

Some LSJ Addenda and Corrigenda*)

By St. S. TIGNER, Toledo

ἄμα *LSJ* s.v., Section A.2, claims a special sense, “*partly . . . partly . . .*,” for the construction “ἄμα μὲν . . . ἄμα δέ . . .,” citing only *Pl. Phd.* 115d: ταῦτά μοι δοκῶ αὐτῷ ἄλλως λέγειν, παραμυθούμενος ἄμα μὲν ὑμᾶς, ἄμα δ’ ἐμαντόν and *X. HG* 3.1.3: αἱ δὲ ἄμα μὲν ἐλεύθεραι βουλόμεναι εἶναι, ἄμα δὲ φοβούμεναι τὸν Τισσαφέρην, . . . εἰς μὲν τὰς πόλεις οὐκ ἐδέχοντο αὐτόν . . . In both of these passages, however, there is no reason not to take the construction in the straightforward sense “*both . . . and at the same time . . .*,” as it *must* be taken in *Arist. GC* 315*3ff.: Ἐμπεδοκλῆς μὲν οὖν ἔοικεν ἐναντία λέγειν καὶ πρὸς τὰ φαινόμενα καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν αὐτός. ἄμα μὲν γὰρ οὗ φησιν ἑτερον ἐξ ἑτέρου γίνεσθαι τῶν στοιχείων οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ τᾶλλα πάντα ἐκ τούτων, ἄμα δ’ ὅταν εἰς ἓν συναγάγῃ τὴν ἅπασαν φύσιν πλὴν τοῦ νείκους, ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς γίνεσθαι πάλιν ἕκαστον. The special sense “*partly . . . partly . . .*” for “ἄμα μὲν . . . ἄμα δέ . . .” is thus not adequately supported by *LSJ* s.v. and should be deleted.

ἄμβροτος To *LSJ* s.v., Section 1 (“poet. Adj. *immortal, divine*, of persons as well as things . . .”), should be added: “b. Subst., *divine things* (prob. *heavenly bodies*), *Emp.* 21.4.” *Emp.* 21.3ff. reads as follows (in *Diels/Kranz*, the citation standard for *LSJ Supplement*):

ἡέλιον μὲν λευκὸν ὄραῖν καὶ θερμὸν ἀπάντη,
 ἄμβροτα δ’ ὅσσ’ εἶδει τε καὶ ἀργέτι δέυεται ἀνγῇ,
 ὄμβρον δ’ ἐν πᾶσι ὀνοφέντά τε ῥίγαλέον τε·
 ἐκ δ’ αἷης προρέουσι θελεμνά τε καὶ στερεωπά.
 ἐν δὲ Κότῳ διάμορφα καὶ ἄνδιχα πάντα πέλονται,
 σὺν δ’ ἔβη ἐν Φιλότῃ καὶ ἀλλήλοισι ποθεῖται.

We have three hints concerning the referents of “ἄμβροτα”: (1) they are divine; (2) they are bathed in the sun’s warmth and bright radiance; and (3) they probably constitute some manifestation of αἰθήρη (*Empedocles*’ usual term for what later tradition almost al-

*) This list of *addenda* and *corrigenda* is a by-product of some work on pre-Platonic cosmology done while the author was a Junior Fellow at the Center for Hellenic Studies, and working under a Younger Humanist Fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am most grateful to these institutions for their support, and to Thomas Drew-Bear, who has read the whole and offered much encouragement and helpful criticism.

ways calls “air” [ἀήρ]). This last point derives from the observation that the six verses here quoted seem intended to constitute a list of manifestations of the six fundamental elements of Empedocles’ physical system: “sun” (Fire), “divine things” (Air), “rain” (Water), “earth” (Earth), “Wrath” (Strife), and “Love” (Love), in that order. All the heavenly bodies would presumably fulfill the first condition (of being divine). As for being bathed in the sun’s warmth and bright radiance, the moon fits this description (cf. *Emp.* 43. 45; *Plu. Strom.* 10), as does also at least one hemisphere of the heaven itself (cf. *Placit.* 2.20.13). Both moon and heaven also fulfill the condition of being manifestations of air. They are made from it (cf. *Placit.* 2.6.3, 2.11.2, 2.25.15; *Plu.* 922 c; *Plu. Strom.* 10).

ἀπολήγω *LSJ* s.v., Section I.2, includes “opp. γίνεται, *Emp.* 17.30.” This should read: “opp. ἐπιγίνεται, *Emp.* 17.30.” The difference is not trivial, for ἐπιγίνεται here is not just an intensified γίνεται, still less an equivalent (cf. *infra* s.v. ἐπιγίνομαι). *Emp.* 17.30 ff. reads as follows:

καὶ πρὸς τοῖς οὗτ’ ἄρ τι ἐπιγίνεται οὐδ’ ἀπολήγει·
εἴτε γὰρ ἐφθείροντο διαμπερές, οὐκέτ’ ἂν ἦσαν·
τοῦτο δ’ ἐπαυξήσειε τὸ πᾶν τί κε; καὶ πόθεν ἐλθόν;

Emp. 17.30, as the verses following make clear, means “And to these (sc. Love, Strife, and the “elements”) not anything comes-additionally-into-being, nor (does anything) *leave-off-from-(being)*.”

ἀσπερίζω *LSJ* s.v. misses entirely the sense *turn into star(s)*, as attested in *Placit.* 2.12.3: Ἀναξαγόρας τὸν περικείμενον αἰθέρα, πύρινον μὲν εἶναι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν, τῇ δ’ εὐτονίᾳ τῆς περιδινήσεως ἀναρπάσαντα πέτρους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ καταφλέξαντα τούτους ἡσπερικένας.

δέρκομαι *To LSJ* s.v., Section I.2 [“c. acc. objecti, *look on* or *at*, *Il.* 13.86, etc.; τί . . . ἥδιον δε.; *A.Ag.* 602; ἐδέρχθης ὀλιγοδρανίαν *Id.Pr.* 547; so δε. εἰς τινα *Hes.Sc.* 169, *E.HF* 951; κατὰ τι *A.Pr.* 679; descry, perceive, *Od.* 10.197, *E.Andr.* 545; κτύπον δέδορκα *A.Th.* 103 (lyr.).”], should be added: “metaph., τὴν σὺ νόῳ δέρκεν *Emp.* 17.21.”

διαίρεσις In listing and illustrating various means by which exegetical difficulties may be overcome, Aristotle mentions τὰ δὲ διαίρεσει, οἷον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς “αἶψα δὲ θνήτ’ ἐφύοντο τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ’ εἶναι ζωρά τε πρὶν κέκρητο”, *Arist.Po.* 1461^a23 ff. Nearly all English translators have rendered διαίρεσει “by punctuation,” despite the anachronism, as the best way to convey the intent of the Greek.

Whether or not this gloss is to be preferred over a more literal “by separation” or “by spacing out,” this special use of *διάλξεις*, omitted by *LSJ* and *Supplement*, clearly warrants specific mention s. v.

διάλλαξις *LSJ* s. v., Section 1, reads: “*separation, μιγέντων* Emp. 8.3, cf. Hp. *Vict.* I. 10.” Emp. 8 reads as follows:

ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω· φύσις οὐδενὸς ἔστιν ἀπάντων
 θνητῶν, οὐδέ τις οὐλομένου θανάτοιο τελευτή,
 ἀλλὰ μόνον μίξις τε διάλλαξις τε μιγέντων
 ἔστι, φύσις δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνομάζεται ἀνθρώποισιν.

The meaning of *διάλλαξις τε μιγέντων* is illuminated somewhat by the *διαλλάξαντα κελεύθους* of Emp. 35.15,

αἶψα δὲ θνήτ' ἐφύοντο, τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι,
 15 ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα διαλλάξαντα κελεύθους

(cf. *infra* s. v. *ζωρός*) and its echo in Emp. 115.8

φνομένους παντοῖα διὰ χρόνου εἶδεα θνητῶν
 ἀργαλέας βιότοιο μεταλλάσσοντα κελεύθους.

LSJ's “*separation*” is apparently based on a wrongly construed complementarity with *μίξις* (as though *διάλλαξις* were equivalent to *διάκρισις*, *ἀπόκρισις*, or *διάστασις*, the term Aëtius uses—apparently going on a similar assumption—in introducing his quotation of the fragment). There is, of course, a complementarity with *μίξις*; but it is the complementarity of “combination and *permutation*” (cf. Lat. correl. *permutatio*) rather than of “mixing and separation.” In the Hippocratic passage (Hp. *Vict.* 1.10) the word occurs in a list of things which are under the governance of fire: *ψυχή, νόος, φρόνησις, αὔξεισις, κίνησις, μείωσις, διάλλαξις, ὕπνος, ἔγερσις*. Here the general context suggests reference to the cyclic *exchanges* or *permutations* which occur in the fanciful metabolism under discussion. *LSJ* s. v., Section 1, would better read: “*permutation, exchange, Emp. 8.3, Hp. Vict. 1.10.*”

διαφύομαι *LSJ*'s whole entry s. v. is poorly organized, and parts of it need correction. As it stands it reads: “Pass., fut. -φύσομαι Philostr. *Jun. Im.* 13: with aor. 2 Act. *διέφυν* : pf. *διαπέφυκα* :—*germinate*, of seeds, Thphr. *CP* 2.17.7. II. *to be disjoined*, *διαφόντος* *ένός* Emp. 17.10. III. *grow between*, Arist. *Fr.* 335, Thphr. *CP* 3.7.9; *intervene*, *χρόνος* *διέφν* *καὶ πάντα ἐξήρηντο* Hdt. 1.61; *βαθὺς δ. αὐλὼν* Eratosth. 8. IV. *to be different from*, *ἀπ' ἀλλήλων* Philostr. *Im.* 2.32.

V. *to be inseparably connected with*, τινός Philostr. Jun. l. c.; *to identify oneself with*, τυραννίδος Plu. Dio 12; *to be intimately acquainted with*, τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν D.C. 72.6, cf. 77.13; δι' ὅλης τῆς Ἰταλίας *to pervade, leaven* all Italy (of Sulla's veterans), Plu. Cic. 14." Now among the senses which διά exhibits in verbal compounds, four seem relevant here. And good lexicographic practice would reflect this by distinguishing four major senses of the compound verb. In the sense (I) "right through" [as in διῦππεύω, "ride through"] we have βαθὺς διαφύεται αὐλῶν ("a deep hollow runs through it"), Eratosth. 8; in the sense (II) "throughout" [as in διαπνίσκομαι, "suppurate throughout"] we have οἱ Σύλλα πάσαι στρατιῶται, διαπεφυκότες μὲν ὅλης τῆς Ἰταλίας ("the old soldiers of Sulla, pervading all of Italy"), Plu. Cic., 14.1, also Philostr. Jun. Im., 13.2; in the sense (III) "between," used both (a) connectively [as in διάχρυσος, "interwoven with gold"], we have (1), quite literally, αἱ μεταξὺ αὐτῶν λεπτὸν ὕμεινα ἔχουσιν διαπεφυκότες ("they have a thin membrane growing between them"), Arist. Fr. 335, also Thphr. CP 3.7.9, and (2), in an extended sense, οὗτος μὲν οὖν εὐθὺς κατελθὼν διεπεφύκει τῆς τυραννίδος ("He, then, immediately after having returned, became connected with the tyranny"), Plu. Dio., 12.1, also D.C., 72.6.5, 77.13.2, and (b) disjunctively [as in διαιρέω, "divide"], we have (1), in a temporal sense, χρόνος διέφν καὶ πάντα σφι ἐξήρτυτο ἐς τὴν κάτοδον ("time passed ['came between'] and everything was ready for their return"), Hdt. 1.61, and (2), in an abstract sense, διαπέφυκε δὲ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὰ παλαιόματα ("Wrestling matches differ from one another"), Philostr. Im., 2.32.2; and in the sense (IV) "apart, in different directions" [as in διαλύω, "loose from one another, and διαπέμπω, "send off in different directions"], we have the following uses of Empedocles and Theophrastus. Among pre-Aristotelian philosophers, Empedocles alone is attested as having used διαφύομαι: Emp. 17.2, 5, 10, 17, and 26.9 (where 17.17 repeats 17.2, and 26.9 repeats 17.10). 17.1–2 (= 17.16–17):

δίπλ' ἐρέω· τοτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡρξήθη μόνον εἶναι
ἐκ πλεόνων, τοτὲ δ' αὖ διέφν πλέον' ἐξ ἑνὸς εἶναι.

17.4–5:

τὴν μὲν γὰρ πάντων σύνοδος τίκει τ' ὀλέκει τε,
ἡ δὲ πάλιν διαφνομένων θρεφθεῖσα διέπτει.

26.8–9 (= 17.⟨9⟩–10):

οὕτως ἦ μὲν ἐκ πλεόνων μεμάθηκε φύεσθαι
ἡ δὲ πάλιν διαφύντος ἑνὸς πλέον' ἐκτελέθουσι.

While there can be no doubt that the physical motion envisaged here is a disjoining one (as *LSJ* correctly asserts s.v., Section II), it is a mistake to isolate this sense from the “*germinating, sprouting*” uses of Theophrastus, as in *διαφύεται δ’ οὐκ ἐν ἴσοις πάντα χρόνοις* (“not all [herbs] *germinate* in the same length of time”), *HP* 7.1.3, and *δεῖ δὲ φυτεύειν προβρέχοντας ὅταν ἤδη διαφύηται ἐν τῷ ὕδατι* (“one should first soak the seed and sow it when it is already *sprouting* in the water,” tr. Hort), *HP* 3.7.2, also *CP* 2.17.7. The developed image would be that of the swelling seed, breaking apart, becoming “organ-ized,” and sending shoots and roots out in different directions. The image is certainly apt for what Empedocles clearly has in mind. And he is indeed given to biological metaphor. His own generic term for the “elements” is *ρίζώματα*, *Emp.* 6.1. And the words ‘*ἡϋξήθη*’, ‘*φύεσθαι*’, and ‘*ἐκτελέθουσι*’ in the immediate context of the Empedoclean occurrences of *διαφύομαι* all naturally point to biological growth as the dominant metaphor of these verses. That *διαφύντος* in 17.10 (= 26.9) was understood as a biological metaphor by at least some medieval Latin translators seems likely. The otherwise unknown translation of Aristotle’s *Physics* to which Aquinas refers in his *Commentary* has, for *διαφύντος ἐνός πλέον*’ (at 250^b 31, where Empedocles is being quoted), *ex uno geminato plurima*, where *geminato* is almost certainly a misreading of either *germinato* or *gemma*. (The slip is very easy. E. L. Brown has pointed out to me a recent instance in *Latomus* 31 (1972), 688.1, which reads: “and *germinate (geminare)* so to . . .” where the text cited actually has “*germinare*.” I suggest then that Empedocles’ use of the term be incorporated into the same section with Theophrastus, as follows: “*germinate, sprout*, of seeds, Thphr. *HP* 3.7.2, 7.1.3, *CP* 2.17.7; metaph., *Emp.* 17.2 al.”

δισκοειδής *LSJ* s.v. gives only “*quoit-shaped*” as the meaning. But this is misleading. In *Placit.* 2.27.2 (cited by *LSJ*), where it applies to the moon, the shape in question is clearly that of a *disc*, not a ring: *Περὶ σχήματος σελήνης . . . Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δισκοειδῆ*.

ἔκλειψις In *Pr.* 937^a 13 “Aristotle” mentions a desiccation process wherein occurs an *ἔκλειψις ὕγροῦ*, a “*departure of moisture*”: *πότερον ὅτι τῇ τοῦ ὕγροῦ ἐκλείπει γίνεται λίθος, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ ἢ τοῦ ψυχροῦ ἐκλείπει τὸ ὕγρόν . . .* *LSJ* misses this particular noun correlate of the intransitive verb, which should be added to Section II [(“from intr.”)], 2: “*failing, cessation, τῶν δυνάμεων* *Plu.* 2.433f. (pl.), cf. *Aret. SD* 1.7; *extinction* of a race, *Str.* 9.5.12.

ἐκχωρέω In keeping with *LSJ*'s later citation of the opposition between *ἐκχωρέω* and *συγχωρέω* in *Anaxag.*15, s.v. *συγχωρέω*, add "go out, go off, opp. *συγχωρέω*, *Anaxag.*15" to Section I.1: "depart, *ἐκ χώρας SIG* 679.53; leave a country, emigrate, *Hdt.* 1.56, *Hecat.*30J.; withdraw, *ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας PAmh.*2.30.44 (ii B.C.), etc.: metaph., *ἐ. ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν Plb.*2.21.2: so abs., *Id.*7.2.1." Cf. infra s.v. *συγχωρέω*.

ἐπαρκής The entry in *LSJ* s.v. reads as follows: "helpful, *κράσις Emp.*22.4; of remedies, effective, *Nic.Al.*564. II. sufficient, *οὐσία ταῖς δαπάναις ἐ. Plu.Cic.*7, cf. *D.P.*1101. Adv. -*κῶς IG* 4.491 (*Cleonae*). The citations in context are as follows: *Emp.*22.4f.:

ὥς δ' αὐτως ὅσα κρῆσιν ἐπαρκέα μάλλον ἔασιν,
ἀλλήλοις ἔστερκται ὁμοιωθέντ' Ἀφροδίτη.

'κρῆσιν ἐπαρκέα' is rendered by English translators quite consistently as "suitable for mixture," "adapted for mixture," "fitted for mixture," etc. *LSJ*'s "helpful" makes no sense. *Nic.Al.*563ff.:

καί τε σύ γ' ἢ γερύων λαιδροὺς δαμάσαιο τοκῆας
ἄμμιγα δὲ ῥίζας ἡρυγγίδας, ἢ καὶ ἐπαρκές
θάλπε βαλὼν χύτρῳ σκαμμώνιον.

The translation in the edition of Gow & Scholfield reads: "Further, either you should bend to your service the tadpoles' impudent parents and eryngo roots with them, or you should throw into a pot a sufficient quantity of scammony and cook it." *LSJ*'s "effective" makes little sense.—*Plu.Cic.*7.3. *Οὐσίαν δὲ μικρὰν μὲν, ἱκανὴν δὲ καὶ ταῖς δαπάναις ἐπαρκῇ κεκτημένος ἐθανμάζετο μήτε μισθοὺς μήτε δῶρα προσίεμενος ἀπὸ τῆς συνηγορίας.*—*D.P.*1101: *ἀλλ' ἔμπης ζωοῖσιν ἐπαρκέες εἰσὶ κέλευθοι.* *LSJ*'s "sufficient" cannot be far off in these instances. (The *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* lists but one meaning for *ἐπαρκής*: *Sufficiens*.) I suggest that all occurrences here cited might well be taken to carry the same basic meaning of being *fitting*, *suitable*, *adapted*, *adequate*, and that the partition in *LSJ*'s entry is a mistake.

ἐπιγίγνομαι *Emp.*17.30ff. seems clearly to express an element conservation principle, together with its Parmenidean rationale:

καὶ πρὸς τοῖς οὐτ' ἄρ τι ἐπιγίνεται οὐδ' ἀπολήγει·
εἴτε γὰρ ἐφθείροντο διαμπερές, οὐκέτ' ἂν ἦσαν·
τοῦτο δ' ἐπανζήσειε τὸ πᾶν τί κε; καὶ πόθεν ἐλθόν;

Here 'ἐπιγίνεται' almost certainly means "comes additionally into being" (cf. supra s.v. ἀπολήγω), a sense omitted from the *LSJ* entry s.v., which includes "I. of Time, to be born after, come into being after . . . II. of things, come at the end, come as fulfilment . . ., esp. of sudden changes of weather and the like, supervene . . . 2. come in after; come upon, assault, attack; freq. in Hp. of additional symptoms, supervene . . . etc."

ἐπίπεδον This noun, with the precise geometrical sense "face of a cube," has been overlooked by *LSJ* and *Supplement*. S.v. ἐπίπεδος I, the *Supplement* does add "'2. τὰ ἐ. (sc. γῆς) the surface of the earth, opp. τὰς γᾶς ὑπένερθε, Pl. *Tht.* 173e,'" where the reading is ἡ δὲ διάνοια . . . πανταχῇ φέρεται κατὰ Πίνδαρον, "τᾶς τε γᾶς ὑπένερθε" καὶ τὰ ἐπίπεδα γεωμετροῦσα . . . Fowler, whose understanding of the passage the *Supplement* seems to follow, translates: "his mind, . . . is borne in all directions, as Pindar says, "both below the earth," and measuring the surface of the earth . . .". Whether or not this quite captures the sense of τὰ ἐπίπεδα in Plato's substantive use, the six ἐπίπεδα of a cube, in Simp. in *de An.* 68.6f., are clearly its faces: τὸν γὰρ κύβον διὰ τὸ δώδεκα μὲν ἔχειν πλευρὰς ὁκτώ δὲ γωνίας ἐξ δὲ ἐπίπεδα . . . And, like πλευρά and γωνία, ἐπίπεδον must be a noun.

ζωρός The *LSJ Supplement* s.v. includes the following addendum to the *LSJ* entry: "but in Emp. 35.15 ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα (s.v.l.) must mean 'a pure, i.e. homogeneous mixture of what had been heterogeneous unmixed elements'." This is the view of *Supplement* editor M. L. West, as advanced in *CR* n.s. 16 (1966), 135f. Now the meaning of ζωρός was a problem even in antiquity (cf. discussion in Plu. 4.677d, and Homer's problematic phrase, ζωρότερον . . . κέραε, *Il.* 9.203). But West's suggestion seems dubious. Emp. 35.14 ff. reads

αἶφα δὲ θεήτ' ἐφύοντο, τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι,
ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα διαλλάξαντα κελεύθους.
τῶν δέ τε μισγομένων χεῖτ' ἔθνεα μυρία θνητῶν.

("And forthwith grew mortal what before learned to be immortal.
And ζωρά, what before was unmixed, exchanging paths.
And as these mingled, there poured forth countless companies of mortal things").

As F. Solmsen has more recently pointed out, "if ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἄκρητα, not ζωρά τε τὰ πρὶν ἔκρητο (or something close to it), is the correct text, as O'Brien and West have made highly probable — for the *recensio* of the tradition favours it and the syntactic parallel

between v. 14 and v. 15 becomes complete—and if the context and trend of the argument require for this text the meaning ‘mixed’,—for, other considerations apart, v. 16 shows how *μίσγεσθαι* and the arising of *θνητά* go together—all we can do is to infer that Empedocles, rightly or wrongly, took Homer’s *ζωρότερον* to mean ‘more mixed.’” (*CR* n.s. 17 (1967), 245f.) In *Emp.* 35.15 *ζωρός* probably means *mixed* (not the *Supplement*’s “pure, i.e. *homogeneous* . . .”).

θέλυμα The complete entry in *LSJ* s.v. reads “*θέλυμα*, *ων*, *τά*, = *θέμεθλα*, *foundations* or *elements of things*, *θ. τε καὶ στερεωπά* cj. for *θελημνά*, *θελημά*, *Emp.* 21.6. (Cf. *προθέλυμος*, *τετραθέλυμος*.)” The *Supplement* stipulates that “For ‘*θέλυμα* . . . 21.6’ read ‘*θελυμνός*, *ή, όν*, = *θελεμνός* (*Suppl.*), cj. *Emp.* 21.6.’” Then s.v. *θελεμνός*, *ή, όν*, the *Supplement* entry reads “*well-founded*, prob. in *Emp.* 21.6 (*-λημν-* or *-λημ-* codd.); *-μνον· όλον έκ ριζών*, Hsch.” D. O’Brien argues convincingly that “*θέλυμα* . . . is probably correct, a derivation from Homer’s *προθέλυμος* and *τετραθέλυμος* to mean ‘thick’, ‘close packed’, ‘dense’. This meaning would accord with Aristotle’s phrase, *τήν δέ γῆν βαρὺ καὶ σκληρόν* [*GC* 315^a10f.] which seems to be a paraphrase of this verse.” (*Empedocles’ Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 267.) If so, then *LSJ* had the probably correct reading and suggested derivation, but selected the wrong sense, and the *Supplement*’s *θελεμνός* should be demoted from “prob. in *Emp.* 21.6” to “cj. *Emp.* 21.6.”

θερμομιγής *LSJ* s.v. has “*half-hot*, *άήρ* *Placit.* 2.20.13.” The passage reads: *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δύο ἡλίους· τὸν μὲν ἀρχέτυπον, πῦρ ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἡμισφαιρίῳ τοῦ κόσμου, πεπληρωκός τὸ ἡμισφαίριον, αἶρ καταντικρὺ τῇ ἀντανγείᾳ ἑαυτοῦ τεταγμένον· τὸν δὲ φαινόμενον, ἀντανγείαν ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἡμισφαιρίῳ τῷ τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ θερμομιγοῦς πεπληρωμένῳ, . . .* Guthrie translates: “Empedocles assumes two suns: (1) the archetype, which is fire in one hemisphere of the cosmos. It fills the hemisphere, and is always stationed opposite its own reflection; (2) the visible sun. This is a reflection in the other hemisphere, namely the hemisphere which is filled with air [or darkness, *aer*] mixed with heat . . .”. (*Hist. Gk. Phil.*, II. 192.) Now one may infer that “air mixed with heat” should be “half-hot air.” But it is anachronistic to understand *θερμομιγής* as having so purely qualitative a meaning here. Heat in Empedocles is elemental and substantial. When Aëtius writes *τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ θερμομιγοῦς* he should be taken quite literally as speaking “of air *mixed with heat*.”

καί The *LSJ Supplement* editors apparently missed an important discussion of *καί* in W. J. Verdenius & J. H. Waszink, *Aristotle on Coming-to-be and Passing-away* (Leiden, 1946; 2nd ed. 1966). The immediate concern of Verdenius & Waszink here is Aristotle's use of *καί* in introducing quotations and references (usually following *διό* or *ὥσπερ*), as in *GC* 314^b7, 20; *Rh.* 1367^a8; *Po.* 1453^b28; *Cael.* 268^a10. *GC* 314^b17–21, for example, reads: τὰ γὰρ πάντα . . . διαφοραὶ τῶν στοιχείων εἰσιν . . . ὥσπερ καὶ φησὶν Ἐμπεδοκλῆς “ἡέλιον μὲν λευκὸν ὄρα” κτλ. The discussion is supported by instances drawn from a wide range of earlier uses: *Il.* 1.249, 12.9; *Od.* 20.156; *Ar.Th.* 580, *Nub.* 612, 1474; *Pl.La.* 194a, *Phdr.* 258e, *Phd.* 73d, 108d, 110d, *R.* 350d. “In all these cases,” Verdenius & Waszink convincingly argue (2nd ed., pp. 2ff.), “*καί* seems to emphasize the accordance of the contents of a subordinate clause with those of the main clause, or of those of a sentence with those of the preceding sentence. It conveys the idea of something natural or factual, which may be translated by ‘indeed’, ‘really’, ‘actually’, ‘in fact’ (in German ‘denn auch’). Consequently, the terms *διό καί* etc. introducing the above quotations from Aristotle do not serve to give one example taken from many others, but to stress the factual accordance of an example with a general truth. Hence, in 314^b, 20, for example, we should translate: ‘as indeed Empedocles says’.” I suggest that a new Section 10 be added to Part B s.v. to reflect this use.

κρυσταλλοειδῶς *Κρυσταλλοειδής* often means “like ice,” and *LSJ* lists the apparently unique adverbial form which occurs in *Placit.* 2.11.2 under this sense of the adjective. But this is surely a mistake. The passage reads: Ἐμπεδοκλῆς στερέμνιον εἶναι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐξ ἀέρος (συν)παγέντος ὑπὸ πυρὸς κρυσταλλοειδῶς, κτλ. One does not form ice by the action of fire. However, Empedocles does take heat to be active in the formation of at least some kinds of rock (*Arist.Pr.* 937^a16ff., cf. *supra* s.v. *ἐκληψις*). Since the adjectival form also frequently means “like [rock] crystal,” it is clearly under this sense of the adjective that the adverb belongs, i.e. in Section II s.v.

κύκλος Section III.3 of *LSJ* s.v. reads: “in *Rhet.*, a rounded period, *περιόδου κύκλος* *D.H.Comp.* 19, cf. 22, 23. b. period which begins and ends with the same word, *Hermog.Inv.* 4.8.” The *Supplement* s.v. directs that, to this Section, “add ‘c. roundabout phrasing, circumlocution, *Plu.* 2.408f.’”: ἡ δὲ τῆς Πυθίας διάλεκτος . . . οὐ ποιοῦσα καμπὴν οὐδὲ κύκλον οὐδὲ διπλόην οὐδ’ ἀμφιβολίαν ἀλλ’ εὐθεῖα

πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὖσα . . . (Babbitt [Loeb] translates: "And as for the language of the prophetic priestess, . . . her language makes no bend nor *curve* nor doubling nor equivocation, but is straight in relation to the truth"). This use of κύκλος is attested much earlier in Arist. *Rh.* 1407^a36, where it is also clearer: (Aristotle is setting forth five rules of style) τρίτον, μὴ ἀμφιβάλοις· ταῦτα δέ, ἂν μὴ τὰναντία προαιρῇται. ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν, ὅταν μὴτὲν μὲν ἔχωσι λέγειν, προσποιῶνται δέ τι λέγειν· οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ἐν ποιήσει λέγουσι ταῦτα, οἷαν Ἐμπεδοκλῆς· φενακίζει γὰρ τὸ κύκλω πολὺ ὄν, καὶ πάσχουσιν οἱ ἀκροαταὶ ὅπερ οἱ πολλοὶ παρὰ τοῖς μάντεσιν· (Freese [Loeb] translates: "The third consists in avoiding ambiguous terms, unless you deliberately intend the opposite, like those who, having nothing to say, yet pretend to say something; such people accomplish this by the use of verse, after the manner of Empedocles. For the long *circumlocution* takes in the hearers, who find themselves affected like the majority of those who listen to the soothsayers.")

κύμβη (B) *LSJ* s. v. has "head, *EM* 545.27: hence, a kind of *bird*, perh. *tumbler-pigeon* (cf. κύμβαχος), πτεροβάμονες κύμβαι *Emp.* 20.7." D'Arcy Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*, s. v. has "A very doubtful bird . . . Supposed by L. & S. to be a Tumbler-pigeon; and, though by mere coincidence, *cumbo* = *columba* in certain Italian dialects, e.g. the Genoese. But cf. κύμβα· κορώνη, Hesych., who also has κύμβαι· ὄρνιθες: κυμβ[α]ενταί· ὄρνιθενταί." It is odd that neither *LSJ* nor Thompson took Hesychius very seriously here, for he is clearly correct. Κύμβαι are simply birds (ὄρνιθες). The term is generic. This is indicated not only by the other generic terms in the context, *Emp.* 20.6f.:

ὥς δ' αὖτως θάμνοισι καὶ ἰχθύσιν ὑδρομελάθροις
θηρσί τ' ὀρειλεχέεσσιν ἰδὲ πτεροβάμοσι κύμβαις,

but also by the fact that Simplicius (our source for *Emp.* 20) substitutes for κύμβαι the more common generic term in introducing his quotation of the fragment, *Simp. in Phys.* 1124.10f.: καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ Νεῖκος καὶ τὴν Φιλίαν παρὰ μέρος ἐπικρατεῖν ἐπὶ τε ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἰχθύων καὶ θηρίων καὶ ὀρνέων ὃ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς φησι τάδε γράφων . . . Latte's edition of Hesychius is surely right in citing Empedocles: "κύμβαι· ὄρνιθες (*Empedocl.* 20,7)." *LSJ* may have been right in suggesting the connection with κύμβαχος. One possible explanation for the use of κύμβη as a generic term, especially when modified by πτεροβάμων (so as to apply more particularly to flying birds, as opposed to ground birds and swimming birds) is that among wing-

borne creatures, what distinguishes flying birds from flying insects is that the former are pretty much restricted to forward motion, while the latter are often seen to hold station, dart sideways, and even move in reverse. (Cf. Aristotle's distinguishing flying birds from flying insects by the latter's lack of a rudder-like tail, *IA* 710^a2ff.) In other words, a common characteristic of flying birds, one which *could* thus have given rise to the use of *κύμβη* as a generic term in Empedoclean verse is that bird flight direction is always *head foremost*.

μέγεθος The long recognized use of *μέγεθος* in the substantial sense of "bulk, mass, or body having *μέγεθος*" is entirely missed by *LSJ* and *Supplement*. Over a century ago Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus*, s. v. pointed out, "*sed plerumque τὸ μέγεθος ubi ad unam potissimum speciem refertur, τὸ σῶμα significat*," and he provided the following examples: *μήτε κενὸν εἶναι τὸ σῶμα μήτε δύο ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ μεγέθη μήτε ἁσωμάτῳ ἀξάνεσθαι* Arist. *GC* 321^b16. *μέγεθος ὁμοιοβαρές, ἀνομοιοβαρές* Arist. *Cael.* 273^b23. *ὁ τῆς γῆς ὄγκος πηγίκος ἂν τις εἴη πρὸς τὰ περιέχοντα μεγέθη* Arist. *Mete.* 339^b7, 340^a8. *ὑπὸ μικροῦ οἴακος μεγάλα κινεῖσθαι μεγέθη πλοίων* Arist. *Mech.* 850^b31.

ὁλοφυής This word occurs only in Emp. 62.4 and in passages which allude to this verse. It reads: *ὁλοφυεῖς μὲν πρῶτα τύποι χθονός ἐξανέτελλον*. The literal sense of *ὁλοφυής* is clearly "whole-natured," as it is now usually translated: "First sprang up from the earth whole-natured forms" (Kirk & Raven, *Presoc. Phil.*, corrected ed. (Cambridge, 1960), p. 338); "Whole-natured forms first sprang up from the earth" (Guthrie, *Hist. Gk. Phil.* II (Cambridge, 1965), p. 206). *LSJ*, however, has s. v. "rough, raw, undifferentiated, of lumps of earth (τύποι χθονός), Emp. 62.4." This misunderstanding of the verse is no doubt derived from Diels' rendering in the first four editions of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*: "Zuerst tauchten rohgeballte Erdklumpen auf" (in Freeman's *Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, a translation of Diels' *Fragmente*, "At first, undifferentiated shapes of earth arose"). The *LSJ Supplement* went part way towards restoring the correct sense of the verse by emending: "for 'of lumps . . . χθονός', read 'τύποι'," following Kranz's correction of Diels in the fifth edition of *Fragmente*: "Rohgeballte Formen von Erde tauchten zuerst aus ihr auf." (The case is discussed at some length by O'Brien, *Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 203ff.) Yet we are still left with *LSJ*'s original "rough, raw, undifferentiated," Diels/Kranz's "rohgeballte." There is no linguistic warrant

for this interpretation of *ὅλοφνης*, only Diels' notion of what the argumentative context required. Since this can no longer be regarded as authoritative, *LSJ* s.v. would be better off simply recording the obvious literal sense, "whole-natured," leaving the interpretation of this notion to extra-lexical scholarship.

περιγηθής The entry s.v. in *LSJ* reads simply "very joyful, A. R. 3.814, 4.888." The word is attested much earlier in Emp. 27.4, in the reading of that verse preserved by Simplicius, in *Phys.*, 1184.1 and in *Cael.* 591.5: *Σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονή περιγηθεῖ γαίων*. Diels/Kranz, the standard citation text for *LSJ Supplement*, assumes that Emp. 27.4 = 28.2, and prints *περιγηεῖ* for Simplicius' *περιγηθεῖ*. But this is probably wrong. Cf. D. O'Brien, *Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 22, 284f. Emp. 27.3f. reads:

*οὕτως Ἀρμονίης πυκινῷ κρύφῳ ἐστήρικται
Σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονή περιγηθεῖ γαίων,*

while Emp. 28 consists of the two verses:

*ἀλλ' ὃ γε πάντοθεν ἴσος (ἐοῖ) καὶ πάμπαν ἀπείρων
Σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονή περιγηεῖ γαίων.*

πλευρά *LSJ* s.v., Section III. ["Math."] c., has "side of a square or cube, and root of a square or cubic number, Euc. 8.11,12 . . .". While "side" will do for plane figures, greater precision is needed in the case of solids, for "side" is ambiguous between "edge" and "face" for solid figures. That *πλευρά* means "edge" of a cube (and not "face") is indicated not only by Euc. 8.12, cited by *LSJ*: *Καὶ ἐπεὶ κύβος ἐστὶν ὁ Α, πλευρὰ δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ Γ, καὶ ὁ Γ ἐναντὸν πολλαπλασιάσας τὸν Ε πεποίηκεν, ὁ Γ ἄρα ἐναντὸν μὲν πολλαπλασιάσας τὸν Ε πεποίηκεν, τὸν δὲ Ε πολλαπλασιάσας τὸν Α πεποίηκεν.* (κ.τ.λ.), but more particularly by Simp. in *de An.* 68.6f. (quoted supra s.v. *ἐπίπεδον*), where the twelve edges (*πλευραί*), eight corners (*γωνίαι*), and six faces (*ἐπίπεδα*) of a cube (*κύβος*) are each mentioned in the same clause. *LSJ* s.v., Section III.c. should read "side of a square, edge of a cube, and root of a square or cubic number, Euc. 8.11,12, Simp. in *de An.* 68.6, . . .".

στόλος In Section I.4 s.v., *LSJ* has "λόγον σ. a set narrative, Emp. 17.26." The verse, which seems to be a rebutting echo of Parm. 8.52, reads: . . . σὺ δ' ἄκουε λόγου στόλον οὐκ ἀπατήλόν. *LSJ*'s "set narrative" is most implausible here, for it gives the word a sense without precedent or parallel when, among its ordinary senses, there is one which will do perfectly well: "course" (here, "course of

argument"). *LSJ* s.v., Section I.2.a., gives "generally, *journey* or (oftener) *voyage* . . . ἰδίῳ σ. *in a journey* . . . ἐλευθέρῳ σ. with free *course*, . . . πατρῶν στόλον (acc. cogn.) ἐσπόμην by my father's *sending* . . .". To this, I suggest, should be added "λόγον σ. *course of argument*, Emp.17.26" (deleting the ref. in I.4).

συγχωρέω *LSJ* s.v. includes "*combine* opp. ἐκχωρέω, Anaxag.15" among the senses listed in Section I. But this is impossible. Anaxag.15 reads: τὸ μὲν πυκνὸν καὶ διερὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν καὶ τὸ ζοφερόν ἐνθάδε συνεχώρησεν, ἔνθα νῦν <ἡ γῆ>, τὸ δὲ ἀραιὸν καὶ τὸ θερμὸν καὶ τὸ ξηρὸν ἐξεχώρησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσω τοῦ αἰθέρος. If συγχωρέω were to mean "combine" here, then it could hardly be "opp. ἐκχωρέω" ("go out" — cf. supra s.v. ἐκχωρέω); if it is "opp. ἐκχωρέω" (as seems to be the case), it can hardly mean "combine," but rather "come in, come together," as in other instances cited in Section I. The specially assigned sense, "*combine*," should be deleted. In Anaxagorean cosmogony, ἐκχωρέω, περιχωρέω, and συγχωρέω are all clearly used in their most literal, locomotive senses (Anaxag.9, 12, 15, 16).

συνάγω *LSJ* s.v. misses the conceptual reduction sense of this verb (analogous to that of ἀνάγω in Arist.*Metaph.*1001^a13, *A Pr.*46^b40; cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἀνάγω, Section II.2 & 4), as in ἐνιοι δ' ἐνθὺς τέτταρα λέγουσιν, οἷον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς· συνάγει δὲ καὶ οὗτος εἰς τὰ δύο, τῷ γὰρ πυρὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀντιτίθησιν Arist.*GC* 330^b20 (Forster [Loeb] translates: "But (d) some declare that there are four from the start, for instance Empedocles, though he also *reduces* these to two, for he too opposes all the others to Fire."). I suggest, therefore, that to Section II. ["of things" as opp. "of persons, animals" in I.] 3. ["conclude from premisses, infer, prove, Arist.*Rh.*1357^a8, 1395^b25, *Metaph.*1042^a3, *Pol.*1299^b12 . . ."] should be added (as a further Aristotelian, quasi-logical use), "b. συνάγει [sc. τὰ τέτταρα] εἰς τὰ δύο, he *reduces* the four to two, Arist.*GC* 330^b20."

τέθηπα *LSJ* s.v., Section 1, has "intr., . . .; mostly in part. τεθηπώς, *amazed*, *astonied*, II.4.243, 21.64, Parm.6.7, Emp.17.21, etc." A modern student would very likely be misled here, for the relevant sense of *amazed* is obsolete, and *astonied* is archaic. There is no element of wonder or surprise in the passages cited; those in question are simply *dazed*. II.4.243ff.:

τίφθ' οὕτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες ἥντε νεβροί,
αἶ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκαμον πολέος πεδίοιο θέουσai,
ἐστᾶσ', οὐδ' ἄρα τίς σφι μετὰ φρεσὶ γίγνεται ἀλκή.

Π. 21.64ff.:

᾽Ως ὠρμαινε μένων· ὁ δέ οἱ σχεδὸν ἦλθε τεθηπῶς
γούνων ἄψασθαι μεμαῶς, περὶ δ' ἤθελε θυμῷ
ἐκφυγέειν θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν.

Parm. 6.6f.:

... οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται
κωφοὶ ὁμῶς τυφλοὶ τε, τεθηπότες, ἄκριτα φύλα

Emp. 17.21:

τὴν σὺ νόῳ δέρεκεν, μὴδ' ὄμμασιν ἦσο τεθηπῶς·

For “*amazed, astonished*,” *LSJ* s.v., Section 1, read “*dazed*.”

ὑπεκπροθέω The entire entry in *LSJ* s.v. reads: “*run forth from under, outstrip*, Ἄτη..πάσας (sc. τὰς Λιτὰς) πολλὸν ὑπεκπροθέει Π. 9.506: abs., ὁ τὸν πεδίοιο διώκετο..τυτθὸν ὑπεκπροθέοντα *running on before*, 21.604, cf. Od. 8.125, A.R. 4.937.” To this should be added reference to Emp. 35.12, where *ὑπεκπροθέω* has the very literal sense, “*run forth outward from below*,” as of a current in a fluid medium. Emp. 35.12f.:

ὅσσον δ' αἰὲν ὑπεκπροθέοι, τόσον αἰὲν ἐπήει
ἠπιόφρων Φιλότητος ἀμεμφέος ἄμβροτος ὄρμη.

ὑποφέρω *LSJ* s.v., Section V. 1 includes “—Pass., *to be borne down*, τοῖς ποταμοῖς Plu. *Alex.* 63; *slip down*, κατὰ κρημνῶν Id. *Mar.* 23; of the legs, *give way under* a person, Hp. *Int.* 36.” To these instances should be added “*go underneath, pass below*, as of the sun’s going underneath the earth, τῷ ἡλίῳ περὶ αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν γῆν] ὑποφερομένῳ Plu. 3.1006e.” In fuller context the passage reads: καὶ γὰρ οἱ τῶν ὠρολογίων γνώμονες σὺν συμμεθιστάμενοι ταῖς σκιαῖς ἀλλ’ ἐστῶτες ὄργανα χρόνου καὶ μέτρα γεγόνασι, μιμούμενοι τῆς γῆς τὸ ἐπιπροσθῶν τῷ ἡλίῳ περὶ αὐτὴν ὑποφερομένῳ. Guthrie, *Hist. Gk. Phil.* II (Cambridge, 1965), p. 195 translates: “The pointers of sundials by staying still and not changing their place with the shadows become instruments and measures of time, like the earth which intercepts the sun when the sun *passes below* it.”

ὑφίστημι The quotation just given from Plu. 3.1006e (supra s.v. *ὑποφέρω*) continues, καθάπερ εἶπεν Ἐμπεδοκλῆς [B 48] ‘νύκτα δὲ γαῖα τίθησιν, ὑφισταμένη φαέεσσι.’ (Guthrie tr.: “as Empedocles says: ‘The earth makes night by blocking the lights.’”) *LSJ* and *Supplement* miss the sense of *ὑφίστημι* here, which I suggest should be in-

cluded s.v., Section B. [Pass., . . .] IV.1 [“*resist, withstand*, c.dat . . .] as: “*block*, as of earth’s making night by *blocking* the luminations, νύκτα δὲ γαῖα τίθησιν, ὑφισταμένη φαέεσσι, Emp.48.”

χωρητικός *LSJ* s.v. has “*able to contain*, ὑγρότητος Sch.Ptol.19.2. *capable of*, ἄνθρωπος ζῶον λογισμοῦ χ. Ael.NA 2.11, cf. S.E.P.3.121. Adv. -κῶς Suid. s.v. χανδόν.” Into this entry should be inserted: 3. Subst., *capacity*, “*χόανα*” . . . ἃ καὶ “*εὔστερνα*” ὡς πλατέα διὰ τὸ χωρητικὸν καλεῖ, Simp. in *de An.* 68.8ff.

ψηφολογικός, -λόγος, -παικτέω, -παίκτης *LSJ* s.vv. reads: “*ψηφολογικός*, ἢ, ὄν, *juggling*, Suid., f.l. in *EM* 535.1. -λόγος, ὄν, *playing juggling tricks*, *juggler*, Suid. -παικτέω *play juggling tricks*, Artem. 3.55 2. ψ. τὸ δίκαιον *juggle away* right, Lys.Fr.17 -παίκτης, ὄν, ὁ (παίζω) *one who juggles with pebbles*, Eudox.Com.1, S.E.P.2.250.” The two most informative passages of those cited read: Suid.: Ψηφολόγοι· ψηφολόγοι εἰσιν οἱ ψηφοπαῖκται. ψηφολογικοὶ γοῦν οἱ πλανῶντες καὶ ἀπατῶντες, ὥσπερ οἱ ψηφολόγοι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ τάχει τῆς μεταθέσεως τῶν ψήφων ἀπατῶντες συναρπάζουσι. Ψηφολόγοι: οἱ λόγον καὶ φροντίδα ποιούμενοι τῆς διὰ τῶν ψήφων ἀπάτης. S.E.P.2.250: ὥσπερ γὰρ οὐδ’ ὅτι ἀληθὴ ἐστὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ψηφοπαικτῶν γινόμενα συγκατατιθέμεθα, ἀλλ’ ἴσμεν ὅτι ἀπατῶσιν κἂν μὴ γινώσκωμεν ὅπως ἀπατῶσιν, οὕτως . . . *LSJ*’s references to jugglers and juggling here are, today, very misleading. While the sense of “juggle” in Old and Middle English was, and in modern English used to be, quite broad (so as to include the performance of all sorts of magician’s tricks, conjuring, sleight of hand, legerdemain) it is today normally taken by both professional entertainers and the general public in a much more restricted sense. A “juggler” today is an “entertainer who specializes in balancing and in feats of dexterity in tossing and catching balls, plates, knives, etc.”—R. Toole-Scott, “Juggler,” *Ency.Brit.*, 1972, XIII, 126f. He actually does what he appears to do, and deception normally plays no role in his performance. The case is quite different with ψηφολόγοι and ψηφοπαῖκται, whose performance is deceptive, whose skill is *conjuring*, “the art of entertaining by pretended performance of those things which cannot be done.”—J. Mulholland, “Conjuring,” *Ency.Brit.*, 1972, VI, 344ff. *LSJ* s.vv. would better read: “*ψηφολογικός*, ἢ, ὄν, *pertaining to conjuring, sleight of hand, legerdemain*, Suid., f.l. in *EM* 535.1. -λόγος, ὄν, *playing sleight of hand tricks*, Artem. 3.55 2. ψ. τὸ δίκαιον *conjure away* right, Lys.Fr.17. -παίκτης, ὄν, ὁ (παίζω) *one who does sleight of hand tricks with pebbles*, Eudox.Com.1, S.E.P.2.250 (cf. Alciph.3.20).”