expert*” (add S. fr. 1038) is presumably an extension of this sense of the word.

γνωστός is glossed (meaning B) “*able to know, capable of knowing*” with reference to LXX Gen. 2:9 τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ (of the second important tree in the Garden of Eden, along with the tree of eternal life), but the last four words in the phrase are then translated “the knowledge of good and evil”. If this is the intended sense (as in the original Hebrew כֹּדַעַת וְרַע וטוֹב, followed clumsily in a style typical of the Septuagint translation), the adjective must actually be an odd internal accusative with the infinitive (~ “the tree of knowing what is knowable of good and evil”).

γνωτοκτόνος is an adjective rather than a noun and is not “*fratricide*” but “*fratricidal*” – perhaps better “*kin-slaying*” (see below on **γνωτός**) – at Eud. Cypr. 1.39 Καῖνου παλάμην γνωτοκτόνου (“the hand of fratricidal Cain”). The same is true of **γνωτοφόνος, -ον** (Nonn. D. 4.463; 26.82) which means not “*killer of one’s brother*”²¹, *fratricide*, but “*brother/kinsman-slaying, fratricidal*”.²² **γνωτοφόντις** (Lyc. 1318), on the other hand, is a noun.

²⁰ Glossed “*rule*” (i.e. “*ruler*”, normally κανών). But a working carpenter needs a square, and the sense “*sundial*” probably depends on the resemblance of the blade (properly the gnomon or style), which casts a shadow on the plate (properly the dial), to a Γ-shaped “*square*” rather than a simple ruler.

²¹ i.e. “*killer of one’s own brother*”.

²² Cf. **γογγοκτόνος, -ον**, which is not “*killer of eels*”, but “*eel-killing*”; **γοναγρός**, which is not “*sufferer from gout in the knee*”, but “*suffering from gout in the knee*”; **γονυαλγής**, which is not “*sufferer from pain in the knee*”, but “*suffering from pain in the knee*”.

γνωτός -ή 2 is an adjective (κ γίγνομαι) and thus means “kindred, related by blood”; “kinsman, brother or sister” is a substantive use of the word (= ὁ γνωτὸς ἄνθρωπος/ῆ γνωτὴ ἄνθρωπος). LSJ s.v. features the same confusion.²³

γομφιόδουπος (attested only at Maec. AP 6.233.1 and in a note on that line at Suda γ 373) is glossed “that squeals between the teeth, of a bite”. But a δοῦπος is a dull, hollow sound (~ “thud, clunk”); the object in question is a bit in a horse’s mouth; and the word means something more like “that clatters between the molars”.

The γόμφοι Odysseus uses to construct his raft on Calypso’s island at *Od.* 5.248 are patently “pegs of wood”, rather than “of iron” or “bolts”, not only because the text makes it clear that the hero produces all his own building material, but also because pegs – i.e. trenails – were routinely used for naval architecture and especially for hulls, since not only do they not corrode but they also expand when wet and thus make the join between the boards or timbers tighter; cf. A. *Supp.* 440 γεγόμενται σκάφος; Hdt. 2.96.2; Plu. *Mor.* 321d (building ships involves both γόμφωμα, “peg-work” – not simply “pegs” – and ἥλοι, “nails”);²⁴ AP 9.31.1 (shipwrights as γομφωτῆρες, which has a more specific technical sense than “carpenters”); CGL s.v. 1. γομφόδετος at A. *Supp.* 846 γομποδέτω τε δόρει (“and a raft bound together by *gomphoi*”) must thus also mean “bound with wooden pins” (i.e. “held together with wooden pegs”; cf. CGL s.v.) rather than “nailed”. Hesiod’s plow at *Op.* 431 is similarly put together with wooden pegs rather than with iron bolts (see West 1978 on 430);²⁵ Empedocles’ Aphrodite uses not “bonds, chains”, but a much more effective construction technique, γόμοις ... καταστόργοις (“pegs of love”; 31 B 87 D.–K.); and the figurative A. *Supp.* 945 ἐφήλωται τορῶς / γόμφος διαμπαξ means not “the rivet has been driven all the way home” (thus approximately also LSJ s.v. ἐφήλω) but “the peg has been fixed securely in place”. The cognate adjective γομφωτικός is accordingly not “of joining with nails”, but “having to do with pegging”, i.e. “joining”, a type of carpentry, as at Pl. *Plt.* 280d τὰς τῶν θυρωμάτων πῆξεις, γομφωτικῆς ἀπονεμηθεῖσαι μόρια τέχνης (“the pegging together of doorways, regarded as part of the craft of construction with γόμφοι”). Cf. γομφώ at Ar. *Eq.* 464 (where the language of carpentry is used figuratively of political conspiracy) γομφούμεν’ αὐτὰ πάντα καὶ κολλώμενα (“all these matters are being pegged and glued together”).²⁶

23 For γνωτός -ή -όν 1 in the sense “well-known, familiar”, the reference should be not to “S. fr. 282” (as also in LSJ s.v.), but to S. fr. 282.2. The further specification “cf. γνωτός” seems to be a remnant of some earlier lemmatization and should be deleted.

24 Pace s.v. γομφωτός (glossed “joined with nails”), the point at Str. 16.1.11 ναυπηγησάμενον διὰ λυτά τε καὶ γομφωτά is that the boats in question were constructed with no nails at all, but with only pegs and dowels, so that they could be more easily taken apart, transported over dry land, and then reassembled.

25 M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod. Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) on 430.

26 Modern American house construction in particular relies heavily on nails as a primary means of fastening, and nails are also necessary for some building techniques long and widely used in

While **γονάτιον** at Orib. 48.66 (= Heliodorus); 49.35 (= Rufus) is formally a diminutive of γόνυ (“knee”), it certainly does not mean “small knee” in either passage; perhaps “the knee area”, allowing Philo Judaeus *Vit. Cont.* 51 to speak of garments that hang τὰ μὲν ἐμπρόσθια κατωτέρω τῶν ὑπὸ γόνου, τὰ δὲ κατόπιν μικρὸν ὑπὸ τοῖς γονατίοις (“lower than the knee in front, but in back just a bit below the *gonatioi*”).

γονοειδής is not γόνιμος but γόνος in the sense “semen”.

γονόρροια was a recognized medical condition that involved – as the name itself makes clear – unwanted genital emissions of some sort. But the word does not mean “*gonorrhea*” in the modern sense of the word, which refers to a disease that is notably absent from the ancient medical record and instead appears to be first attested clinically at the very end of the 16th century.²⁷ The same correction applies to s.vv. **γονορροϊκός** and **γονορρυής** (both glossed “suffering from *gonorrhea*”).²⁸

ὁ **Γονύπεσος** (“the Kneeler”, whatever that may signify) is the nickname of a grammarian named Demetrius who worked on Homer. The word is otherwise unattested and does not mean “hassock”.

The mountains referenced at Plu. *Alex.* 31.10 are not the **Γορθυαῖα** (obscurely lemmatized Γορθυαίων, ὄρη, τά and glossed “mountains of the Gortyaioi (*sic*)”), but the Γορδυαῖα range (mentioned also at e.g. Str. 2.1.26; 11.12.4; St.Byz. γ 101).

Modern “gorilla” comes direct from Hanno’s **Γόριλλαι** (thus also LSJ) or **Γορίλλαι** (thus DGE) and is said by him to be the local term for a tribe of hairy African women; the name was awarded to a specific kind of ape in the mid-19th century. Despite LSJ s.v. “name of a tribe of hairy women (but prob. *gorilla*)”, there is no way of knowing precisely what sort of creature Hanno – who claims that three pelts were brought back to Carthage – is referring to, or if he or whoever is impersonating him is simply making the entire story up.

γορφία – better lemmatized as γορφίον, as in DGE, despite the fact that the word is attested only in the plural (Gp. 9.5.12) – is glossed “sticks for knocking down olives”. What is actually under discussion in the text is the cutting and planting of superfluous branches to produce new olive trees by asexual means, and the definition in the *Dictionary* appears to represent a crude misunderstanding of LSJ s.v. “stocks from which olive-trees are struck”, in which “strike” has the semi-technical sense “propagate via cuttings”. Cf. DGE s.v. “*esqueje, rampollo, plantón de oli-*

North America but less common in other places, such as clapboard and shingles. In ancient Greece, such techniques would have been unfeasible, since they would have required an enormous expense not only of valuable metal but of skilled labor, since every nail would have had to be made individually by a blacksmith.

²⁷ See in general R. Flemming, “(The Wrong King of) Gonorrhea in Antiquity”, in S. Szreter (ed.), *The Hidden Affliction: Sexually Transmitted Infections and Infertility in History* (Rochester 2019) 43–67.

²⁸ The cognate verb γορπυέω is well attested, but is omitted from the *Dictionary*.

vo". The word is borrowed direct from Aramaic, in which it means "shoot (of an olive tree)".

In at least two of the three passages cited (X. *An.* 6.3.22; D. 18.260²⁹), **γραιδίον** is not a diminutive (glossed "*little old woman*") but a deteriorative ("nasty old woman, worthless old woman" *vel sim.*), as also at e.g. Ar. *Ec.* 1000 "You're crazy, *graidion!*", 1003; Men. *Georg.* 54 "Shut up, *graidion!*" In Attic, at least, the word is in fact best understood as trisyllabic (vs. tetrasyllabic γραιδίον in LSJ and DGE).

γραιῦς is sometimes the "*film, skin*" that forms on top of a boiling cookpot (Ar. *Pl.* 1205–1206 ταῖς μὲν ἄλλαις γὰρ χύτραις / ἡ γραιῦς ἔπεστ' ἀνωτάτω, "on other pots, the *graus* is on top", punning on the word in its more common sense "old woman"; Arist. *GA* 743^{b7} καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐψήμασιν ἡ καλουμένη γραιῦς, "just like the so-called *graus* on boiled dishes"), and in an anecdote at Ath. 13.585c scum of a similar sort has formed on milk (although not obviously because it has been boiled). The final point does not suggest that **γραιῖζω** at Ar. fr. 461 means specifically "*to skim, remove the skin, of milk*", and Antiatt. γ 37, who cites the fragments, in fact glosses the word specifically ὅταν τὸ συναγόμενον ἐν ταῖς χύτραις καὶ ἐπαφρίζον ἐκχέωσιν. Ἀριστοφάνης Πλούτῳ ("what they do when they pour off that which collects in cookpots and forms on top of them; Aristophanes *Ploutos*").³⁰

The earliest references to **γραμματεῖα** (glossed "*tablets*") are at *IG* I³ 34.15, 17, 32 (448/7 BC), where public records of tribute payments are in question; cf. *IG* I³ 52.11 (434/3 BC); 138.6 (before 434 BC) (all omitted). *IG* I³ 52.11–12 distinguishes such records from πινάκια (presumably = "*whitened boards*").³¹ The ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον (not "*list of citizens*", but "*list of deme members*") mentioned at e.g. Is. 7.27 is another example of such records. At Ar. *Nu.* 19–20, by contrast, Strepsiadēs uses a γραμματεῖον to keep track of his personal accounts (omitted, with this sense of the word noted only in Demosthenes a century later). Ar. fr. 163 (also omitted) shows that γραμματεῖα were covered with wax; there are a number of references in the Demosthenic corpus to "opening" them (e.g. D. 45.11–12; [D.] 44.37; 46.2, 5); and there can be little doubt that the object in question is identical to the δελτίον δίπτυχον described at Hdt. 7.239.3, the crucial characteristic of which was that it could be closed and sealed to guarantee the security of the contents. See Austin–Olson on Ar. *Th.* 778–780 for further details and bibliography.³² The word is accordingly used only by extension to mean "*writing, note, document, contract*"; so too the **γραμμάτιον** at Luc. *Merc.cond.* 36 (a message sent to a woman by her lover, and thus of course secret). The γραμματεῖον referenced at

²⁹ Of the crones who celebrated depraved mysteries with the young Aeschines.

³⁰ Kassel–Austin treat this as a legitimate fragment of the lost *Ploutos I*. But the coincidence with Ar. *Pl.* 1205–6 (quoted above) is so obvious, that it is difficult to believe that this is not simply a reference to the original play, with the original point garbled as a result of the process of epitomization.

³¹ The two categories appear to be conflated late in the 4th century at [Arist.] *Ath.* 47.4 ἀναγράφας ἐν γραμματεῖ[οις λελ]ε[υ]κωμένοις, 53.4 εἰς λελευκωμένα γραμματεῖα.

³² C. Austin and S. D. Olson (eds.), *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazousae* (Oxford 2004).

Poll. 9.41 is a “*position of scribes*” only in the sense that Pollux is discussing the physical parts of a city (πόλεως μέρη), among which he includes stoas, race-tracks, and public offices, including those belonging to γραμματεῖς of various sorts, i.e. the individuals charged with producing and guarding official local γραμματεῖα, meaning court records, accounts, lists, and the like.

γραμματίζω at Herod. 3.24 Μάρωνα γραμματίζοντος / τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ is not “*teach spelling*” but ~ “*dictate*”: Kottalus’ father tried to get him to show he had learned something in school, by spelling “Maron”, but the boy was a bad student and wrote “Simon” instead.

Poll. 9.98 describes a board game for two players involving five lines (γραμμαί), with the middle line being the ἱερὰ γραμμή (lit. “sacred line”), and five moveable pieces (ψῆφοι/πεττοί) per player. How the game worked – it was not checkers, and the lines do not constitute a “*checkerboard*”, which is merely a vague point of modern comparison – is uncertain. Theoc. 6.18 uses the expression τὸν ἀπὸ γραμμᾶς κινεῖ λίθον, which is translated “*he moves the counter off the line, of a decisive move*”. The Greek actually means “*she*³³ moves the counter that comes from the line”, as if this piece were normally positioned there, and what Galatea is doing is precisely *not* acting decisively but teasing Polyphemus, who inexplicably refuses to engage with her.

While γραπτῆρ at Paul.Sil. AP 6.66.2 ἄβροχον ἀπλανέος μόλιβον γραπτῆρα κελεύθου is in apposition to a word that means literally “lead”, the reference is to a roller of some sort made of lead, which is used together with a ruler to create lines on the page so that the scribe’s writing remains properly aligned. Cf. Jul. Aeg. AP 6.67.1–3, where the same process is described.

The word Eustathius offers meaning “wrinkled” at p. 633.56, 634.2 (= II.277.12, 278.9 van der Valk) is in both cases not γράπτης but γράπτις (easily understood as an error for γράπις³⁴).

The γραπτὸν κύρβιν at Achae. TrGF 20 F 19.3–4 has not been “*painted*”; this is instead a riddling description of a Spartan messenger baton, as the discussion of the lines by Athenaeus (who quotes them at 10.451c–d) makes clear.

The ancient authorities agree that γράω in Call. fr. 551 καὶ γόνος αἰζηῶν ἔγραε κηδεμόνα means “*eat*”, not “*gnaw*” (Philox. fr. 651** τὸ γρῶ, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ ἐσθίω, ἀφ’ οὗ Καλλίμαχος ... “ἔγραε” ... ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσθιεν; Gal. XIX.132.1–2 K. ἔγρασε κηδεμόνα· Καλλίμαχος ἀντὶ τοῦ κατέφαγε; Hsch. γ 876 γρᾶ· φάγε, adding that the word is Cyprian).

Neither Opp. H. 3.80 nor Plu. Mor. 471d suggests that a γρῖφος (a fishing net of some sort) was “made of rushes”.

³³ I.e. the sea-nymph Galatea.

³⁴ At S. fr. 314.183 (unhelpfully cited s.v. γράπις as “S. Ichn. 183”), on the other hand, there is no good reason to think that the word means “wrinkled”, and Radt and O’Sullivan–Collard follow Robert in taking Γράπις to be the name of one of the satyrs.

At Sotad. fr. 1.3, **γρυμέα** means not “*rubbish, old thing*” but “odds and ends, spare bits”: after a cook roasts the central cut from a γαλέος, he stews τὴν ... λοιπὴν γρυμέαν. Nor does Poll. 10.160 claim that the word means “*sack or basket for old or dirty clothes*”; instead he says it is ἀγγεῖόν τι εἰς ἀπόθεσιν, ὃ ἔνιοι πῆραν νομίζουσιν (“a vessel for storage, what some authorities consider a pouch/wallet”). Cf. Phryn. *PS* p. 60.15–16 ἔστι δὲ παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις πῆρα τις γρυμέα καλουμένη, ἐν ᾗ παντοῖα σκεύη ἐστίν (“the Athenians refer to some sort of pouch/wallet called a *grymea*, in which items of all kinds are found”), citing Diph. fr. 128 (where no text is preserved) and Sapph. fr. 179 (the same object supposedly referred to as a **γρύτη** = τὴν μύρων καὶ γυναικείων τινῶν θήκην, “storage place for perfumes and women’s items”).

γρύπαι is defined at Hsch. γ 953 not as a “*vulture’s nest*” (following LSJ s.v.³⁵) but as “*vulture chicks*” (αἱ νεοσσιαὶ τῶν γυπῶν), hence the plural. Cf. below on **γύπη**.

A **γύης** is not a “*crossbeam* (of a plow)” but the “*beam*”, i.e. the part that extends forward from the share to the pole that connects to the yoke.³⁶ See West 1978 on Hes. *Op.* 427 (using the term “*tree*”) with an illustration; *CGL* s.v. 1. The word (more often “*field, arable land*”) is used at S. *Ant.* 569 ἀρώσιμοι γὰρ χἀτέρων εἰσὶν γύαι (“(Yes,) because others too have fields that can be plowed”; Creon responds to a question about whether he is willing to put his son’s fiancée to death) in an extended sense, not with a reference to an otherwise unattested meaning “*furrow*” extended to the female genitalia, however, but as an echo of the Attic marriage formula παίδων ἐπ’ ἀρότῳ γνησίων (“for the plowing of legitimate children”; e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 842 with Handley *ad loc.*³⁷).

In classical Athens, **γυμνασιάρχῳ** (glossed “*be head of a gymnasium*”) refers to a liturgy that involved organizing and paying for athletic competitions, staffing, maintaining, and perhaps renovating *gymnasia*, and the like; cf. [X.] *Ath.* 1.13 γυμνασιαρχοῦσιν οἱ πλούσιοι (“the wealthy serve as gymnasiarchs”; quoted by LSJ s.v.); *CGL* s.v. “hold the office of gymnasiarch”. The verb is attested epigraphically a generation earlier than any of the passages cited, at e.g. *IG* I³ 969bis a.3 (before 415 BC). In other parts of Greece in the Hellenistic period, it and its cognates are used to refer to a magistrate charged with running a gymnasium, setting its rules, enforcing them, and the like; this arrangement is perhaps most well-known from the 2nd-cent. BC law from Beroia, for which see the edition with extensive commentary of Gauthier and Hatzopoulos.³⁸

35 Perhaps intended as a – now impossibly old-fashioned and awkward – metonym describing the contents of the nest by reference to the nest itself (i.e. “*vulture’s nest*” = “*nest full of vulture chicks*”).

36 Cf. **γύον**, similarly misdefined “*plow crossbeam*”.

37 E. W. Handley (ed.), *The Dyskolos of Menander* (Cambridge Mass. 1965).

38 P. Gauthier and M. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (Athens 1993).

A **γυμνάσιον** is a “*gymnasium*”, which was a large public complex including e.g. a running track and bathing facilities. It is not a “*palaestra*”, which was simply a wrestling school that might or might not be associated with a γυμνάσιον and often belonged to an individual trainer (e.g. Pl. *Chrm.* 153a τὴν Ταυρέου παλαίστραν, “Taureas’ wrestling school”).

S.v. **γυμνός**, Thrasydaeus of Thebes, who is celebrated in Pindar’s 11th Pythian ode, was victorious in the boy’s stade race; P. 11.49 γυμνὸν ... στάδιον thus means not “unarmed race”, but “stade-race in which the competitors are naked”.³⁹ γυμνός can mean “without a cloak, not fully clothed” (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 497–498 and *Lys.* 150–151, where the point is explicit). But Hes. *Op.* 390–391 seems to mean that one ought to perform certain agricultural tasks literally “naked”; see West 1978 *ad loc.* γυμνός at Archil. fr. 265 = Hsch. γ 1001 is glossed “without hair, bald, beardless”; what Hesychius actually says the word means there is ἀνυπόδητον. ἢ ἀπεσκυθισμένον (“shoeless, or with a shaved head”).

The **γυναικίσις** with which Inlaw is charged at Ar. *Th.* 863 is not “womanish behavior or disguise”, but “transformation into a woman”, as the passage as a whole makes clear: αὖθις αὖ γίγναι γυνή, / πρὶν τῆς ἐτέρας δοῦναι γυναικίσεως δίκην; (“Are you turning into a woman again, before paying the penalty for your other *gynaikōsis*?”).

The earliest attestation of **γυναικωνίτις, -ιδος, ἡ** (glossed “women’s quarters”) is Ar. *Th.* 414 (omitted). The word is lemmatized as a noun (as also in *CGL* s. v.), but is nonetheless treated as an adjective often used substantively (as in *DGE* s. v.; LSJ s.v. seemingly treats it as a noun that eventually morphs into an adjective). The simplest explanation of the evidence is that the word is in fact an adjective and should thus be lemmatized as γυναικωνίτις, -ιδος, with αὐλή routinely supplied. *Inter alia*, this makes it clear that the “women’s quarters” of a house are not a sealed interior space but include open areas of the sort that domestic work of all sorts would require in any case.

The otherwise unattested **γυναικόκοσμος** (taken over from LSJ) is neither part of the text nor a manuscript variant at Poll. 8.112 γυναικονόμοι δὲ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῶν γυναικῶν. τὰς δὲ ἀκοσμούσας ἐζημίουν, although it appeared in the vulgate of the text up through Bekker’s edition. The lemma should be struck (as rightly in *DGE*). **γυναικονόμος** and cognates are common in inscriptions, although not until the Roman period and not in Athens (e.g. *IG* V,1 209.10 (Sparta, 1st century BC); *IC* IV 252.2 (Gortyn, ca. 100–50 BC)).

γυναικοτραφής means “effeminate” only by extension, the basic sense being “brought up by women” (τρεφω) and thus “lacking an appropriate training in masculinity”. Cf. Σ^T on *Il.* 10.317 (Dolon was brought up in the company of five

³⁹ The armed race was called the *hoplitodromos*, and was thus almost by definition restricted to adults. It would accordingly make no sense for Pindar to specify that the boy Thrasydaeus won in the unarmed race, as if there was some other standard possibility.

sisters) ὡς γυναικοτραφῆς δειλὸς ἦν καὶ ῥίποκίνδυνος (“being *gynaikotraphês*, he was a coward and foolhardy”).

In the classical period, *γύναιον* is almost entirely restricted to Attic prose and comedy – [Hippocrates] has it once, at *Epid.* 5.50 – and looks like a colloquial, familiar equivalent of *γυνή*, which similarly can mean both “wife” and “woman”. There is no more contempt in the use of the word at *And.* 1.130; *D.* 25.57 (where it is glossed “little woman, foolish woman”) than there is in any contemporary reference to the foolish things women generically can be expected to do, say, and believe.

Hsch. γ 1018–1019 does not define *γύπη* as “vulture’s nest” (taken over direct from LSJ s.v.) but instead glosses it (1) γύπας· καλύβας, καὶ θαλάμας. οἱ δὲ γυπῶν νεοσσιὰς, ἄλλοι στενὰς εἰσόδους. οἱ δὲ τὰς κατὰ γῆς οἰκῆσεις. οἱ δὲ σπήλαια (“*gypai*: monks’ cells, or dens. Others (take it to mean) vulture chicks, others narrow entrances. Some take it to mean dwelling places beneath the earth, others caves”); (2) γύπη· κοίλωμα γῆς. θαλάμη. γωνία (“*gypê*: a hollow in the earth; a chamber; a secluded spot”⁴⁰). Cf. above on *γρύπαι*.

Poll. 4.104 says not just that *γύπωνες* were “dancers (Spartan)” (so too LSJ s.v. “dancers at Sparta”) but that they were stilt-dancers who wore transparent outfits of some sort (οἱ δὲ γύπωνες ξυλίνων κώλων ἐπιβαίνοντες ὠρχοῦντο, διαφανῇ ταραντινίδια ἀμπεχόμενοι, “*gypônes* danced mounted on wooden legs, wearing transparent Tarentine garments”).

The reference to “*Plat. Phil.* 690a13” s.v. *γωνία* in the sense “carpenter’s square” is a garbled combination of *Pl. Phlb.* 51c κανόσι καὶ γωνίαις and *Arist. PA* 690^a13 (which uses the word, however, with a different meaning).

γωνιαῖος in *Pl.Com.* fr. 69 ὅταν δέωμαι γωνιαίου ῥήματος, / τούτῳ παριστῶ καὶ μοχλεύω τὰς πέτρας (“whenever I need a *gôniaios* word, I stand beside this and lever at the rocks”) is glossed “difficult to pronounce” (following LSJ s.v. “hard to pronounce”; cf. *DGE* s.v. “*esquinado, difícil de pronunciar*”). As Pirrotta *ad loc.* notes,⁴¹ this would be an odd and otherwise unexampled sense of the adjective, which is more plausibly taken to mean ~ “serving as a cornerstone” (cf. *IG* I³ 474.19, from 409 BC), i.e. “as a basis for my argument”.

γωρυτός means “quiver”, i.e. a container for arrows, in the three passages cited s.v. (*Od.* 21.54 τόξον / αὐτῷ γωρυτῷ with *LfgrE* s.v.; *Lyc.* 458 γωρυτός ... Σκύθης; *Luc. Herc.* 1, one of the items of Heracles’ equipment, along with a club and bow). Some later authorities erroneously took it to be a bowcase (e.g. *Apollon.* p. 56.1 ἡ τοξοθήκη; thus *CGL* s.v.). But it nowhere means “scabbard”, i.e. a sheath in which to keep a sword or dagger.

⁴⁰ Seemingly a reference to *Call.* fr. 43.71 κέκρυπται γύπη ζάγκλον ὑπὸ χθονίῃ (translated “in an underground nest”; but the sense is “in an underground cave”, referring to the hiding place of the sickle with which Cronus castrated Ouranos).

⁴¹ S. Pirrotta (ed.), *Plato comicus. Die fragmentarischen Komödien. Ein Kommentar* (Studia Comica Band 1: Berlin 2009) *ad loc.*

Correspondence:

S. Douglas Olson

Department of Classical and Near Eastern Religions and Cultures

245 Nicholson Hall

216 Pillsbury Drive SE

Minneapolis, MN 55455

USA

sdouglasolson@gmail.com