

Some Greek Words: Part I

By THOMAS DREW-BEAR, Harvard University

In this article are listed one hundred *corrigenda*, *addenda* and *delenda* to the *Greek-English Lexicon* of Liddell, Scott, Jones and its *Supplement* (1968). Numerous and helpful corrections to *LSJ* were listed by M. N. Tod in *Hermathena* 59 (1942) pp. 67–93 and 60 (1942) pp. 16–37 (for some errors in these lists see J. and L. Robert, “Bull. Épigr.” 1944 no. 31), but not utilized in the *Supplement*.

ἁβέβηλος The article s.v. in *LSJ* reads: “*sacred, inviolable*, Plu. *Brut.* 20, cf. *Cam.* 30; of persons, *pure*, Inscr. Prien. 113.67.” The inscription referred to describes the services rendered to his city by a benefactor who provided a banquet for all the citizens, with entertainment: [ἀκροάματα] μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς [ξένης μι]σθωσάμενος καὶ τὸν δυνάμενον τῇ [έχρη ψυχᾷ] γωγῆσαι παντόμιμ[ο]ν [Πλ]ουτογένην, ἐπιδεξάμενος δ’ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τ[έσσσερας or τρεῖς] ἡμέρας, ἁβέβηλον καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιθυμίας τὸν {τε} καιρὸν [έποίησεν]. L. Robert (to whom are due most of the restorations) pointed out in *Hellenica* XI–XII p. 9 that “Il ne s’agit pas du pantomime, mais du καιρός . . . C’est un tour rhétorique, où le rédacteur dit que le bienfaiteur a fait en sorte que ‘la circonstance’, ‘le moment’, ne fût pas privé de la satisfaction de ce désir (de jouir de l’art de l’illustre pantomime); ἁβέβηλος y est le contraire de βέβηλος, qui signifie: non-initié, profane, ἀμύητος. Cette recherche rhétorique de psychologie correspond au ton de tout le passage.” The definition “pure” given by *LSJ* on the basis of this text alone is therefore erroneous and should be replaced by a Part II added to the article giving the correct meaning of ἁβέβηλος in this text, which is different from its meaning in the two passages of Plutarch cited.

ἀήρ Section II.2 of the article s.v. in *LSJ* gives the definition “volume” (with a reference to Pseudo-Hero *Stereometrica*); in the *Supplement* is added a Section II.3 “*space on a flat roof*”, from a sixth-century papyrus. An inscription published by W. Judeich in *Altertümer von Hierapolis* (1898) p. 121 no. 158 has been neglected: ὁ βωμὸς καὶ ἡ [έ]πικιμ[έ]νη σορὸς [ς] Δοκιμην[ή] Φλ. Μεττίας Θεωφιλιανῆς· ὃν βωμὸν σὺν τοῖς] θέμασιν αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ προδηλουμένη σορῷ οὐδενὶ ἐξέσται πωλῆσαι . . . μὴ ἐξὸν εἶνε μήτε ἀέρα τοῦ βωμοῦ τινα συνχωρῆσε· εἰ δέ τις . . . τὴν ἐπικιμένην σορὸν τὴν Δοκιμηνήν τοῦ τόπου μεταθήσιν εἰς ἕτερον τόπον τοῦ βωμοῦ, ἰσώσει (i.e. εἰσώσει) π[ρ]οστίμον κτλ. Clearly

this funeral monument consisted of a sarcophagus (σορός) placed on a pedestal (βωμός, v. infra) which in turn stood on a base (θέματα); the prohibition against granting the ἀήρ τοῦ βωμοῦ is explained by the following penalty ordained against anyone who should move the sarcophagus to a different part of the pedestal, so that the ἀήρ τοῦ βωμοῦ must be the “space on top of the pedestal.” J. Kubińska (*Les monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l’Asie Mineure*, Warsaw 1968 p.131) notes that ἀήρ occurs with the same meaning in an inscription published by J. Keil and A. von Premerstein, *Erste Reise* (*Denkschr. der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien* 53.2: 1908) p. 51 no.102: Ἀῶρ. Παγκράτης β’ Θνατειρηνός κατεσκευ[α]σεν τὴν σορὸν σὺν — — καὶ τῶ] κατ’ αὐτῆς ἀέρι καὶ τῇ πρὸ αὐτῆς πναλεῖ[δι] κτλ. Thus ἀήρ is not merely space “on a flat roof”. Both inscriptions should be cited. Cf. A. Cameron, *AJP* 1931 p. 238 s. v. *area*.

ἀκροδικαιότερος This word, not registered in *LSJ*, occurs in an epitaph at Aphrodisias published in *MAMA* VIII no. 569, but because it was omitted from the index of the latter work it naturally does not appear in the *Supplement* (cf. infra ἀνδράδελφος, εἰδοφόρος, εὐσυνειδήτως etc.). L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII p.184) discusses ἀκροδικαιότερος (“sans doute un hapax”) and the rare adjective ἀκροδίκαιος, attested in Christian authors omitted from *LSJ*.

ἀνδράδελφος This word, cited in *LSJ* only from the Suda, occurs on an epitaph published in *MAMA* VIII no.167. For other attestations and the history of the word see L. Robert, *Hellenica* XIII pp. 32–33.

***ἀνθυποφαίνω** In *LSJ* appears an article “ἀνθυποφαίνω, reveal in turn, *CIG* 4958 (Egypt)”; no entry s.v. in the *Supplement*. The second line of a Christian inscription in verse painted on a tomb at El-Bagawat appears in *CIG* loc. cit. as follows:

Ἰλαθει, χρηστὲ πᾶτερ, χρύσειον γένος ἀν[θ]υποφήνας.

However, in 1907 G. Lefebvre (*Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d’Égypte* no. 353) printed the following text, after a copy of W. de Bock:

Ἰλαθει χρηστε πατερ χρυσειον γενοσ υποφηνας .

In 1968 L. Koenen (*Zeitschr. für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* II pp. 75–78) reedited this text with a photograph and remarked “In der Edition der vorstehenden Inschrift im *CIG* (4958) und bei Kaibel (1024) steht ἀν[θ]υποφήνας. Die Stelle ist bei L.S.J. s.v. ἀνθυποφαίνω als einziger Beleg für dieses Wort aufgenommen. Die diplomatische Abschrift im *CIG* klärt den Irrtum auf. ἄνδρα, das

letzte Wort des ersten Verses, hatte in dem vor der Kuppel der Grabkammer gebildeten Feld keinen Platz mehr. Der Schreiber setzte es unter *εἰδον*, das im CIG als *εἶαον* gelesen ist. *ἄνδρα* steht so zwischen dem 1. und dem 2. Vers, aber entschieden rechts von dem letzten Wort des durch die Auslassung und etwas engere Schreibweise kürzeren 2. Verses. In der Abschrift des CIG ist dieses *ἄνδρα* nach links über *ὑποφήνας* verrutscht und zudem falsch als *αν.α* gelesen worden. Auf diese Weise entstand *ἄν[θ]᾽ υποφήνας*. Der Sachverhalt ist deutlich. Die Fata Morgana *ἀνθυποφαίνω* ist aus dem Lexikon zu streichen." J. and L. Robert in "Bull. Épigr." (*REG*) 1968 p. 541 no. 588 remark that Koenen "explique comment le CIG (disons J. Franz) avait mal interprété le copiste (c'était Cailliaud). Le mot a disparu depuis De Bock."

ἀπαράλίσκευτος The article s.v. in *LSJ* reads as follows: "not defeated in discus-throwing, *Ephes.* 2 No. 72 (iii A.D.)." Upon looking up the inscription *Ephesos* II (1913) no. 72 one is surprised to find in line 18 the reading *ἀπαράλίσκευτον* (without comment by the editor, R. Heberdey). The error was corrected by R. Herzog in R. Knab, *Die Periodoniken* (Diss. Giessen, 1934) p. 15 (cf. L. Robert, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*: Fondation Hardt XIV, 1969: *L'épigramme grecque* p. 242). In order to avoid referring without explanation to a text which differs from the entry registered in *LSJ*, a future edition should either mention the (perhaps not immediately apparent) passage in which the reading was corrected or, more simply, cite the text as L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* no. 75.

**ἀριστονείκης* This word is registered for the first time in the *Supplement* as follows: "dub. sens., *BCH* 10.232, cf. *Eos* 48 (2).230." M. Holleaux and P. Paris published in *BCH* loc. cit. (1886) an agonistic inscription of Oinoanda, of which lines 8–10 were read as follows:

Ἀσ. Φλ. Φλαβιλλίαν[ο]-
[ς] ἀριστονείκης παράδ[ο]-
[ξο]ς Οἰνοανδὲς καὶ . . .

The word *ἀριστονείκης*, omitted from *LSJ*, was included by Ad. Wilhelm in the list of *addenda* at the end of Kretschmer-Locker's *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch* (cf. s.v. *προεντυπώω* in Part II) whence it was copied into the *Supplement*. However, in the article cited by the *Supplement* (now *Opera Minora Selecta* I p. 646) L. Robert wrote: "Il ne me semble pas que l'on puisse fournir une explication de la première partie du composé *ἀριστονείκης*; nous ne connaissons pas

de fêtes *Ἀριστα*, ni de concours qualifiés de *ἄριστοι*. Les inscriptions de cette région sont souvent difficiles à lire et les éditeurs de la base d'Oinoanda étaient tout à fait au début de leur carrière et de leur expérience. D'ailleurs, la copie de M. Holleaux, qui m'avait confié son carnet, donne, avant le mot qui me paraît suspect, une haste verticale qui ne s'accorde pas avec un *sigma*. Je crois que de légères erreurs ont été commises dans la lecture du début de la ligne 9: un *lambda* a été pris pour un *alpha*, et un *epsilon* pour un *rho*. Je rétablis un titre courant, très fréquemment lié à *παράδοξος* et convenant à notre homme, qui n'était pas un athlète de très grande renommée, en reconnaissant *πλειστονείκης*, 'vainqueur en de nombreux concours'." Had the *Supplement* editors read either this passage to which they refer or its analysis in "Bull. Épigr." (*REG*) 1958 p. 319 no. 464, they would have seen that *ἀριστονείκης* is not a word of "dubious sense" but a word which does not exist.

ἀρχιστολιστής For the erroneous definition in *LSJ* and the correct explanation of the word v. infra s.v. *πρωτοστολιστής*.

ἀτραυμάτιστος For this word *LSJ* gives the meaning "not caused by a wound", with references to Lucian and Aetius (sixth century A. D.). The list of victors at the Olympic Games drawn up by Sextus Julius Africanus (available since 1862 in the edition of I. Rutgers) includes the following item for the 135th Olympiad (240 B.C.): *πυγμῆν Κλεόξενος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, περιοδονίκης ἀτραυμάτιστος*. L. Robert (*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*: Fondation Hardt XIV, 1969: *L'épigramme grecque* pp. 235–236) points out (cf. already R. Knab, *Die Periodoniken*: Diss. Giessen 1934, p. 12) that here *ἀτραυμάτιστος* (to be understood in the passive) is a technical term given as a title to a successful boxer skilled in avoiding his opponents' blows.

βαθρικόν The article s.v. in *LSJ* gives two meanings for this word, "base" (citing *IGR* 4.835) and "stairway" (citing *REG* 19 p. 265). Th. Reinach in *REG* loc. cit. (1906) published an epitaph from Aphrodisias which mentions *ἡ ἰσώστη . . . ἡ ἐν τῷ βαθρικῷ*; he commented "*βαθρικόν* n'est pas un nom géographique comme l'a cru Waddington mais signifie escalier" (whence the definition in *LSJ*). According to J. Kubińska (op. cit. p. 91) this is the only occurrence of the word outside of Hierapolis, where it is frequently attested; numerous examples from the latter city (e.g. *Altertümer von Hierapolis* no. 208 *ἡ σορὸς καὶ τὸ βαθρικὸν καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον θέμα*; ibid. 227 *ἡ σορὸς καὶ ὁ περὶ αὐτὴν τόπος σὺν τῷ ὑποκίμενῳ βαθρικῷ*) show clearly that the only correct definition of *βαθρικόν* is "stepped pedestal". For the steps, which gave access to the sarcophagus, cf. ibid. 152:

ἡ σορός καὶ ὁ περὶ αὐτὴν τόπος καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ αὐτὴν [θέ]μα καὶ τὸ ἐπιστρέφον βαθρικὸν καὶ τὸ ἔμπροσθεν σύνστρομα (in *LSJ* s.v. ἐπιστρέφω 2b the words τὸ ἐπιστρέφον βαθρικὸν are explained as “the steps *leading to* the sarcophagus”). A photograph by L. Robert of a funeral monument with βαθρικόν at Hierapolis is published by Kubińska, Pl. XV. The single correct definition must replace the two different and erroneous explanations given by *LSJ*.

βάλλω The article s.v. in *LSJ* cites Soph. *Ajax* 1333 (cf. also 1308–1309) for the meaning, in the aorist, “cast out a corpse” (unburied). In later Greek the same verb has in the aorist the opposite sense, “to bury” (in a tomb): e.g. W. M. Ramsay *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* I p. 233 no. 80 (epitaph of a citizen of Eumeneia) [ἐξουσία οὐκ] ἔσται ἕτερον βαλεῖν; *MAMA* VI 325 (Jewish epitaph at Akmonia) δς ἂν ἀνορύξῃ καὶ βαλῇ ἄλλον νεκρὸν . . . ἐξολέσει ἐκίνου σύνπαν γένος ἡ θεοῦ ὀργή; *MAMA* I 167 (Christian epitaph at Laodiceia Combusta) εἰ δέ τις ἐξωτ[ι]κὸν βαλῇ, δώσει λ[ό]γον θεῷ; ibid. 169 (cf. H. Grégoire in *Byzantion* 4, 1927–28, p. 735); *CIG* 3266 (Smyrna) ἐὰν δέ τις εἰσβιασάμενος βάλλῃ, ἀποδότω κτλ.; ibid. 3270, from the same city εἰς τὴν σορὸν δέ μου μηδένα ἕτερον βληθῆναι . . . πλὴν ἐμοῦ· ἐὰν δέ τις βάλλῃ δότω . . . ἐὰν βούληται τεθῆναι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, θεῖσα σορὸν ἐαυτῇ βληθήσεται μόνῃ κτλ.; *TAM* II 1148 (Olympos) ἐπιτρέπω βλεθῆναι τὰ τέκνα μου; J. and L. Robert “Bull. Épigr.” (*REG*) 1950 p. 203 no. 204 (n. 26), at Perge ἐτέρω δὲ οὐδενὶ ἐξέσται βαληθῆναι; etc. This frequently attested meaning of the verb should be registered in *LSJ*.

Βιθονιάρχης From the article s.v. in the *Supplement* must be deleted the reference to *ιεραρχία*, q.v.

βωμός In Section 3 of the article s.v. in *LSJ* is given the meaning “tomb, cairn” with a single example, G. Kaibel *Epigrammata Graeca* no. 319 (now W. Peek *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* no. 685), an epitaph from Philadelphia in Lydia selected at random from hundreds. Both definition and documentation are inadequate, for βωμός certainly does not normally mean “cairn”, and “tomb” is too general (the same definition is given by *LSJ* for such diverse words as εἰσώστη, εἰσένεκτον, ἡρώων, μνήμα, μνημεῖον, τάφος etc.). Therefore “tomb, cairn” should be deleted and replaced with the definition: “funerary altar”. For the second meaning of βωμός in sepulchral inscriptions: “pedestal” or “platform” supporting one or more sarcophagi (cf. supra ἀήρ), see in addition to J. and L. Robert, “Bull. Épigr.” (*REG*) 1950 p. 202 no. 204 also J. Kubińska, op. cit. pp. 73–78, with several photographs by L. Robert of funeral monuments at Hierapolis which show that in this city the βωμός “n’est pas à proprement

parler un soubassement; c'est plutôt une grande plate-forme . . . en forme de pièce rectangulaire plus ou moins grande couverte d'un toit plat et munie dans la plupart des cas, d'une porte sur le petit côté."

γνήσιος The article s. v. in *LSJ* registers and documents the senses "lawfully begotten" and "genuine, legitimate"; but L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII pp. 218–222) has shown that there existed a third meaning, frequently attested in sepulchral inscriptions: "dear" (e.g. *MAMA* VIII 595 εἰς ἣν σορὸν ταφήσομαι ἐγὼ τε ὁ Μελτιανὸς καὶ τὰ γνήσιά μου παιδιά; *MAMA* IV 305 τῇ γλυκντάτῃ τεκούσῃ Μελ[τ]ίνῃ καὶ γνήσιᾳ γυναικὶ Ἀμμία κα[ὶ] τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἀμμία). Robert concludes "Je crois que *γνήσιος* est ici une épithète sentimentale du même ordre que *γλυκύτατος*, *φίλτατος*, et que partant du sens de 'légitime, authentique, vrai, non simulé,'—comme on a *γνήσιος φίλος* et . . . *γνήσιᾳ σπουδῇ* . . . on a donné à *γνήσιος*, accompagnant un terme de parenté, un sens affectif, l'équivalent de *γλυκύτατος*" (cf. also *Ant. Class.* 1966 pp. 387–388). This sense, frequent in the late Empire, should be registered by a new edition of *LSJ* with a reference to the demonstration by Robert.

γράδος The article s. v. in the *Supplement* distinguishes two meanings of this word, "= Lat. *gradus*, step or base" (citing *IGR* 4.737) and "esp. platform of a sarcophagus" (citing E. Kalinka, *Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien* 323). It is not correct to separate thus two different senses, for in the inscriptions of Eumeneia (the only city in Asia Minor at which the word is presently attested) as in those of Philippopolis (Plovdiv: the example given by the *Supplement* is now to be cited as G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae* III.1 no. 993 and should in any case be replaced by no. 992, which is better preserved), as in epitaphs at Nikopolis on the Istros (ibid. II 688) and Thessaloniki (see the examples collected by J. Kubińska, op. cit. pp. 92–93) the word has the same meaning: "stepped pedestal" supporting a funerary altar or a sarcophagus (cf. *βαθρικόν* and *ἐκβάσμωνις*). Thus both explanations given by *LSJ* should be replaced by the single correct definition.

δημωφελῶς Among the attestations of this adverb cited by *LSJ* in the article s. v. is the inscription *CIG* 4415b, which is said to have been found at the city of "Iotapata". As L. Robert remarked (*Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* p. 97) the city in question is Iotape on the coast of Rough Cilicia, named after the wife of Antiochos IV of Commagene.

διάβασις Among the meanings listed for this word by the article s.v. in *LSJ* is “bridge”, documented by a single reference: Xen. *Anabasis* 2.3.10. This passage, in the *OCT* edition of E. C. Marchant (1904) reads as follows: ἐνετύγχανον τάφροις καὶ ἀλῶσιν ὕδατος πλήρεις, ὥς μὴ δύνασθαι διαβαίνειν ἄνευ γεφυρῶν· ἀλλ’ ἐποιοῦντο διαβάσεις ἐκ τῶν φοινίκων οἱ ἦσαν ἐκπεπτωκότες, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐξέκοπτον. L. Dindorf in his Teubner edition of 1857 had deleted διαβάσεις; cf. his Preface, p. xiii “Eiusdem auctoritate . . . deleui διαβάσεις, quo Hesychius explicat γέφυρα nec pontis significatione facile usurus erat Xenophon, neque sic dixit 3, 4, 20: ‘Οπότε δέοι γέφυραν διαβαίνειν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ διάβασιν· 23: Εἰ δὲ καὶ διαβαίνειν τινὰ δέοι διάβασιν ἢ γέφυραν.” Dindorf was not followed by subsequent editors (W. Gemoll, Teubner 1927; P. Masqueray, Budé 1930; Marchant); but he was correct in stating that neither here nor elsewhere does Xenophon use διάβασις to mean “bridge”. Elsewhere in his works the word means “ford” or “(means of) crossing”, as it does in other authors (see the citations in *LSJ*); and it is the latter definition which suits the passage quoted, for the soldiers did not construct proper bridges of palm-trees but simply contrived temporary expedients for getting across the ditches and canals. Since this is the only passage alleged by *LSJ* to support the definition “bridge”, this definition must be deleted.

διαφωνέω Among the examples cited by the article s.v. in *LSJ* for the meaning “disagree” is a passage from Polybius (21.43.23) describing the provisions of the Treaty of Apameia; after mentioning the amount of the indemnity to be paid by Antiochos III the text reads εἰ δέ τι διαφωνήσῃ τῶν ἀποδιδόμενων χρημάτων, τῷ ἐχομένῳ ἔτι ἀποδότωσαν—explained in *LSJ* “[if] there is a discrepancy in the accounts.” However, L. and J. Robert (*La Carie* II p. 310 note 10) point out that “L’emploi financier du mot . . . s’entend aisément, d’après le sens général: disparaître”; they translate the passage “s’il manque quelque chose dans les sommes versées” and note that “le dictionnaire de Liddell-Scott-Jones sépare à tort ce passage des exemples de ‘to be lost, perish’ pour le classer à ‘disagree’.” The passage in Polybius must therefore be removed from Section 2 of the article in *LSJ* and placed where it belongs, in Section 3b with a correct translation.

δομestικός For this very common word, omitted from *LSJ* and its *Supplement* although many of its occurrences fall well within the time limit set for that dictionary (cf. p. xi), the editors are referred to the instances cited by Sophocles *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and*

Byzantine Periods s.v.; A. Cameron “Latin Words in Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor” (*AJP* 1931) p. 244; S. Daris “Il lessico latino nella lingua greca d’Egitto” (*Aegyptus* 1960) p. 200. For some epigraphical examples from Egypt (dated probably to the sixth century) see E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines de Philae* II nos. 219–222.

δουλικόν An inscription published by J. Keil and Ad. Wilhelm (*MAMA* III no. 795, from Elaioussa-Sebaste) mentions ἡ μάκρᾳ σὺν τῷ δουλικῷ. The editors comment “Ob unter *δουλικόν* die Sklavenschaft oder, wie jetzt noch im Neugriechischen, eine einzelne Dienerin oder eine für diese bestimmte Bestattungsstätte neben oder unter dem Sarkophag der Herrschaft zu verstehen sei, vermögen wir nicht zu entscheiden.” J. Kubińska (op. cit. p. 90) remarks “Il nous semble que ce mot désigne probablement le soubassement. En effet, les esclaves sont le plus souvent enterrés dans le soubassement. Là le soubassement devait leur être réservé et il tirait de là son nom: τὸ δουλικόν.” This form (in the neuter) with the meaning suggested by Kubińska should be added to the article s.v. *δουλικός* in *LSJ*.

δωμάτιον For this word the article s.v. in *LSJ* cites *IG* 12 (8) 442 line 8, a metrical epitaph of Thasos which says of the defunct that she

ἀποφθιμένη δὲ πρὸς Αἶδαν
πλουτῖον τέκνων λίπετο δωμάτιον.

However, revision of the text by P. Bernard and F. Salviat (*BCH* 1967 p. 621 no. 81) has shown that line 8 reads in fact:

πλουτῖον τέκνων λίπετο δῶμα πό[σει].

This example of *δωμάτιον* must therefore be deleted from *LSJ*.

εἰδοφόρος The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as “part of a tomb which bore the figure of the deceased (cf. *ζωφόρος*)” and cites one inscription of Aphrodisias. Both definition and example are taken directly from *CIG* II (1843) p. 534 where Boeckh wrote (on no. 2840) “Haud dubie igitur *εἰδοφόρος* est ea pars aedificii, quae . . . imaginem domini s. defuncti antefixam ostendebat, ut *ζωφόρος* ostendit anaglypha.” Since 1843 this inscription has been republished in Le Bas—Waddington, 1870 no. 1637 (this is the edition used by J. Kubińska, op. cit. p. 60, who collected three occurrences of the word from Aphrodisias and its territory) and above all in *MAMA* VIII no. 560, without commentary but with a photograph.

From the text (εἰς δὲ τὴν ὑπὸ τῇ σορῶ ἐν τῷ εἰδοφόρῳ εἰσώστην καὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ βωμῷ κηδευθήσονται κτλ) it is clear (as already Boeckh explained l.c.) that the εἰδοφόρος was not merely “part of a tomb” but precisely a sculptured frieze placed between the sarcophagus (σορός) and its pedestal (βωμός) and containing one or more *loculi* (εἰσῶσται, v. infra); there exists no evidence to support the assertion that the εἰδοφόρος bore sculptures representing the deceased. In the *Supplement* is added s.v. εἰδοφόρος a Part II with the definition “frieze” from *I. Delos* 442 B 232 (see the commentary of F. Durrbach ad l.); in fact the word has the same meaning at Delos and Aphrodisias.

εἰματιστής This word occurs in an epitaph at Tabai (*MAMA* VI 170) re-edited by L. and J. Robert, *La Carie* II pp.112–113 no.18: *Π. Αἰλίου Παρθενοκλέους, Καίσαρος ἀπελευθέρου, εἰματιστοῦ κτλ.* The Roberts remark “Le mot εἰματιστής semble nouveau. Il ne doit pas désigner un tailleur ou un marchand d’habits (la terminaison ne serait d’ailleurs guère adaptée à ce sens; on attendrait *ἱματιοποιός, ἱματιοπώλης, ἱματιοπράτης*), mais la fonction de Parthenoklès à la cour d’Hadrien, dont il était l’affranchi: *vestiarius* ou *a veste*, intendant chargé de l’habillement (cf. notamment *CIL*, VI, 8544–8563 et 9960, avec la note).” After reading these words one may open the *Supplement* and find the following entry: “εἰματιστής, οὔ, ὁ, *clothes-dealer*, Robert *La Carie*” etc.

εἰσένεκτον The *Supplement* cites this word from an inscription of Synnada (*MAMA* IV 85) with the definition “tomb-building”. The text is as follows: *Ἀμμία . . . κατεσκεύασεν τὸ πε[ρίβο]λον καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσένεκτον καὶ τὰς ἀποκειμένας λά[ρνακ]ας [κ]αὶ παντὶ τῷ περὶ αὐτὸ κ[όσμ]ῳ ἐ[ξ]αντῇ καὶ τοῖς τέκν[ο]ι[ς];* the definition given by the *Supplement* is derived from the editors’ commentary: “Sir W. M. Ramsay has kindly shown us his copy of a Lycaonian text in which occurs the word εἰσένεκτον. Like εἰσώστη this rare term seems to denote ‘tomb-building,’ i.e. structure *placed within* the burial precinct.” The Lycaonian text here referred to has since been published as *MAMA* VII 323 and reads as follows: *Δίκαιος . . . ἀνέστη[σε] τὴν στήλλην κ[ε]ῖ ἐαυτῷ ζῶν ἐποίησεν· τὸ δὲ εἰσένεκτον τοῦ κο[ι]τῶνος ὅπου ἡ θύρα ἐπέστηκεν.* The editor, W. M. Calder, remarks that *κοιτών* is here “used in the sense given by contemporary Christians to *κοιμητήριον*; εἰσένεκτον (cf. *M.A.M.A.* loc. cit.) will then mean ‘entrance-passage’, and *θύρα* the slab covering it.” J. Kubińska discusses εἰσένεκτον among the “termes obscurs ou inexplicables” (op. cit. pp.154–155, with another example and further bibliography); whatever the precise meaning of the word, the definition offered by the

Supplement is clearly insufficient and would not have been advanced had the editors known of the inscription published in *MAMA VII* (1956).

εἰσώστη The article s.v. in *LSJ* cites two occurrences: “*CIG* 2824 (Aphrodisias), *JHS* 20.76 (Caria)” (the latter provenience is repeated in the *Supplement*, where further examples from Aphrodisias are added). In fact the third-century inscription found in “Caria” was copied at the Turkish village Yaygın, identified as the site of Plarasa which under the Empire was a village in the territory of Aphrodisias. Thus all the examples cited by *LSJ* and its *Supplement*, as well as those collected by J. Kubińska, op. cit. pp. 104–107, come from Aphrodisias and its territory: the word was epichoric. Furthermore the definition “tomb” given by *LSJ* and conserved by the *Supplement* is inexact. Already Boeckh, commenting on the first inscription cited by *LSJ*, discussed at length the meaning of this word on the basis of numerous attestations and concluded (correctly) that “*loculos vel columbaria intelligi patet*” (thus also Kubińska, loc. cit.: “*loculus*, niche”). One or more *εἰσῶσται* could be built into the sculptured frieze (*εἰδοφόρος*) or into the platform below the sarcophagus (*βωμός*), or below or beside the *βωμός* (for these words v. supra s.v.).

ἐκβάσμωνσις This word is defined by the article s.v. in *LSJ* as “steps for descending from an altar” with the citations “*IGRom* 4.514 (Pergam.), *BCH* 4.381 (Aeolis).” In place of the vague “Aeolis” *LSJ* should inform its users that the word is attested only at Pergamum and its territory, for the inscription published in *BCH* loc. cit. was found at Elaia, the port of Pergamum. Furthermore this inscription reads [*Ἡ δεῖνα κατεσκεύασ[?]εν τὴν ἐκβάσμωνσιν ἐαντῇ . . . [οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἄλλ]ον τινὰ τεθῆναι εἰς τὴν σορὸν ταύτην*; no mention is made of an altar, and the inscription is obviously an epitaph, so that the very example cited by *LSJ* renders apparent the value of its definition. J. Kubińska (op. cit. p. 92) compares *ἐκβάσμωνσις* with *βαθρικόν*, q.v.; in fact “stepped pedestal” may serve to define *ἐκβάσμωνσις* as well as *ἐκβασμείδωσις*, the latter cited by *LSJ* s.v. from “*Epigr. Gr.* 229” (i.e. G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, 1878) rather than from the improved text published by E. L. Hicks, *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* III 627 a.

ἐμβάλλω Like *βάλλω* q.v., this compound is used in epitaphs to mean “bury”, usually without authorization in an already occupied tomb: e.g. W. M. Ramsay *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* I p. 233 no. 80 (Eumeneia, cited supra s.v. *βάλλω*) *εἰ δέ τις ἐπιχειρήσει ἀνῶξαι*

ἡ ἕτερον ἐμβαλεῖ . . . ἔσται ἐπάρατος κτλ; *JRS* 16 (1926) p. 69 no. 192 (a Christian epitaph from the same city) εἴ τις δὲ ἕτερον ἐμβαλεῖ ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν; *ibid.* p. 93 no. 226 (also Christian, at Sebaste) ὃς δ' ἂν ἐνβάλῃ ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (here the verb is used absolutely, with *ἕτερον vel sim.* to be understood); etc. This sense should be added to the definitions of ἐμβάλλω in *LSJ*. Cf. also ἐπεμβάλλω which is used with the same meaning; *LSJ* cites for this verb one example of this usage, and others could easily be added (e.g. *MAMA* I 162, 164, 166 etc.).

ἐναιμής This word, not registered in *LSJ* or the *Supplement*, occurs in a verse oracle from Claros at Syedra (L. Robert, *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale* pp. 91–100):

Ἄρῃος δείκῃλον ἐναιμέος ἀνδροφόνου.

Although ἐναιμής is not elsewhere attested, Robert (p. 92 note 3) points out that it takes its place alongside ἐναιμήεις and ἔναιμος.

ἐνόριος For the meaning “on the boundaries” *LSJ* cites a single attestation, Heliodorus *Aethiopica* X 1. There may be added an earlier occurrence “important par sa date, son origine et son caractère” (L. Robert, *Noms indigènes* p. 358 note 3, with the bibliography): on the crest of the ridge which formed the border between Apollonia and Apameia, and likewise the frontier between the provinces of Asia and Galatia, stood a pillar erected by the senate and people of Apollonia and dedicated to the Θεοῖς [Ε]νορίοις, dated by the mention of Hadrian with his titles of 135.

ἐνσόριον The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as “place for a sarcophagus” citing two documents: *IGR* 4.1452 (a Jewish inscription from Smyrna, now Frey-Kittel *C. Ins. Jud.* II 741) and *AJA* 18.68 (an inscription from Sardis, now to be cited as *Sardis* VII 166). The occurrences of the word (with variant spellings) are collected by J. Kubińska, *op. cit.* pp. 101–104 (contrary to her statement on p. 101, the word is attested more than once in Lydia); it is found most frequently at Smyrna, in the formula κατεσκεύασε (ἐποίησε) τὸ ἐνσόριον ἐαντῷ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις κτλ, and Kubińska’s definition “*loculus, niche*” (cf. εἰσώστη) is preferable to that given by *LSJ*.

ἐπιβάλλω Like βάλλω, ἐμβάλλω q.v., and ἐπεμβάλλω, also ἐπιβάλλω is used in epitaphs to mean “bury” as in this Christian inscription from Laodiceia Combusta (*MAMA* I 163): εἴ τις ἕτερον ἐπιβαλῇ, δώσει λόγον θεῷ. This meaning should be added to the article s.v. in *LSJ* (other examples at Perge, “*Bull. Épigr.*” 1950 p. 201 no. 204).

ἐπικτηνίτης The article s.v. in *LSJ* translates this word as “drover”, referring to “*P Flor.* 126.13 (iii A.D.), *Gloss.*” Citing the same papyrus and other documents from the same archive, Rostovtzeff (*Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft* I p. 344) wrote “scheint es sicher, daß *ἐπικτηνίτης* im 3.Jh. n.Chr. der Beauftragte ist, dem die Verwaltung der Zugtiere eines großen Gutes untersteht.” The word occurs on an inscription at Kellai in Thrace (*IG Bulg.* III.1 1518) to which G. Mihailov devoted a page of commentary, quoting the definitions of Rostovtzeff (*supra*), J. Bingen, J. Seyfarth, L. Robert (*Hellenica* X p. 53 note 0), and others; most recently the word has been discussed by L. Robert in *Hellenica* XIII pp. 190–191, referring to the view of T. Zawadzki (*REA* 1960 pp. 90–91) that the *ἐπικτηνίτης* was responsible for providing fodder. All of this bibliography remained unknown to the editors of the *Supplement*; the prefix *ἐπι-* renders evident the definition stated by Robert (*Hellenica* XIII p. 191): “*l’ἐπικτηνίτης* est le chef des palefreniers” (for the correct definition of *κτηνίτης*—which is not given by *LSJ* or the *Supplement*—v. *infra* s.v.).

ἐπίξυνος This word is cited by *LSJ* only from the *Iliad* XII 422:

μέτρ’ ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες ἐπιξύνω ἐν ἀρούρη

To this may be added a verse oracle of Claros at Syedra dated by L. Robert (*Documents de l’Asie Mineure méridionale* p. 92) to the first century B.C., of which the first line (as restored by Robert) reads as follows:

Πάμφυλοι Σνεδοῖες ἐπιξύν[ω ἐν ἀρούρη]
ναίοντες χθόνα

The first editors of this document printed *ἐπίξυν[ον πάτριόν? τ]ε*; in Robert’s restoration the borrowing from Homer is apparent.

εὐοχθεία This word, not registered in *LSJ* or the *Supplement*, occurs in the oracle mentioned *supra*:

ὄρσει δὲ πολύλλιτον εὐοχθείαν

Although *εὐοχθεία* is not elsewhere attested, Robert (p. 93 note 2) points out that “le groupe est bien attesté: *εὐοχθος*, *εὐοχθεῖν*. Quelle qu’en soit l’étymologie . . . ces mots évoquent l’abondance des banquets . . . [Bacchylides, Euripides]; depuis Hésiode, c’est la bonne vie, à l’abri du besoin.”

εὐσυνειδήτως This word, not registered in *LSJ* or the *Supplement*, occurs in an inscription of Aphrodisias (*MAMA* VIII 413e lines 12–14): [ἐ]νσεβῶς καὶ εὐσυνειδ[ήτ]ως ἔχων πρὸς τὴν Οὐρανία[ν] Ἀφρο-

δίτην. Although the *Supplement* does not register εὐσυνειδήτως it cites ἀμεμφῶς from the same inscription. L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII p. 177 note 2) points out that even before *MAMA* VIII εὐσυνειδήτως should have figured in *LSJ* on the basis of an earlier publication of the same inscription by Th. Reinach in *REG* 1906 p. 242: “Il n’est guère à supposer qu’on l’a écarté parce qu’il y manquait deux lettres, dont la restitution ne peut laisser place au moindre doute; il a dû être oublié, parce que la publication dans *REG* ne comporte pas d’index”; likewise the word was not included in the *Supplement* precisely because it was omitted from the index of *MAMA* VIII. “D’autre part, comme le remarquait Th. Reinach, l’adverbe était connu par Clément d’Alexandrie, auquel notre inscription païenne apporte un parallèle à peu près contemporain. On saisit d’ailleurs ici la conséquence du principe qui a exclu les auteurs chrétiens du Liddell-Scott-Jones. Le Thesaurus de Dindorf est toujours seul à donner une idée de l’histoire d’un mot grec dans son ensemble” (cf. *infra* s.v. κτηνίτης).

ἐχιόδηκτος The article s.v. in *LSJ* gives for this word the definition “= ἐχιδνόδηκτος”. However, there is no entry (either in *LSJ* or in the *Supplement*) s.v. ἐχιδνόδηκτος. If the latter word is attested it should be registered with documentation; if not, it should be deleted.

Θεαγένης This hero (see Pausanias 6.11, Dio Chrysostom 31.22, and the discussion by J. Pouilloux in *Thasos* I pp. 62–105), worshipped in Thrace and at Olympia as well as on his native Thasos, is proved by inscribed dedications to have been considered a god under the Empire (see Chr. Dunant and J. Pouilloux, *Thasos* II p. 157 no. 322; P. Bernard and F. Salviat, *BCH* 1962 p. 594 no. 15 and *BCH* 1967 p. 579 no. 26) in spite of the fact that Momos in Lucian, *Θεῶν Ἐκκλησία* 12 contested his right to divinity. Although excluded from the *Supplement*, Θεαγένης is certainly more important than several deities who have been admitted, e.g. Ἀγναία (according to F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* no. 131 the reading is doubtful; the photograph in the first edition by A. P. Stephanou, *Χιακὰ Μελετήματα* p. 57, is entirely illegible); Ἴπτα; the Τέλεσσαι; and Παφώ, the two latter known only by a single inscription each (for Παφώ, *IG* II² 4547; cf. S. Solders, *Die außerstädtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas* p. 17 no. 11 for Wilamowitz’ explanation of the name). Although the *Supplement* admits Παφώ it excludes the Γεραισταὶ Νύμφαι γενεθλῖαι who are mentioned in the same inscription. Ἰφθίμης “an Egyptian deity” and Ἄπις “a bull worshipped in

Egypt” are registered by *LSJ* but Ἄνουβις is omitted (cf. M. N. Tod in *Hermathena* 59, 1942, 72) although the words Ἄνουβιακός and Ἄνουβιδεῖον are listed. Kakasbos, worshipped in Lycia and Pisidia (see above all L. Robert, *Hellenica* III and for the more recent bibliography *Berytus* 1966 p. 38) is equally excluded.

θέμα Section I 6 of the article s.v. in *LSJ* reads as follows: “either common burial-place or common land, Michel 995 B 50 (pl.); private burial-ground, ἡ σορός καὶ τὸ βαθρικὸν καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον θ. Judeich *Altertümer von Hierapolis* 208, cf. 124, al.; θέμα· ἐξίς, τόπος, στάσις, μνήμα, Hsch.” There is no reason why the various definitions given by Hesychius should all be grouped in this section; rather they should be distributed throughout the various parts of the article, each in its appropriate group of attestations (the only one of Hesychius’ definitions which belongs in Section I 6 is μνήμα). Furthermore, rather than citing their first example from Ch. Michel’s *Recueil d’inscriptions grecques* (1900, without *apparatus*, translation or commentary) the editors of *LSJ* should have referred for this inscription containing the sacred regulations of the Delphic phratry of the Labyadai (generally dated to the end of the fifth century B.C.) either to the edition of J. Baunack in *SGDI* 2561 (extensive commentary) or to that of Dareste, Haussoullier and Th. Reinach in their *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques* II 28 (translation and commentary) or to that of W. Dittenberger in *SIG²* II 438 (this text was omitted from *SIG³*), or to M. Guarducci, *L’istituzione della fratria* II pp. 67ff. (commentary and further bibliography). The passage reads as follows: καὶ ὁ κα δέξονται ἢ δαράταν ἢ ἀπελλαῖα παρὰ τὰ γράμματα, μὴ ἔστω Λαβνάδας μηδὲ κοινανείτω τῶν κοινῶν χρημάτων μηδὲ τῶν θεμάτων. The original editor, Th. Homolle (*BCH* 19, 1895, p. 40) weighed two possible interpretations of θέμα, “dépôt fait chez un banquier” or “offrande des gâteaux ou des viandes de sacrifice”; in his translation he chose the word “revenus”. J. Baunack (op. cit. p. 727) wrote “Ist dieser Sinn nicht in χρήματα eingeschlossen? Ich nehme θέμα im Sinne von τεθμός.” The *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques* (p. 187) translates “portions de sacrifices (?)” (in the commentary on p. 196, it is said that “Le sens de θέμα est douteux”); and Dittenberger, after rejecting both of the alternatives proposed by Homolle, suggested that θέματα means “praemia certaminum per ludorum sacrorum sollemnia proposita.” The interpretation proposed by *LSJ* derives from none of these editions, but was taken (without acknowledgement or reference) from Guarducci op. cit. p. 68 (“forse è probabile . . .”), whence the

dictionary also borrowed the mistaken comparison with epitaphs nos. 124 and 208 at Hierapolis. In the example quoted the *θέμα* is stated to be below (*ὑποκείμενον*) the stepped pedestal (*βαθρικόν*) which supported the sarcophagus; sometimes the *θέμα* is said to be directly beneath the *βωμός*, which performed the same function as the *βαθρικόν* (as in no. 124, *ἡ σορός καὶ ὁ βωμός σὺν τῷ θέματι*). For photographs by L. Robert of *βωμοί* on *θέματα* at Hierapolis see J. Kubińska, op. cit. Pl. VIII–X inclusive; at Hierapolis as at Laodiceia on the Lykos (*MAMA VI* 19) *θέμα* means simply a low flat platform serving as base for the higher portions of the monument. Thus this section of the article *θέμα* in *LSJ* must be completely revised.

θηριοδείκτης The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as meaning “exhibitors of wild beasts”. However, L. Robert in *Hellenica I* (1940) pp. 132–137, overlooked by the editors of the *Supplement*, has shown with numerous examples that *θηριοδείκτης* means exactly “snake-charmer” (see now, for the same meaning of the word in later Greek, L. Robert. *Opera Minora Selecta II* pp. 934–937).

**θηριοδήκτης* In *LSJ* appears an article “*θηριοδήκτης, marsus, Gloss.*” The editors of the *Supplement* are again referred to the following passage by L. Robert (*Hellenica I* p. 135): “Dans la liste des métiers (*περὶ τεχνιτῶν*), non alphabétique, donnée par les *Hermeneumata Einsidlensia*, on lit, vers la fin (III, 272, 1. 4–6): *φαρμακός maleficus, θηριοδήκτης marsus, ἰξεντής auceps* . . . Mais le mot ne peut être conservé tel quel; il ne peut s’agir d’un homme qui fait métier de ‘mordre les serpents’, ni même, si l’on veut, ‘les bêtes’ . . . *θηριοδήκτης* n’est, à mon avis, qu’une transcription, due à l’itacisme, de *θηριοδείκτης* [v. supra], tout comme *θηριοδέκτης* dans Teukros.” The entry must therefore be deleted from *LSJ*.

θηριοδιώκτης In the *Supplement* appears the following article: “*θηριοδιώκτης, marsus, Gloss.*; cf. *θηριοδήκτης*.” The last two words, retained twenty-five years after *Hellenica I*, must naturally be deleted.

θηρίον Section I.3.b of the article s.v. in *LSJ* reads as follows: “*poisonous animal, Dsc. 1.75, Act. Ap. 28.4.*” The passages cited do not however exemplify the meaning under which they are subsumed. Dioscourides *De materia medica I* 75, discussing the juniper (*ἄρκυθος*), writes that it *θυμιάμεναι δὲ θηρία διώκονσι . . . εὐστόμαχος, ποιῶν πρὸς τὰ . . . θηρία πινόμενος* (another version of this passage has: *ὁ χυλὸς αὐτῶν μετ’ οἴνου ποιεῖ πρὸς ἐχιοδήκτους*). The passage in the *Acts of the Apostles* is equally clear: *ἔχιδνα ἀπὸ τῆς θέρμης ἐξελθοῦσα*

καθῆψε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. ὥς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον . . . ὁ μὲν οὖν, ἀποτινόςας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακόν. In both of these works (as often elsewhere) *θηρίον* means “snake”, and this definition must be substituted for “poisonous animal” in *LSJ* loc. cit.

θηριόπληκτος The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as meaning “struck by a poisonous animal”. However, L. Robert (*Opera Minora Selecta* II p. 936 note 95) has pointed out that *θηριόπληκτος* means exactly “bitten by a snake” (cf. *θηριόδηκτος*).

Θριπιεῖον A *Θριπιεῖον* was a sanctuary of the goddess Thripis (for this divinity see M. N. Tod, *JEA* 25, 1939, p. 57). *LSJ* registers *Ἀνουβιεῖον*, *Ἀπιεῖον*, *Βουβαστ(ι)εῖον*, *Ἰσιεῖον*, *Σαραπιεῖον*; to these must be added *Θριπιεῖον*, and the name of the goddess *Θρίπις* (*Θρίφης*, *Τρίφης*). Cf. also “Bull. Épigr.” 1940 p. 233 no. 196.

θωρακεῖον The article s.v. in *LSJ* gives as its first definition of this word “breastwork, parapet, or dwarf-wall of an enclosure” and cites the attestations *IGR* 1465 and 1474, two epitaphs from Smyrna. The part of the former document which concerns us reads as follows: ἀγοράσασα τοῦτο τὸ ἡρῶν καὶ τὸ θωρακεῖον καὶ ἐφ’ αὐτῷ ἐποῦσαν σορὸν Προκονησίαν ἀνάγλυφον καὶ σόρια παρ’ ἐκαστέρα καὶ μ(ύ)λινον (σορόν) προσκατασ(κ)εύασα ἐαυτῇ τὴν καμάραν κτλ. According to the definition offered by *LSJ*, at least four sarcophagi stood on this “parapet” or “dwarf-wall”; this definition is to be found in *IGR* ad loc., and is derived from the commentary upon this inscription by Waddington (1870). The editors of *LSJ* and its *Supplement* evidently did not realize that the inscription had been seen since the time of Le Bas and Waddington, nor that another explanation of *θωρακεῖον* had been excogitated since 1870; in fact the stone has been kept since 1852 in the British Museum, and is therefore republished (with improved text and photograph) in Part IV of the *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* by F. H. Marshall (1916) no. 1026. Marshall commented “The ordinary meaning of this word is ‘parapet’. Here apparently, as in other inscriptions from Smyrna, it refers to some sort of platform.” Such is the danger of citing from *IGR*, which in a volume published in 1927 ignores an edition (with photograph) which appeared in 1916 and refers instead to a work of 1870. Furthermore, in an article unknown equally to *GIBM*, *IGR* and *LSJ* entitled “Über kleinasiatische Grabinschriften” which appeared in 1908 (*Hermes* 43, p. 541 note 0) Br. Keil explained the word as follows: “Das Wort bedeutet, wie Boeckh [*CIG* 3278] richtig ausführt, ein massives Mauerquadrat, welches überdeckt wurde und dann den

Sarkophag trug; kürzer *θωράκιον* bezeichnet dasselbe, was anderwärts *ὑποσόριον* heißt." J. Kubińska (op. cit. pp. 87–89) collects six occurrences of *θωρακεῖον* at Smyrna and adds one at Aphrodisias (*MAMA* VIII 556 b); a separate section must be added to the article s.v. in *LSJ*, with the correct definition.

ιατρός The article s.v. in *LSJ* states that *Ἰατρός* was a name of Apollo, Artemis, Aphrodite and certain nymphs in Elis, but fails to mention that it was also a name of Asklepios under which this god was customarily invoked at Cyrene: cf. Pausanias 2.26.9 *ἐν Βαλάγγραις ταῖς Κυρηναίων ἐστὶν Ἀσκληπιὸς καλούμενος Ἰατρός*, and G. Pugliese Carratelli (*Parola del Passato* 1960 p. 296) on the entry *Ἰατρῶι ὅς* in a list of prescribed sacrifices at the same city.

**ἱερανομέω* In *LSJ* is an entry "*ἱερανομέω, hold office as commissioner of sacred rites, Mon. Ant. 23.179 (Iotape).*" R. Paribeni and P. Romanelli published in *Monumenti antichi* (1915) an honorific inscription from this city in Rough Cilicia honoring a man *ἱερανομήσαντα ἐκτενῶς*; but L. Robert (*Noms indigènes* p. 98 note 0) wrote, "D'après l'inscription de Iotapè on a admis la forme curieuse *ἱερανομεῖν* dans le vocabulaire grec; ainsi Liddell-Scott-Jones . . . d'où E. Laroche, *Histoire de la racine nem en grec ancien* (1949), 157, n. 82 . . . Il ne me paraît pas douteux que cet *hapax* n'ait dû l'existence à une de ces erreurs de lecture qui abondent dans ce mémoire des *Mon. Ant.*; ici, elles ne sont d'ailleurs pas fortes: l'*iota* était un *gamma*, l'*epsilon* lunaire un *omicron*, et un *alpha* avait disparu à la fin de la ligne précédente: [ἀ]γορανομήσαντα. Cf. *CIG*, 4415b, 1.6–7: ἀγορανομήσαντος ἐκτενῶς." The entry must therefore be deleted from *LSJ*.

**ἱεραρχία* This word is not registered in *LSJ*, but in the *Supplement* is inserted an article which reads as follows: "*ἱεραρχία, presidency of sacred rites, ἔθνους ἢ οἶον Ἀσιαρχία, βιθυνναρχία* (v.l. βιθυνιαρ-), *καππαδοκαρχία Dig. 27.1.6.14.*" The correct form of the name of the second office cited is *Βιθυννιαρχία* (the article in *LSJ* s.v. *Βιθυννιαρχία*, which cites as sole attestation of the word the same passage in the *Digest*, has the correct spelling!); the names of these offices are normally capitalized, as in Mommsen's edition of the *Digest* to which reference is made and in the *Supplement* itself s.v. *Ἀραβαρχία, Ἀσιαρχία, Καππαδοκαρχία, Κιλικιαρχία*; but most important, the whole entry must be deleted. The editors of the *Supplement* do not indicate that in the passage of the *Digest* (the sole authority cited) *ἱερ[αρχία]* is a conjecture of Mommsen; and J. Deininger (*Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* p. 44 note 5) has shown

that this must be replaced by the supplement adopted by Marquadt, *ἱερ[οσύνη]*). This entry is therefore to be deleted from the *Supplement*; the word is however abundantly attested in later Christian literature, excluded on principle from this dictionary: see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* s.v. (where *ἱεραρχία* should be preceded by an asterisk, used to designate words which do not appear in *LSJ*).

ἰμαγίνυφερ This transliteration of the Latin word *imaginifer* (also spelled and pronounced *ἡμάγνυφερ*) is omitted from *LSJ* and its *Supplement* although it has been included in such general works as B. Meinersmann, *Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den gr. Papyri* (1927); F. Bilabel, *Sammelbuch V* (1950); and S. Daris "Il lessico latino nella lingua greca d'Egitto", *Aegyptus* 1960. See most recently E. Bernand, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Philae II* p. 206, and cf. John the Lydian, *De magistratibus* (ed. Wuensch) p. 48, 4: *ἰμαγινιφόροι, εἰκονοφόροι*.

ἰνδixτιών This word is not registered in *LSJ* or its *Supplement*. The editors of the latter are referred to A. Cameron "Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor", *AJP* 1931 p. 247; *MAMA III* (index) p. 237 (six examples); and the article *Indictio* by O. Seeck in *RE* 18 (1916) cols. 1327–1332 (according to Seeck, the first cycle began in 297/8 and is attested in a papyrus of May 27, 303).

ἰτράκιος In the *Supplement* this word is defined as "= Lat. *vitarius, glazier*" with reference to two Christian epitaphs of Korykos, *MAMA III* 549 and 598. However, L. Robert (*Opera Minora Selecta II* pp. 933–934) has shown that *ἰτράκιος* are not *vitarii* but "fabricants et marchands des pâtisseries craquantes appelées *ἰτρία* et connues depuis le V^e siècle av. J.-C.; ils correspondent à l'*ἰτριοπώλης* de Pollux; leur marchandise, les *ἰτρία*, est attestée dans les papyrus depuis Zénon; on les avait reconnus dans l'abréviation *ἰτρ-* de deux colonnes de Pompeiopolis . . ." Thus the definition in *LSJ* should read "pastry-cook" instead of "glazier".

καναβιονργός This word, which occurs on an Attic curse-tablet of the fourth century B.C., is explained by *LSJ* in its article s.v. as "maker of *κάναβοι*"; and "*κάναβος* or *κάνναβος*" in turn is defined as a "wooden framework round which artists moulded wax or clay, block-figure; mannikin or rough drawing of the human frame; metaph., lean person, 'skeleton'." L. Robert (*Noms indigènes* p. 146) remarks "Je ne vois vraiment pas bien ce que serait un ouvrier fabriquant cela"; the text reads *καταδῶ Κίττον τὸν γείτονα τὸν καναβιονργὸν καὶ τέχνην τὴν Κίττον καὶ ἐργασίαν καὶ ψυχὴν κτλ.*, and Robert comments

“Il ne me paraît pas possible que ce soit autre chose qu’un chanvrier [see here *καρναβάριος*, *καρναβᾶς*], même si le scripteur a simplifié la gémée, suivant une graphie qui d’ailleurs se répandra.” Robert’s explanation is certainly correct.

καρναβάριος In *LSJ* appears the following article: “*καρναβάριος*, ὁ, (Lat. *canabae*) booth-keeper, stall-holder, *Jahresh.* 24 *Beibl.* 31 (Ephesus). II = *stupparius*, *Gloss.*” In *Études Anatoliennes* pp. 203–204 L. Robert recognized a [*κ*] *αρναβαρίον* disguised by the previous editor as an *Ἄρνα Βαρίον*, and referred to an article by P. Wahrmann (*Glotta* 22, 1933, p. 43) in which *καρναβάριος* is correctly explained not by Latin *canabae* (with which it has no connection) but by the gloss “*stupparius καρναβάριος*”. Consequently Part I of the article in *LSJ* was revised in the *Supplement* to read: “*καρναβάριος*, ὁ, worker in hemp (Lat. *cannabis*) or seller in a booth (Lat. *canaba*), *Jahresh.* 24 *Beibl.* 31 (Ephesus, ii/iii A. D.; pl.)”; Part II was left unchanged. L. Robert (again *Noms indigènes*, p. 143 note 5) remarked “Il eût été bon d’indiquer d’où venait la première traduction, nouvelle, et le renvoi à *Glotta* eût éclairci la question. J’ajoute que le second sens maintenu comme possible (du latin *canabae*) est inacceptable et n’était qu’une hypothèse désespérée pour qui avait oublié le grec *κάνναβις*, ‘chanvre’, et la formation de noms de métiers, à l’époque impériale, avec le suffixe latin *-arius* après un radical grec. D’autre part, il est extraordinaire que ce dictionnaire fasse venir *καρναβάριος* du ‘latin *cannabis*’ et non du grec *κάνναβις*, attesté depuis Hérodote” (the passage in Herodotus is cited by *LSJ* in the paragraph immediately following the entry *καρναβάριος*). A future editor of the *Supplement* will have to unite Parts I and II of this article under the single definition “dealer in hemp” and abandon the etymologies repeatedly exposed in the past.

καρναβᾶς This word, absent from *LSJ*, is registered in the *Supplement* with the definition “prob. tow-seller”. Had the *Supplement* editors known L. Robert’s *Noms indigènes* (pp. 142–146 and Pl. III–V) no doubt could have subsisted as to the accuracy of the definition.

κηρωματίτης This word, absent from *LSJ*, is registered in the *Supplement* with the definition “trainer in wrestling” (Edict of Diocletian). L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII pp. 167–170) points out that whereas in Diocletian’s list of prices the *παιδαγωγός*, *χαμαιδιδάσκαλος*, *γραμματικός* etc. are paid a sum *ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου παιδός*, the *κηρωματίτης* like the *ῥήτωρ ἦτοι σοφιστής* is paid *ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου μαθητοῦ*. “Il semble que le *κηρωματίτης* n’est plus le ‘pédotribe’ ancien . . .

il enseigne à un public plus âgé et plus restreint, il apprend à soigner les membres autant qu'à les exercer: il est à la fois maître d'éducation physique, masseur, kinésithérapeute et chiropracte ou rebouteur" (all these senses are based closely on passages from Christian authors, excluded from *LSJ*). According to Robert, as time went on the medical aspects of this profession outweighed its gymnastic functions, for the *κηρωματίτης* "soignait les foulures, les entorses, les luxations, les fractures, avec ses mains et avec ses emplâtres . . . Ainsi évolue vers le temps de Dioclétien le professeur de gymnastique . . . le céromatite, nom plus récent de l'*ἀλείπτης*, du masseur, est devenu au V^e et au VI^e siècle, et sans doute avant, un spécialiste qu'on appelle pour les fractures et autres accidents des membres; il remplit la fonction d'un *ιατροαλείπτης* et d'un *χειρουργός* spécialisé dans l'ostéopathie." The definition in *LSJ* must be modified accordingly.

κίναυδος One of the meanings given for this word by the article s. v. in *LSJ* is "public dancer (?)" referring to a papyrus and "perh. also *CIG* 4926". E. Bernand (*Les inscriptions de Philae* II no. 154; cf. also no. 155) has re-edited this inscription, which reads as follows: *Τρόφων δίς, [θ]εοῦ κίναυδος ἦκ[ω] παρὰ τὴν Ἰσιν κτλ.*; Bernand cites for the sense "dancer" Polybius, papyri, the grammarian Nonius Marcellus (*saltatores vel pantomimi*), Macrobius, and Firmicus Maternus (*cinaedos efficient templorum cantibus servientes*), and concludes that "le visiteur de Philae précise que son métier ne relève pas d'un divertissement profane. Son art est au service du dieu. On sait . . . qu'à l'époque impériale des cinèdes pouvaient être employés dans certaines cérémonies religieuses" etc. The doubt twice expressed by *LSJ* concerning this meaning may now disappear, and the reference to *CIG* should be replaced with one to E. Bernand loc. cit.

κοράλλιον The article s. v. in *LSJ* gives for this word the single definition "coral" and cites among its examples Alciphron 1.39, a letter in which Megara writes to Bacchis that at the forthcoming festival of Adonis *ἤξεις φέρουσα κηπίον καὶ κοράλλιον καὶ τὸν σὸν Ἄδωνιν, ὃν νῦν περιφύχεις*. L. Robert (*Noms indigènes* p. 282 note 1) explains "Bacchis qui viendra avec son amant (son Adonis) apportera un 'jardin d'Adonis' et, comme l'a entendu Hercher, avec d'autres (*Thesaurus*, etc.), une 'imaguncula', une 'poupée' du dieu ou d'Aphrodite, et non pas 'un corail', ce qui n'a pas de sens." This meaning of *κοράλλιον*, which as Robert points out was already registered in the *Thesaurus*, must be added to the article s. v. in *LSJ*.

κοραλλιοπλάστης This word, attested in *CIG* 3408, is explained by the article s.v. in *LSJ* as “one who makes images of coral.” However, L. Robert (*Noms indigènes* loc. cit.) pointed out well before the appearance of the *Supplement* that “le corail—recueilli dans la Méditerranée occidentale—a joué un rôle infime dans la mode du monde gréco-romain.” Furthermore *πλάσσω* is not an appropriate verb to designate the working of coral. Therefore “dans *κοραλλιοπλάστης* je reconnais *κοράλλιον*, non point au sens de ‘corail’, mais comme un diminutif de *κόρη*, comme *κοράσιον* ou *κορίδιον*. C’est exactement une figurine ou une poupée . . . Ainsi les *κοραλλιοπλάσται* de Magnésie ou de Smyrne fabriquaient des poupées et figurines de terre cuite, tout comme les *κοροπλάσται*.”

κρούω To the article s.v. in *LSJ* should be added the sense “sting” (of a scorpion), as in an epitaph from Egypt (G. Lefebvre, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes* no.120) *κρουστίς* (i.e. *κρουσθεῖς*) *ὑπὸ σκορπίου* (cf. Aelian *De natura animalium* 9.4, and M. N. Tod, *JEA* 25, 1939, pp. 55–56; L. Robert, *Ét. épigr. et phil.* p. 87).

κτηνίτης *LSJ* gives for this word the definition “belonging to beasts”, citing as sole attestation “*Gloss.*” In the *Supplement* appears s.v. the following entry: “add ‘II. dub. sens., *Θησσεὺς* (sic) *κτηνείτης* ὁ λαλούμενος *MAMA* 8.569. III. epith. of Hermes, *Schwyzzer* 721.9 (Thebes-on-Mycalē, iv B.C.).’” As elsewhere, this attempt at improvement by the *Supplement* editors only compounds confusion. Discussing the epitaph of Theseus at Aphrodisias, L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII p.190) remarks: “*LSJ* a fait un contresens sur la glose, citée déjà dans le Thesaurus, où *κτηνίτης* a pour équivalent *iumentarius*. Mais ‘iumentarius’ n’est pas là un adjectif, mais un nom de métier, palefrenier ou cocher, *iumentarius*, *iumentorum pastor* (*C. Gl. Lat.*, II, 585,1), *ζυγιάτης iumentarius* (*ibid.*, 326,36), *iumentarius κτηνοτρόφος* (356,6); il n’y a ainsi pas la moindre équivoque.” To this initial error was added a second mistake in the *Supplement* concerning the inscription at Aphrodisias: Section II “dub. sens.” was created specially for this occurrence, whereas in fact the word has exactly the same meaning here as it does in the glosses cited in Section I. Finally, the *Supplement* adds a Section III to accommodate E. Schwyzzer, *Dialectorum Graecorum exempla epigraphica potiora* (1923) no. 721, an inscription in which sacrifice is prescribed to *τῷ Ἐρμῇ τῷ Κτηνίτῃ*; one welcomes the fact that the *Supplement* has at last registered this epithet of Hermes, which was known since the first publication of the inscription in *I. Priene* (1906) but it is unfortunate that the *Supplement* editors did not consult the

original edition, where they would have found the following translation: “den *herdenschützenden* Hermes”. Thus although *LSJ* and the *Supplement* distribute the occurrences of *κτηνίτης* to three separate divisions, in none of the three is given the single correct definition. After citing numerous Byzantine attestations of *κτηνίτης*, always with the same meaning, Robert concludes: “Une fois de plus, un mot du II^e ou du III^e siècle est la tête d’une série plus riche attestée à l’époque byzantine, ici du V^e au IX^e siècle; la coupure chronologique établie dans *LSJ* rend souvent un tel mot inintelligible, en ne gardant qu’une glose sans les textes qui la confirment et l’explicitent et qui aident à ne pas l’entendre à contresens.”

κωδικοίλλοι This word (according to the dictionary of Lewis and Short, used only in the plural in classical Latin) was transliterated into Greek and employed in two senses, of which one is “official letter from the emperor”: e.g. *OGIS* 543 (at Ankyra) *πρεσβεύσα[ν]τα ἐν Ἀσίαι ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς κ[αὶ] κωδικίλλων θεοῦ Ἀδρια[νοῦ]*; *IGR* III 175 (honoring the same man); *IGR* I 113 (a bilingual inscription at Rome) *Σεβαστοῦ ἀπελεύθερος ἐπὶ τῶν κωδικίλλων* = *Aug. lib. a codicillis*. The second meaning of this word in Greek is the same as that which it has in English: “codicil” to a will or testament, e.g. *TAM* II 77 (an epitaph of Telmessus) *οὐκ ἐξέσται . . . θάψαι τινὰ χωρὶς εἰ μὴ τινι ἐγὼ συγχωρήσαιμι ἢ ζῶσα ἢ ἐν διαθήκαις ἢ κωδικίλλοις γρά[ψ]ασα* (E. Kalinka comments “*codicilli eo differunt a testamentis (διαθήκαις) quod non sunt sollemnes itaque minus valent*”); *I. Cret.* IV 300 (Gortyn); etc. Although this word is noted (without any attempt to establish its meanings) by A. Cameron “Greek Words in Latin Inscriptions of Asia Minor”, *AJP* 1931 p. 242, it is omitted entirely from both *LSJ* and the *Supplement*.

λάρναξ The article s. v. in *LSJ* cites for the meaning “*cinerary urn* or *coffin*” the following three inscriptions: “*CIG* 4003, 4007 (Iconium), 4441 (Adana).” In *Hellenica* XIII p. 242 note 3, L. Robert remarks “Il faut bien dire que ce dictionnaire n’eût pas dû retenir comme exemples typiques ces trois références à un très vieux Corpus, mais renvoyer à l’article [of W. M. Calder] *Rev. Phil.* 1912 [pp. 48–77], qui contient un grand nombre d’exemples et un commentaire sur les termes funéraires à Iconion.” On the same page Robert demonstrates the danger inherent in citing from *CIG*: for the third example (from Adana) begins in that work *Κυρίανα Ποπλίον τὴν λάρνακα κατεσκεύασας* but the *apparatus* of J. Franz gives in place of *λάρνακα* the word *μάκραν*, copied by Paul Lucas, which is the correct reading later “emended” by Muratori. This inscription can therefore

no longer be cited among the examples of *λάραξ*; and in place of the two remaining citations from *CIG*, reference should be made to the numerous attestations collected by J. Kubińska, op. cit. pp. 52–55, and above all to the extended discussion of the word by Robert, op. cit. pp. 239–245: *λάραξ* can mean funerary urn, *loculus* or *arcosolium*, or sarcophagus.

λεπτοποιός On a stele erected by the Demos of Thiounta (north of the Phrygian Hierapolis) is named a *Μένανδρος Ἀφειανοῦ λεπτοπνοῦ*. Although this inscription has been known since 1895 (W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics* I pp. 142–143 no. 30) and was republished in 1927 (Ramsay, *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilization* p. 196) the word *λεπτοποιός* is still omitted by *LSJ* and its *Supplement*. In *Asiatic Elements* p. 209 Ramsay explained that the word meant “a maker of *lepta* (perhaps delicate pottery, or more probably fine thin garments)”; but L. Robert (*Noms indigènes* p. 292 note 4) wrote “Certes *λεπτός* est connu pour désigner des étoffes. D’autre part, *λεπτόν* ou *λεπτίον* peut s’appliquer à des vases . . . Mais *λεπτουργός*, abréviation de *τέκτων λεπτουργός* (terme complet dans le Tarif de Dioclétien comme dans des papyrus du Bas-Empire) opposé au *τέκτων οἰκοδόμος*, désigne le menuisier . . . et se retrouve dans des emplois de *λεπτουργία* et de *λεπτουργεῖν* . . . Je croirais que le *λεπτοποιός* de Thiounta correspondait à ces *λεπτουργοί* et que c’était un menuisier” (i.e. a joiner or cabinet-maker).

λευκουργός The first example cited for this word by *LSJ* is “*BCH* 32.500 (Aphrodisias).” The inscription in question was published in 1908 by Th. Reinach using a squeeze of P. Gaudin, then excavating at Aphrodisias; since Gaudin had omitted to inform Reinach of the location where the squeeze had been made, Reinach naturally inferred that he was dealing with an inscription of that city. However, in the following year Reinach published, on the basis of information from Gaudin, a note in *BCH* (p. 547) stating that the inscription had in fact been found “à moitié chemin de Medet à Dilkily, dans la plaine de Davas” and in the territory of Apollonia Salbake. This rectification remained unknown to the editors of *LSJ*. In 1937 L. Robert re-edited the text (*Études Anatoliennes* pp. 106–109) and stated naturally that the inscription belonged to Apollonia Salbake. This too remained unknown to the Oxford editors. In 1954 L. and J. Robert again re-edited the text (*La Carie* II pp. 281–283 no. 162, with a photograph of Gaudin’s squeeze) and observed (p. 282 note 1) that the inscription is erroneously cited by *LSJ* s.v. *λευκουργός* as having been copied at Aphrodisias. This text as published in *La Carie*

was used by the *Supplement* editors for their erroneous entry s.v. *παρθενών* q.v., but the third statement of provenience, like the preceding two, was ignored by them. Once more these scholars did not actually read *La Carie* (cf. here s.v. *εἰματιστής* and *πλάσσω*, and the comparable case s.v. *ἀριστονίκης*).

μαρτυρητικός The article s.v. in *LSJ* translates this word as “complimentary” with a reference to “*Jahres*. 13.201 (Alabanda, ii A.D.)”, an honorific inscription for a man with an equestrian career who is described as *ἔχοντ[ι] δὲ καὶ ψηφίσματα μαρτυρητικά καὶ τε[ι]μητικά παρὰ πολλῶ[ν] ἐπαρχειῶν*. L. and J. Robert re-edited this inscription in *La Carie* II pp. 180–181 no. 78, where it is proved that the monument comes not from Alabanda but from Heracleia Salbake.¹⁾ Furthermore, the Roberts point out that the translation in *LSJ* is incorrect: for an explanation of what is meant by *ψηφίσματα μαρτυρητικά*, a variation of the common phrase *ὥς μεμαρτυρηῆσθαι*, see the discussion by Robert in *Hellenica* III pp. 22–23, where the formulas derived from *μαρτυρία* are translated by the word “témoignage”.

μονοτάφιον This word, omitted by *LSJ* and its *Supplement*, occurs in an inscription at “Sorghun, nördl. von Side” published by W. Weber in H. Rott, *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien* (1908) p. 369 no. 74: cf. Br. Keil, *Hermes* 1908 p. 545 note 2 (the comment of J. Kubińska, op. cit. p. 156, is not accurate: the provenience is known).

ξυλικάριος This word is explained by the *Supplement* as meaning “dealer in timber or worker in wood”; the single attestation cited is an epitaph at Korykos (*MAMA* III 731). Discussing the words *ξυλικάριος* and *ξυλικός*, L. Robert (*Opera Minora Selecta* II pp. 929–930) lists four other occurrences of *ξυλικάριος* and points out that “le premier sens proposé [by the *Supplement*], marchand de bois, n’est pas exact; car on formerait un mot sur *ξύλον*, mais non sur *ξυλικόν* . . . Le *ξυλικάριος* est . . . un charpentier ou un menuisier.” The definition “dealer in timber” must therefore be deleted from the *Supplement*.

ὀδονιοπράτης This word, absent from *LSJ* and its *Supplement*, occurs in an epitaph at Odessos published by V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien* p. 180 no. 249, with photograph: *Στέφανος ὁ ἐν μακαρία τῇ μνήμῃ ὀδονιοπράτης τῆς*

¹⁾ It is now at Warsaw: cf. L. Robert in *Laodicée du Lykos : Le nymphée* p. 311 n. 1.

Βηθυνῶν ἐπαρχείας. For the meaning of the word cf. J. and L. Robert, "Bull. Épigr." (*REG*) 1962 p.182 no. 215: "C'est un marchand, exact synonyme de ὀθονιοπώλης . . . Au Bas-Empire c'est une évolution générale qui tend à transformer les composés en -πώλης en composés en -πράτης, ἀρτοπώλης en ἀρτοποιάτης, οἰνοπώλης οἰνοπράτης etc.; plus tard le Livre du Préfet en porte témoignage." Since the inscription is dated to 544 A. D. it falls within the time limit set for *LSJ* (cf. p. xi of the preface), and the word should therefore be included.

οἰκονόμισσα In *LSJ* appears the following article s.v.: "perh. wife of οἰκονόμος, or female official in the church, *JHS* 24. 283 (v A. D.), *Papers of Amer. Sch. at Athens* 3 p. 216 (Tchaundir)." Both definitions are wrong. In the *Supplement* appears an entry: *οἰκονόμισσα*, add 'II. housekeeper, *MAMA* 8.399'." Once more (cf. supra *κτηνίτης*) an attempt at improvement by the *Supplement* editors only compounds confusion. The first example cited by *LSJ*, *JHS* 24 (1904) p. 283 no. 24, is an epitaph at the Turkish village Dorla in Isauria published by A. M. Ramsay (after a copy of W. M. Ramsay) with a drawing and the following text and commentary: Δόξα οἰκονόμισσα ἡ σεμνή. "Doxa may be assigned to the fifth century. Her name is of the Christian type . . . this official in a convent was likely to be buried with some state. The word οἰκονόμισσα is not given by Stephanus, and it is difficult to say whether it should be taken as the title of a female official in the church, or as meaning simply the wife of an οἰκονόμος." L. Robert (*Hellenica* XIII p.107 note 0) commented "Il n'y a aucune raison de faire descendre cette inscription au V^e siècle [thus also in *LSJ*], ni au IV^e, ni pour l'écriture (fac-similé), ni pour la décoration [only a rosette in a circle], et il n'y a pas de croix avec le nom de cette femme 'official in a convent'. L'affirmation sur le caractère chrétien du nom est des plus surprenantes, car Δόξα est un nom très bien attesté et répandu dans le monde païen, hellénistique et romain . . . [numerous examples]. Il n'y a nul indice suggérant que cette Doxa d'Isaurie s'occupait d'une église ou un couvent, et non pas d'une propriété privée. Je la date du III^e siècle p.C., avant le Bas-Empire." Thus disappears the second definition given by *LSJ*. "D'ailleurs, dans *LSJ*, la rédaction [quoted supra] paraît admettre la possibilité du sens de 'female official in the church' aussi pour la seconde inscription, celle de Çavundur, ce qui est naturellement exclu." The second example cited by the dictionary is J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor (Papers of the American School at Athens* III: 1888) p. 216

no. 345, at Çavundur north of the Beyşehir Lake: *Εἰρήνη, Λονγίλλια-
νοῦ καὶ Σεονήρου οἰκονόμισσα, Στάχυι τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀνδρὶ σεμνοτάτῳ μνείας
χάριν*. Since Irene was not a “female official in the church” she must
according to *LSJ* have been the “wife of [an] οἰκονόμος.” But
Robert (loc. cit.) points out that “la rédaction même de l’inscription
montre clairement que Stachys n’était pas ‘économiste’; c’est Irène
qui était ‘économiste femme’ au service de Longillianus et de Severus;
son mari n’était pas économiste, il était ‘le mari de l’intendante’
comme d’autres sont ‘le mari de la concierge’. Irène devait s’occuper
de tout ce que peut gérer une femme dans un domaine et spéciale-
ment dans la maison.” Thus disappears the first definition given by
LSJ. “La rubrique du *LSJ*, qui s’inspire sans critique du commen-
taire de A. M. Ramsay, aurait donc dû être radicalement différente,
quelque chose comme: ‘intendante; *JHS* 1904, 283 (III p.; Isauria);
Wolfe Exp. (II–III p.; Plaine Cillanienne’.” The *Supplement* now
gives the definition “housekeeper”, which is better although still
not exact (on the influence and social standing of these estate-
managers, see L. Robert *Études Anatoliennes* pp. 241–243); but the
inscription cited in the *Supplement* as sole documentation for this
meaning is exactly the same text as that which was published by
Sterrett loc. cit. and already adduced by *LSJ* for a totally different
definition.

ὀρθοστάτης Section I Part 2 of the article s.v. in *LSJ* gives the
following definition: “funeral monument with pillars”, citing only
two attestations, *Ath. Mitt.* 24 (1899) p. 235 no. 76 and Euripides
Helen line 547. The first document is an inscription of Thyateira in
Lydia published by C. Schuchhardt: *Ἀρχ. Ματρία κατεσκεύασε τὸν
ὀρθοστάτην ἑαυτῇ καὶ τῷ ὑῷ κτλ*; J. Kubińska, op. cit. p. 90, remarks
“on penserait plutôt à quelque sorte de soubassement.” In *Helen*,
on the other hand, the word occurs at the moment when Menelaus
meets his wife and says:

σὲ τὴν ὄρεγμα δεινὸν ἡμιλλημένην
τύμβον ᾗ κρηπὶς ἐμπύρους τ’ ὀρθοστάτας,
μεῖνον*

In her edition of the play (1967) A. M. Dale comments “ὀρθοστάται
elsewhere in Eur. always means ‘uprights’, whether of masonry or
wood . . . ‘base and uprights’ (= pilasters) gives the horizontal and
vertical aspects of the asylum where the suppliant sits and clasps.”
This is the first meaning given by *LSJ* Section I part 1: “upright
shaft, pillar . . . upright beam”, and the passage in *Helen* clearly

belongs in this heading; thus Part 2 of Section I and the definition “funeral monument with pillars” must be deleted.

ὀρμάω To the meanings of this verb in the middle and passive given by the article s.v. in *LSJ* should be added in Section B.2.b the idiom **ὀρμώμενος ἀπὸ . . .** discussed by L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* II pp. 925–926: “Celle-ci se retrouve au V^e et au VI^e siècle dans des épitaphes d’Odessos: un **Στέφανος . . . ὀρμώμενος ἀπὸ χωρίου Βαμβωλῶ** [V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien* p.180 no. 249], un autre **[ὀρμώ]μενος ἀπὸ χωρίου[v] Γδαμεον** [ibid. p. 72 no. 101], comme dans des récits hagiographiques . . . Ces textes suffisent à montrer que c’est une formule stéréotypée, opposant l’origine soit à la résidence actuelle, soit simplement au nom: un tel de tel endroit. Il s’agit toujours de caractériser des ‘étrangers’; tel est le cas dans les épitaphes d’Odessos et de Constantinople” (the epitaph of a *Μενᾶς ὀρμούμενος ἀπὸ χωρίου Μαλινον* at Istanbul is published by Robert loc. cit.). Since the examples cited are earlier than the chronological limit set for *LSJ*, this meaning of **ὀρμάω** should be registered.

παίω To the article s.v. in *LSJ* should be added the meaning “sting” (of scorpions), as in Aelian *De natura animalium* 5.14 **ἀκούω σκορπιους εἶναι, οἷπερ οὖν τοὺς μὲν πολίτας σφίσι παίωνσιν ἐς θάνατον**; 6.23; 10.23 **ὄντων δὲ σκορπίων ἐνταῦθα . . . παίσαντες γὰρ ἀναιροῦσι παραχρῆμα**. The meaning “sting” is correctly given by *LSJ* for **πλήσσω** and **τύπτω**, which in this context mean the same as **παίω** and **κρούω**, q.v. supra.

παράδοξος The article s.v. in *LSJ* gives as the first meaning of this word “contrary to expectation, incredible”; then, in Part II, is set forth a separate definition: “**παράδοξος**, title of distinguished athletes, musicians, and artists of all kinds, *the Admirable*.” This division is incorrect, for the use of the word as a title derives directly from its primary meaning and the exact translation of the title is “astonishing”. Cf. L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l’Orient grec* (1940) p. 252: “J’ai déjà eu plusieurs fois l’occasion de signaler [references loc. cit.] que des dizaines d’inscriptions agonistiques montrent que le titre **παράδοξος** est porté non seulement par des lutteurs et pancratiastes, mais par n’importe quels athlètes, boxeurs, coureurs, ou par des hérauts, poètes, musiciens, pantomimes etc. Il signifie ‘étonnant’, et était employé aussi couramment que notre mot ‘champion’.” Thus also the explanation given s.v. by *LSJ* is incorrect: the title **παράδοξος** was not given to “artists of all kinds” (a sculptor for example or a painter would not have been thus

honored) but rather only to athletes of all kinds and to *performing* artists. Cf. also L. Robert, *Eos* 48.2 (1956, published 1957) p. 230 note 7, and *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale* p. 82 note 3.

παρθενών In re-editing an inscription of Apollonia Salbake first published by Th. Reinach in *BCH* 1908 (for the history of this text and another error of *LSJ* concerning the same document v. supra s.v. *λευκουργός*), L. and J. Robert (*La Carie* II p. 283 note 3) observed that “Ce texte capital est précisément omis dans l'article *παρθενών* du dictionnaire de Liddell-Scott-Jones.” The text, as published in *La Carie* no. 162, reads as follows: (Σ)τεφανίων Σεφάνου παραφύλαξ Μητρὶ Θεῶν Ὀρεία ἐπηκόω θεᾶ καὶ τῇ πατρίδι μετὰ τῶν νεανίσκων κατεσκεύασεν τὸν παρθενῶνα κτλ. The Roberts' admonition was heeded by the *Supplement* editors, with the result that the following entry appears in the latter work s.v. *παρθενών*: “read ‘b. the apartment occupied by virgin priestesses . . . of Aphrodite at Apollonia Salbace’.” The editors have transformed the votaries of Meter Theon Oreia into virgin priestesses of Aphrodite.

παστός Among the instances of *παστός* in the sense of “woman's chamber, bridal chamber” cited by *LSJ* is “*Supp. Epigr.* 1.567.5”. *SEG* I (1923) 567 is a metrical epitaph of a young girl from Karanis, of which the relevant lines (in the most recent edition by E. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine* no. 83) are:

Δις δέκα γὰρ μ' ἐκόμησε πατήρ ἔτη, οὐδ' ἐτέλεσσα
 νυμφιδίων θαλάμων εἰς ὑμέναια λέχη,
 οὐδ' ὑπὸ παστὸν ἐμὸν δέμας ἤλυθεν . . .

Clearly the meaning “bride-chamber” assigned to *παστός* by *LSJ* makes the poet say the same thing twice in two successive verses. Bernand comments (p. 330) “D'après le vers précédent, le mot revêt ici une signification plus concrète, et précise *ὑμέναια λέχη*. Il désigne proprement l'alcôve du lit ou plutôt l'ensemble des rideaux qui l'enveloppaient, le voile brodé . . . de la chambre nuptiale.” In the *Addenda et corrigenda* to his volume, Bernand adds “voir la thèse de Claude Vatin (à paraître) qui pense à une sorte de kiosque ou de dais, en forme de tente dressée à l'occasion du mariage.” The custom of referring to *SEG* rather than to the original edition has betrayed the editors of *LSJ*: for the first editor, G. Lefebvre, correctly translated “Je ne me suis pas glissée sous la courtine” (cf. Bernand, p. 330 note 12).

πατάσσω Section II of the article s.v. in *LSJ* gives the meaning “*sting*, of a bee” with a reference to Achilles Tatius 2.7. The verb

was also used by Aristotle (*Historia animalium* 607a17) of the scorpion's sting: οἱ σκορπίοι . . . χαλεποὶ γίνονται, καὶ τινὰ πατάξωσιν ἀνθρώπον ἢ θηρίον, ἀποκτείνουσι (cf. supra s.v. παίω; the words for "sting" are collected by M. N. Tod, *JEA* 25, 1939).

πατρόβουλος The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as "hereditary senator". L. Robert (*Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale* pp. 87–89) collects the occurrences of the word in inscriptions and saints' lives and recalls the correct translation, published by Is. Lévy in 1902: "fils de bouleute, successeur désigné par son père et comme tel associé dès l'adolescence aux travaux de la Boulè." Concerning the definition given by *LSJ*, Robert remarks (p. 89 note 0): "Je ne sais si jamais *πατρόβουλος* a désigné un 'bouleute héréditaire.' Une fois que le personnage avait atteint la majorité et était devenu pleinement 'bouleute', il semble que le titre de *πατρόβουλος* avait perdu son intérêt." Cf. "Bull. Épigr." 1968 p. 509 no. 455.

πατρογέρων This word, which occurs in the inscriptions of Ephesus, is explained by the article s.v. in *LSJ* as "hereditary member of the *γερονσία*." However, L. Robert (loc. cit.) has demonstrated that this word must be similar in sense to *πατρόβουλος* q.v., and the definition in *LSJ* must be revised accordingly. It is interesting that the commentary on the very inscription cited by *LSJ* (*Forschungen in Ephesos* II no. 20) refers for this word to the article of Is. Lévy (*Rev. de Phil.* 1902) which contains the correct explanation.

πατρομόστης This word, attested in connection with a Dionysiac association at Smyrna, is defined by *LSJ* as "one whose father was a *μωστής*, hereditary *μώστης*." In fact *πατρομόστης* is a word of the same class as *πατρόβουλος* and *πατρογέρων* (v. supra), and designates a young man not yet initiated whose father is a *μώστης* and has chosen his son as his successor.

πε(ι)σσοβολία In the *Supplement* appears the entry "πεσσοβολία, ἡ, casting of πεσσοί, used as dice, *P Ness.* 21.20, 22.10 (both vi A. D.)." It should have been mentioned in this entry that both of the documents cited (from 562 and 566 A. D. respectively) have the spelling *πεισσοβολία* ("difficult to explain" according to the editor, p. 68 note on lines 19–20); the form given in the *Supplement* is actually nowhere attested.

πλάσσω Section I.2 of the article s.v. in *LSJ* reads as follows: "plaster, τὸν . . . ναὸν χρίσαντες καὶ πλάσαντες *BCH* 15.209 (Panama)." However, L. and J. Robert point out (*La Carie* II p. 364) that "ce dernier mot ne doit pas être un *hapax* dans le sens de *χρίειν* et un redoublement sans valeur de ce premier verbe; il a sans doute

ici son sens normal de 'modeler' et nous reconnaissons là une décoration de reliefs en stuc." Since the inscription from Panamara is the only attestation cited for this sense, this entire section should be deleted from the article in *LSJ*. In the very same paragraph which contains the words just quoted, the authors of *La Carie* comment upon the newly-attested word ἐκθέτωσις which occurs in an inscription there published for the first time; the word ἐκθέτωσις is duly registered by the *Supplement*, but the error of *LSJ* s.v. πλάσσω is left uncorrected.

πλήσσω The article s.v. in *LSJ* includes a section I.1.b "sting, πληγεῖσα ὑπὸ σκορπίου, *Sammelb.* 1267.6 (i A.D.)." Rather than referring to the *Sammelbuch*, the editors of *LSJ* should consult the article of M. N. Tod in *JEA* 25 (1939), in which are collected on pp. 59–60 a dozen examples of the verb πλήσσω used in this sense (among them Aristotle *Hist. Anim.* 607a20, an occurrence three centuries earlier than that cited by *LSJ*); add now another instance in J. and L. Robert, "Bull. Épigr." (*REG*) 1954 p.185 no. 271. In the sense "to sting" πλήσσω is used of bees as well as of scorpions: e.g. Achilles Tatius 2.7.

πλουτέω The article s.v. in *LSJ* cites, in Part 2, *IG* 12 (8) 442 line 8, a metrical epitaph of Thasos said to contain the following words: πλουτῖον τέκνων . . . δωμάτιον; but revision of the stone has demonstrated that the latter word does not exist here (v. supra s.v. δωμάτιον) and the entry must be modified accordingly.

προμέτρης The article s.v. in *LSJ* has two sections: "= Lat. *ensor*, camp-surveyor, *Lyd. Mag.* 1.46. II. title of magistrate at Ephesus, *CIG* 3028." L. Robert (*Hellenica* XI–XII p. 236) discusses the latter document, a tomb placed under the protection of οἱ ἐν Εφέσῳ ἐργάται προπυλεῖται πρὸς τῷ Ποσειδῶνι: "Si cette corporation ne s'en charge pas, elle sera relayée par une autre: ἐκδικήσουσιν . . . οἱ ἐν Εφέσῳ προμέτραι. Certains y ont vu des 'magistrats d'Éphèse', ce qui n'est certainement pas le cas. D'après tout le contexte il s'agit d'un métier. Ce sont, je crois, ceux qui mesurent le blé, pour la vente, la distribution ou le transport, comme le σιτομέτρης. Le προμέτρης correspond au *ensor* latin, mot qui recouvre divers emplois, mais s'applique souvent aux mesureurs de blé. Une glose établit directement cette correspondance: *prometris ensor*." Thus Section II of the article in *LSJ* must be deleted, and Section I revised.

προμετωπίς The article s.v. in *LSJ* reads as follows: "star on the forehead, π. χρυσαῖ, ἀργυραῖ, Callix. 2. II. front of a coffin, *Inscr.*

Magn. 281 (i A. D.).” A passage of Callixenus of Rhodes (preserved in Athenaeus V 200e) describes a procession at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphos: τῶν δὲ ὄνων οἱ μὲν χρυσᾶς, οἱ δὲ ἀργυρᾶς προμετωπίδας καὶ σκευασίας εἶχον; the translation in *LSJ* is too specific, for nothing in the passage indicates that the ornaments on the animals’ heads were in the form of stars. Epigraphically the word is attested twice at Magnesia on the Maeander: *I. Magnesia* 281 ἡ σορός καὶ ἡ προμετωπὶς καὶ ἡ στήλη Ἀρτέμονος κτλ and 282 ἡ προμετωπὶς Γναῖον Δεκμίου Φιλέρωτος καὶ Κασσκε(λλ)ίας Πώλης. For these *LSJ* follows the explanation of O. Kern ad loc.: “Hier ist die Stirnseite des σορός gemeint, welche die Portraits der Verstorbenen trug.” J. Kubińska, op. cit. p. 158, remarks “on voit bien que la προμετωπὶς ne fait pas partie du sarcophage, mais qu’au contraire c’est une chose tout à fait à part. Les inscriptions funéraires ne nous mentionnent jamais ni la construction ni l’achat d’un seul côté du sarcophage. On pourrait plutôt supposer que c’est une espèce de soubassement qui se trouvait au-dessous du sarcophage.” The second inscription quoted renders it certain that the προμετωπὶς was an independent part of the funeral monument within which at least two persons could be buried. Both sections of the article in *LSJ* must be revised.

πρωτοστολιστής In *LSJ* this word is said to mean “chief of the στολισται”, and ἀρχιστολιστής is defined as “keeper of the sacred vestments.” This is not correct. E. Bernand explains these words (*Les inscriptions grecques de Philae* II p. 236): “Le terme de πρωτοστολιστής implique une hiérarchie parmi les stolistes. J.-A. Letronne songe à en faire l’équivalent de ἀρχιστολιστής . . . Mais un même temple peut compter parmi son personnel plusieurs πρωτοστολισταί, de rang égal [reference to the same papyrus cited by *LSJ*], et l’existence, connue par un papyrus, d’une fonction de δευτεροστολιστής suppose que la charge de stoliste comportait différentes classes que l’on ne peut confondre. L’ἀρχιστολιστής se plaçait à la tête de la hiérarchie.” Thus the definition given by *LSJ* for πρωτοστολιστής should be transferred to ἀρχιστολιστής and vice versa (with cross-references).

**πιιστής* In *LSJ* appears the following entry: “πιιστής, οὔ, ὁ, cj. for πιισάνης (q.v.).” This word is incorrectly described as a “conjecture for πιισάνης”, for **πιισάνης* appears nowhere outside the pages of *LSJ*; it is in fact a conjecture of Scaliger for the MS reading *πιισάνας* in an epigram of Palladas in the *Anth. Pal.* Since the MS

reading is correct (only the accentuation needs to be changed: *πισανᾶς*) the unattested word **πιστής* may be deleted from the lexicon.

πυργίσκος The first meaning given for this word by the article s. v. in *LSJ* is “Dim. of *πύργος*, *burial-vault*” citing *CIG* 4207 and 4212. These inscriptions should now be cited as *TAM* II.1 (1920) 51 and 63; the same word appears also in nos. 64, 65 and 66 (all these documents are from Telmessus, where the word was obviously epichoric). J. Kubińska points out (op. cit. pp. 159–160) that all the inscriptions which mention a *πυργίσκος* are carved on sarcophagi, and concludes that “le *πυργίσκος* signifie le tombeau composé d’un soubassement en forme de haut pilier et d’un sarcophage.”

σάρον The article s. v. in *LSJ* gives for this word three sections: “broom, besom”; “II. sweepings, refuse, rubbish”; and “III. σ. *σιδαροῦν* dub. in *Supp. Epigr.* 6.171 (Acmonia).” The “iron broom” which threatens violators of this Jewish tomb is merely another instance of *σάρον* in its first meaning, and the sense is quite clear; furthermore, L. Robert (*Hellenica* XI–XII p. 400 note 3) points out that “le mot y est parfaitement attesté, contrairement à ce que dit le dictionnaire de Liddell-Scott-Jones . . . C’est l’inconvénient de ne pas se reporter aux textes et aux commentaires et de se contenter de compilations abrégées.”

σεβαστολόγος The article s. v. in *LSJ* reads “*Σεβαστολόγος*, ὁ, and *-νέως*, ὁ, names of officials, coupled with *ἀρχινεώκορος*, *Milet* 7.65.” This inscription has been re-edited by L. Robert (*Hellenica* VII Chapter XXII) and the title *ἀρχινεώκορος* (contrary to the citation in *LSJ*, the word in *Milet* loc. cit. was spelled with an *omicron*) is exposed as a false reading for *ἀρχινεοποιός* (the same man was also *σεβαστονέως* and *σεβαστολόγος*). The phrase in *LSJ* concerning *ἀρχινεώκορος* must therefore be deleted, and for the inscription reference should be made to the improved edition of Robert rather than to *Milet* VII. In place of the unhelpful translation “names of officials” one may consult the remarks of Robert on p. 210: “Le titre de *σεβαστονέως* est nouveau et témoigne d’une grande recherche dans la création des titres hiérarchiques du culte de Caligula. Le mot *σεβαστολόγος* est nouveau lui aussi. Il est à rapprocher étroitement de *θεολόγος*, qui est fréquent dans les cultes d’Asie et de Bithynie à l’époque impériale; je l’ai rapproché aussi de *ἡρακ μαρτυρολόγος*; le *σεβαστολόγος* prononçait les éloges en prose de l’empereur” (cf. also *REA* 1960 p. 321).

Σεβαστονεικηφόρια For this word the article s. v. in *LSJ* gives the translation “Imperial games” with a reference to *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1932 (5) 43, an inscription of Pergamum published by Th. Wiegand who believed that “Die *σεβαστονεικηφόρια* erinnern daran, daß Trajan den Beinamen *νικηφόριος* erhalten hat.” L. Robert (*Hellenica* VII p. 211 note 0) remarks that the word “ne peut être expliqué par ‘Imperial games’; il doit s’agir de fêtes pour Auguste (ou les Augustes) et Athéna Nikephoros.” Once again the “improvement” in the *Supplement* (“for ‘Imperial games’ read ‘= Σεβαστά’”) hardly constitutes progress.

στατίων *LSJ* (which accents *στατιών*, contrary to the practice of L. Robert, L. Moretti, W. Dittenberger, G. Kaibel et al.) gives no proper definition but merely states “= Lat. *statio*”, citing the following epigraphical attestations: *OGIS* 755, *IGR* III 748, *IG* XIV 830, *IGR* III 883. In fact the Greek word *στατίων* has two entirely different meanings: “military guard-post or guard” (e.g. *IGR* III 748, better cited as *TAM* II 1165: *Αἰλίῳ Τηλέφῳ Ίσανρῶ βενεφικιαρίῳ ἔχοντι στατιώναν ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ*; also *SEG* II 666), and “à la fois l’association des étrangers fixés dans une ville et le local où ils se rassemblent” (L. Robert, op. cit. infra). The word has the latter sense in *IG* XIV 830 (better cited as *OGIS* 595), concerning a *statio* of the Tyrians: *εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλη στατίων ἐστὶν ἐν Ποτιόλοις, (ὥς οἱ πλείους ὁμῶν ἴσασι, καὶ [ῆ] ἡμετέρα ἐστὶν καὶ κόσμῳ καὶ μεγέθει τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρονσα*; thus also *IGR* III 883 (to be cited as L. Robert, *Hellenica* VII Chapter XXI; like the following text, this attests an extension of the meaning to denote also the headquarters of a local association composed of residents of the city): *οἱ αὐτοὶ γραμματεῖς τὴν στατίωνα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τῷ ἱερῷ συνεργίῳ*, and *OGIS* 755 (at Miletus): *ὁ στατίων τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν κηπουρῶν*. The documents cited by *LSJ* are thus to be separated into two divisions according to their meaning; for the second sense cf. also L. Moretti *Inscriptiones graecae Urbis Romae* nos. 82–84 (near the Forum).

**σφεκλαράριος* In *LSJ* is an entry “*σφεκλαράριος*, v. *σπεκλάριον*”; and s. v. *σπεκλάριον* one reads “= sq. 2 [*σπέκλον*], *P Holm.* 4.28: hence *σφεκλαράριος*, ὁ, = Lat. *speculararius*, *Supp. Epigr.* 7.197 (Berytus, v/vi A.D.).” The inscription in question is a Christian epitaph published by R. Mouterde in *CRAI* 1929 pp. 99–102: [*Σ*]ορός σὺν [*τ*]οῖς [*ὀ*]κτῶ (θ)ήκες δι[*α*]φέρονσα Σαμ[*β*]ατίου σφεκλα[*ρ*]α(ρίου) κὲ Λεοντίας [*γ*]αμετῆς αὐτοῦ. L. Robert (*Opera Minora Selecta* II pp. 930–931) insisted once again that “Il serait beaucoup plus raisonnable de renvoyer directement à l’édition originale, *CRAI*

1929, où il y a commentaire détaillé et discussion, bien plutôt qu'à SEG, où l'on écrit: 'σφεκλαράριος specularius, de quibus . . . cf. editoris commentarios.'” Not only does the reference to *SEG* interpose another step between the dictionary and the text for the reader who desires to consult the sources, it also is frequently productive of error among the dictionary editors themselves (v. supra s. v. *σάρον*). Robert continues “Il faut remarquer que le mot *σφεκλαράριος* n'est pas proprement attesté par cette inscription. On ne signale pas de signe d'abréviation après *alpha*, et d'ailleurs on attendrait plutôt, s'il y avait eu abréviation, la coupure après le *rhô* qui précède. L'existence du latin *speculararius* n'oblige nullement à retrouver ici, à toute force, son correspondant exact *σπεκλαράριος*. Il est beaucoup plus indiqué d'écrire ici *σφεκλαρᾱ̃*, génitif de *σφεκλαρᾱ̃ς*. Il n'est pas de nom de métier, en *-άριος* ou en *-ίτης*, qui ne puisse aussi avoir une forme en *-ᾱ̃ς*; *ὕελάριος*, le verrier, a pour correspondant *ὕελᾱ̃ς*, etc.; chaque année en fait connaître de nouveaux; ils sont souvent méconnus; tel fut le cas de *σφεκλαρᾱ̃ς* à Berytus.”

σφεκλαρᾱ̃ς This word, absent from *LSJ* and its *Supplement*, must be inserted in place of **σφεκλαράριος*, q. v.; L. Robert (*Opera Minora Selecta* II p. 932) has defined its meaning as “vitrier en ‘pierre spéculaire’ ou en verre”, i. e. maker of windows in mica or glass.

ταβουλάριος This word, absent from *LSJ*, is registered in the *Supplement* with two epigraphical attestations: “Ramsay *The Social Basis* 129, *MAMA* 7.524 (pl.).” In fact this is the same inscription, an epitaph erected by an *ἀπελεύθερος ἰνστρουμεντάριος ταβουλαρίων* at the Turkish village of İnsuyu, near an ancient site which is identified by W. M. Calder (commentary on *MAMA* VII 529) as Pillitokome. The first citation should be deleted. Cf. also *AJP* 1931 p. 260.

**Υγγιος* This word, which appears on an inscription of Skotussa in Thessaly (J. Pouilloux *BCH* 1955 pp. 449–450; *Choix d'inscriptions grecques* p. 149 no. 40) should be registered as a variant of the month name *Ἰύγγιος* which occurs in the calendar of Thessaly.

ὑποδημιουργός This word, omitted from *LSJ* and its *Supplement*, occurs on an altar at Hierapolis Castabala in Cilicia dedicated to *Θεᾷ Περσσία ἐπηκόω* by *Πό(π)λιος Μέσσιος Ποῦφος ὁ ὑποδημ[ι]ουργός* and published (with a facsimile) by R. Heberdey and Ad. Wilhelm in *Denkschr. der kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien*, phil.-hist. Klasse 44 (6) 1896 p. 27 no. 59. On such compounds in *ὑπο-* see J. and L. Robert, “Bull. Épigr.” (*REG*) 1961 p. 159 no. 269 (this attestation is mentioned as omitted from *LSJ* in spite of the fact that “le mot n'y

semble pas douteux”; the reason is explained by Robert in *La déesse de Hierapolis Castabala* p. 34).

**ὑπομαρτυρέω* In *LSJ* appears the following article: “*ὑπομαρτυρέω*, in Pass., *receive testimony*, ἐπὶ τῇ σεμνότητι τοῦ βίου CIG 4415 (Cilicia).” This word does not exist. L. Robert remarks (*Documents de l’Asie Mineure méridionale* p. 78) that “A vrai dire, on doit être surpris devant ce composé; si *διαμαρτυρεῖν* et *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* s’expliquent au mieux à côté de *μαρτυρεῖν*, on se demande quelle nuance introduit *ὑπομαρτυρεῖν*; le *ὑπο* initial ne pourrait indiquer qu’une idée de restriction, de diminution, de subreptice.” Robert demonstrates that in each of the two appearances of this verb at Iotape (it is attested nowhere else) the text cited by *LSJ* depends upon corrections of Cockerell’s copy and restorations by J. Franz (neither indicated as such in *LSJ*); the correct restorations are *ὑπὸ πάντων μαρτυρηθέντα* and *ὑπ[ὸ πάντων μαρ]τυρηθέντα*, and the word must be expunged from the dictionary.

ὑποσόριον The article s.v. in *LSJ* defines this word as “vault below the σορός”, citing three inscriptions from Lycia. Although etymologically unexceptionable, this definition is not sufficient in practice; the examples collected by J. Kubińska, op. cit. pp. 81–84, reveal that the word occurs in Asia Minor only in Lycia and at Philadelphia in Lydia, and whereas the Lycian occurrences (according to E. Petersen and F. von Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien* etc. II p. 26) designate the lower part of the tomb with an opening at one side, at Philadelphia the word is always attested alone without the mention of any other parts of a funeral monument, and as Kubińska reasonably supposes may well denote something entirely different from what it means in Lycia. The definition in *LSJ* should therefore be revised to take account of these two epichoric usages: in Lycia, the pedestal below the sarcophagus (this part was reserved for less important members of the family such as slaves, freedmen, *θρεπτοί*, etc.), and at Philadelphia, a local word for a very modest sort of tomb (cf. the descriptions of J. Keil and A. von Premerstein “Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der südlichen Aiolis” in *Denkschr. der kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien* 53.2 (1908) p. 36 no. 60, p. 41 no. 82).

χαλίσμησις One of the two attestations cited by *LSJ* for this word is G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca addenda* 903a, an inscription on the base of a statue erected in the fifth century by the citizens of Hypaipa in Lydia to honor the proconsul of Asia Flavius Anthemides Isidoros. L. Robert (*Hellenica* IV p.18) has pointed out

(after J. Keil; bibliography *ibid.*) that line 4 of this text should be restored as follows:

*Ἀνθεμίον παῖς οὗτος, ὃς ἀνθυπάτων μέγ' ἀμύνων
Ἰσα Διὸς θέμιδι φαίνων χραίσμη[σεν] ἄπασιν*

“Les quatre autres editeurs écrivaient *χραίσμη[σιν]*, mais alors le verbe qu’annonce *ὃς* fait défaut (‘verbum amissum in enuntiato relativo’, dit Kaibel).” This reference must therefore be deleted from *LSJ* s.v. *χραίσμησις*.

To be continued.

Atque and neque again

By J. A. RICHMOND, Dublin

In his interesting new book on *Style and Tradition in Catullus*, Harvard 1969, p. 42, n. 83, David O. Ross, Jr., refers to the explanation I gave in this journal (43, 1965, 99) of the fact that Plautus and Lucretius allow *neque* to stand before a consonant much more often than they allow *atque* to occupy such a place. My explanation was based on ancient metrical theory, and Mr. Ross objects to it on the ground that the theories of the metrical writers and grammarians in antiquity were “artificial and unrealistic”. He propounds (p. 45 sq.) an alternative view based mainly on the different semantic conditions and literary history of *atque* and *neque*.

Without entering here into the merits of his argument I should like to record an additional piece of evidence that has come to my notice since I wrote my previous article on this subject. H. Drexler, in his *Einführung in die römische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1967, p. 58, n. 70^b, points out that *-ne* tends to be apocopated in Plautine metre after a long open syllable, but to keep its final vowel after a short syllable. From the examples given in Drexler’s note it seems that apocope of *-ne* was also frequent after long closed syllables. Analogy accordingly suggests that it is the short first syllable in *neque* that made the unapocopated form seem natural before a consonant, and that the difference in the treatment of *atque* and *neque* in this respect depends on the quantity of the first syllable. This suggests a phonetic basis for the fact under discussion. It can be explained in