

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

Abstract: Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9th edition of the monumental Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon (1940) as supplemented by Barber and his fellow editors (1968). The following notes on the letter *psi* in the new Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek are offered in a similar spirit.

Keywords: Lexicography, Philology, Definition

Comprehensive new lexica of the ancient Greek language rarely appear. This is a consequence of the enormous scale of such projects, on the one hand, and of the extraordinary breadth of learning and intellectual competence required to produce one, on the other.¹ At the same time, philological work of this type is never complete, but goes on constantly across linguistic, political, and cultural boundaries, as new material is added to the corpus and new understandings are developed of what we already have. Two generations ago, Robert Renehan published a series of articles expanding, refining, and correcting entries in the 9th edition of the monumental Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon (1940) as supplemented by Barber and his fellow editors (1968).² The following notes on

1) Thanks are due to Benjamin Millis, David Sansone and Stephan Schröder for careful, thoughtful comments that greatly improved this article.

2) R. Renehan, *Some Greek Lexicographical Notes*, *Glotta* 46, 1968, 60–73; *Greek Lexicographical Notes: Second Series*, *Glotta* 47, 1969, 220–234; *Greek Lexicographical Notes: Third Series*, *Glotta* 48, 1970, 93–107; *Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fourth Series*, *Glotta* 49, 1971, 65–85; *Greek Lexicographical Notes: Fifth Series*, *Glotta* 50, 1972, 38–60; *Greek Lexicographical Notes: Sixth Series*, *Glotta* 50, 1972, 156–81. These articles were subsequently collected and combined with further, similar contributions in R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (*Hypomnemata* Heft 45: Göttingen 1975). See also R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes, Second Series* (*Hypomnemata* Heft 74: Göttingen 1982). A Revised Supplement by P. G. W. Glare and A. A. Thompson was added to the 9th edition of LSJ in 1996; I refer to it in what follows simply as “LSJ Supplement”.

the letter *psi* spring in a similar manner from entries in the new Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek (Leiden / Boston 2015), edited by Franco Montanari and translated into English from the 3rd edition of the Italian version (2013) by a team of scholars associated with Harvard's Center for Hellenic Studies and led by Gregory Nagy, Leonard Mueller, Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder.³

The oldest attestation of **ψάγδαν**, ψάγδας, or **σάγδας** (glossed “*Egyptian ointment*”, but better “*Egyptian perfume*”; cf. Ar. fr. 213 τί σοι δῶ τῶν μύρων; ψάγδαν φιλεῖς; “Which of the perfumes should I give you? Do you like *psagdan*?”) is Eup. fr. 204 ψάγδαν ἐρυγγάνοντα (“belching *psagdan*”). Eub. fr. 100 Αἴγυπτίῳ ψάγδανι shows that the word must be masculine or neuter third declension, and it is lemmatized in the Dictionary (more or less following LSJ) as masculine **ψάγδαν**. But that form at least must be neuter, given accusative ψάγδαν in Ar. fr. 213 (above).⁴ There seems to be no explicit evidence for masculine **ψάγδας** before the Roman period, although **σάγδας** is attested at Epil. fr. 1 βάκκαρις τε καὶ σάγδας ὁμοῦ (where either ψάγδας or ψάγδαν might just as easily be read).

ψαθάλλω (no etymology; Beekes s.v. rejects Frisk’s suggestion of a connection to ψάω / ψῆν as “just a guess”)⁵ is glossed “*touch, scratch*”, which may be the basic sense of the word (thus Phryn. PS p. 12.6 ἀντί τοῦ κνᾶν, in reference to Hermipp. fr. 70). But Suda ψ 1 (= Ael. Dion. ψ 1 = Phryn. PS fr. 368*) ψαθάλλειν· τὸ ψηλαφᾶν, καὶ μαλάττειν αἰσχροῶς (“*psathallein*: to grope at, or to

3) My comments refer specifically to the English-language version of the Dictionary rather than to the Italian original; tracing the precise genetic relationship between the two would doubtless be revealing, but is beyond the scope of this article. In what follows, bold-face lemmata appear in the Dictionary; omission of bold-face signals that the word is not glossed there but ought perhaps to have been. Italicized glosses within quotation marks represent the Dictionary’s definition of words (bold-face in the original), as opposed to its comments, clarifications, and the like (italicized in the original). I use LSJ’s abbreviations for authors and works throughout. Occasional references to standard commentaries, etymological handbooks and the like are treated as self-explanatory. References to mistranslations of the original Greek in primary texts in the Dictionary, or to minor typographical errors and the like, are omitted except when relevant to the larger point at hand.

4) ψάγδαν’ could be printed at Eup. fr. 204.

5) So too with ψαθύρος.

be shamefully soft”) suggests that the verb also had an obscene colloquial sense ~ “masturbate” or perhaps “give a hand-job”; cf. Ar. Ec. 920 κνησιῶς (literally ~ “you want a scratch”, meaning “you’re eager to have sex”, addressed to a young woman). This may be the sense of Pl. Com. fr. 60 ἐψάθαλλε λειῖος ὄν (“he was ‘scratching’, since he was smooth”), smoothness – i. e. a lack of body hair – being a standard supposed tell for passive sexuality. Bergk accordingly conjectured ⟨πεός⟩ ἐψάθαλλε λειῖος ὄν.

ψαθύριον is glossed “*crumb*” (with reference to Ath. 14.646c, where the word is used to gloss ψωθίον, which seems to have a somewhat different sense; see below) and “*crumbly bread*” (with reference to Leontius, Life of Saint Symeon 8.55, where all that is clear, is that ψαθύρια are dainties of some sort; see below on Ψαθυριανοί). Feminine **ψωθία** (glossed “*bubble*, on a round loaf” sc. of bread) is attested only at Poll. 7.23 (somewhat awkwardly worded), which in fact identifies this as a fragment of the lower portion of a loaf, which sticks to the pan when the bread is taken out of it; a blister on the top of the loaf, by contrast, is an ἀττάραγος: τοῦ γε μὴν ἄρτου τὸ ἄνω μέρος, οἰονεὶ φλύκταιναι, ἀττάραγος, αἱ δ’ ἐκ τοῦ κάτω ψωθίαι, αἱ δὴ καὶ προσέχεσθαι εἰώθασι τῷ κριβάνῳ (lit. “the upper part of a loaf of bread, what resembles blisters, is an *attaragos*, while the pieces that come off the bottom are *psôthiai*, which in fact tend to cling to the pan when they are overbaked”).⁶ This matches the definition for **ψωθίον** offered elsewhere (Hsch. ψ 307 ψώθιον· τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ ἄρτου, “*psôthion*: the lower parts of the loaf of bread”; Phot. p. 657.6 = Suda ψ 129 = CGFPR 342.28 (from a catalogue of comic vocabulary) ψωθία· τὰ ὑποκάτω τοῦ ἄρτου, “*psôthia*: the lower parts of the loaf of bread”) and suggests that Pollux or his source has mistaken neuter nominative plural ψωθία for a feminine nominative singular, and thus that the lemma should be struck.⁷ Pollux’ gloss, at any rate, makes better sense of what Apollodorus of Athens (FGrH 244 F 283) and Theodorus in his *Attic Vocabulary* (FGrH 346 F 2), both ap. Ath. 14.646c (= Paus.

6) Cf. Paus. Gr. β 12 βλωμός· ἀδρότερος τῶν ψωθίων καὶ ἀττάραγων (“*blōmos*: more substantial than *psôthia* and *attaragoi*”).

7) LSJ s. v. misleadingly suggests that the word at Pherecr. fr. 86 is a form of feminine ψωθία rather than of neuter ψωθίον.

Gr. ψ 6*), mean by τοῦ ἄρτου τὰ ἀποθραυόμενα ψωθία καλεῖσθαι, ἃ τινὰς ὀνομάζειν ἀτταράγους (“the pieces that break off of a loaf of bread are known as *psôthia*, although some authorities call them *attaragoi*”). According to Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.23, the Arian sect known as **Ψαθυριανοί** got their name not precisely from ψαθύριον, but ὅτι Θεόκτιστός τις ψαθυροπώλης ... διαπύρως τῷ λόγῳ τῷδε συνίστατο (“because a certain Theoktistos, who was a ψαθύριον-vendor, ardently attached himself to this doctrine”). The reference to a **ψαθυροπώλης** in turn suggests that ψαθύριον did eventually come to be used of some sort of “bread-pan-crum-bread”, whatever exactly that may have been.

The earliest attestation of **ψαθυρός** (in its Attic form ψαθαρός) may well be Ion TrGF 19 F 15 ψαθαρὸν νάρθηκα (“fragile fennel-stalk”; also ignored in LSJ s.v.).

μάζα **ψαιστή** is not “bread made from fine flour, with oil and honey”, but unbaked barley cake; the specification that it was made with oil and honey comes not from Hp. Int. 20 but from Gal. XIX.156 K., and cannot automatically be taken to apply to the classical period. The neuter substantive **ψαιστόν** must similarly be not “bread” but some type of fancy unbaked cake used in sacrifices (Ar. Pl. 138, 1115; Antiph. fr. 204.3; IG II² 1363 fr. a col. 1.18 [Eleusis, ca. 330–270 BCE]), while **ψαιστώδης** (a *hapax* at AB I p. 313.13 μαζίων τι ψαιστώδες) is not “bread-like”, but “like a *psaistos*”, i. e. like an unbaked barley cake used in sacrifices. See on **ψάμμητον** below.

ψάκιον is treated as a neuter noun and glossed “droplet or *small piece*” (following LSJ s.v.). But Hsch. ψ 34 defines the word – obscurely; the text is insecure – with two adjectives (ἀραιόν. μακρόν, “diffuse, large”), and the lemma ought perhaps to be ψάκιος -α -ον with the sense being “finely scattered” vel sim. Cf. the similarly obscure ψάκελον (omitted), glossed μέγα (“big”) at Hsch. ψ 33; Suda ψ 6.

ψαλάσσω / ψαλάττω (glossed “touch”) is rare, but is attested already in Sophocles (fr. 100a) and Ion (TrGF 19 F 13a) (both omitted in LSJ; the latter added in LSJ Supplement).

Crabs are described at Batr. 295 as **ψαλιδόστομοι**, which is glossed “*having a mouth like a scissors*” (cf. LSJ s.v. “*nipper-mouthed*”). But the shape of crabs’ mouths is of no interest to anyone, and the “mouths” in question are patently the edges of their claws (cf. LSJ s.v. **στόμα** III.1 and compounds such as **ἀμφίστομος**, “two-edged”, of a sword), which “bite” like scissors or shears do.

A **ψάλιον** is not a “*curb chain*” or “*bridle*”, but a cavesson, which is the object in question in all the passages cited in the Dictionary; see Anderson, JHS 80, 1960, 3–6. At Hippiatr. 28.1 **πάθος ἐν τῷ ψαλίῳ** (where the word is given the exceptional meaning “*jaw*”), the sense is more likely that the animal suffers “*pain when wearing a cavesson*”.

ψαλληγενής, a nonce-word produced by Bion of Borysthenus (SH 227.1) on the model of the Homeric **μοιρηγενής** at Il. 3.182 to mock Archytas of Tarentum, is glossed “*born from the sound of the kithara*”. The first element in the word seems to be < **ψάλλω** (“*pluck*”), and LSJ’s “*sprung from harp-playing*” thus comes closer to capturing the literal sense. The insult does not seem very pointed, and Lloyd-Jones / Parsons ad loc., following Wachsmuth, suggest that the idea is actually “*ad psallendum natus*” (“*born to play the lyre*”, sc. rather than to do philosophy). But adjectives in **-γενής** generally refer to the source or circumstances of the birth, with the first element being nominal or adverbial.

ψάλλω (“*pluck*”) is often used of plucking bowstrings and thus of shooting arrows, regardless of whether the missile hits its mark. E. fr. 494.1–2 **μάτην ... εἰς γυναικάς ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ψόγος / ψάλλει κενὸν τόξευμα**, translated “*criticism by men strikes women with an empty arrow*” (with the first word omitted), thus means something more like “*criticism directed at women by men plucks in vain an empty arrow*” (cf. Collard, Cropp, and Lee ad loc. “*vainly ... does men’s censure twang an idle shaft*”), i. e. “*shoots no arrow and thus accomplishes nothing*”.⁸ When used of playing a instrument, the

8) Nauck set off **κενὸν τόξευμα** with commas, putting it in apposition to what precedes it (“*criticism directed at women by men plucks in vain, an empty arrow*”, i. e. an empty shot).

verb refers to plucking the strings with one's fingers rather than with a pick (πλῆκτρον).

Ψαμάθεια is described as a “daughter of Nereus and Doris”, with reference to Pi. N. 5.13 (where all that is actually said of her is that she was the mother of the hero Phokos of Salamis), while **Ψαμάθη** is described as a “Nereid”, with reference to Hes. Th. 260, 1004 (where she is identified as the daughter of Nereus and Doris, on the one hand, and said to have borne Phokos to Aiakos, on the other). **Ψαμάθεια** and **Ψαμάθη** are thus apparently to be understood as a single figure, as the overlapping details in the entries for them here suggest, and both are patently < ψάμαθος (“sand”), in reference to their home and origin in the sea. See West on Hes. Th. 260 (for the suggestion that Psamatheia / Psamathe should also be identified with the Nereid Ἀμάθεια at Il. 18.48), 1004 (for more details of her story). For the variation, e.g. Περσεφονείης vs. Περσεφόνην and Hes. Th. 768, 913, respectively. Ψαμάθη at Ath. 13.586e appears to be a prostitute's working name (playing on that of the Nereid) rather than her given name; it is supposed to have been used by the orator Lysias (fr. 208 Carey). Ψαμάθη is also the name of a mythological daughter of the king of Argos who was supposedly the mother of the poet Linos (Paus. 1.43.7; 2.19.2).

Hsch. ψ 58 (our only source for the word) glosses **ψαμαθία** as αἰγιαλός (“sea-shore, beach”). That the word – glossed “*sandy beach*”; cf. LSJ s. v. “*sandy sea-shore*” – refers specifically to a sandy rather than a rocky shore is the obvious conclusion, but is not quite what our source tells us.

ψαμμακοσιογάργαροι -αι -α (an extravagant comic coinage at Ar. Ach. 3; the final element is < γαργαίρω, “teem”) is lemmatized as an adjective, but is glossed “*immense multitude*” (following LSJ s. v. “to denote a countless multitude”), as if it were a noun; read “teeming as countless as the sand” vel sim. Athenaeus' characters use simple ψαμμακόσιοι (“as numerous as the sand”; attested in the classical period at Eup. fr. 308) three times (3.113d; 6.230d; 15.671a), which suggests that he saw it as a rare and colorful Atticism.

Herodotus routinely uses ψάμμος when he wants to refer to “sand”, and ὄφρῴη ψάμμης (“a ridge of sand”, with ψάμμης as a

genitive of material) at 4.181.1 is accordingly odd. This is particularly so because **ψάμμη** is attested elsewhere only at [A.] PV 573 (where M^{ac} has ψάμμα in lyric for the consensus reading ψάμμον, which editors adopt, an accusative being needed) and Ar. Lys. 1261 (Doric genitive singular ψάμμας in what is supposed to be a Spartan song). Read nominative **ψαμμόδης** (“sandy”), as at Hdt. 2.32.6; 4.191.3 and frequently in Hippocrates (also Ionic)?⁹

A **ψάμμητον** (glossed “cake”) is identified specifically by Semus FG rH 396 F 2 ap. Harp. ε 15 as some type of **ψαιστόν** (fancy barley-cake; see above) offered to Leto at Delos. The *hapax* ψαμμῆν (omitted, as also in LSJ, although added there in the Supplement), glossed ἄλφιτα (“barley-meal”) at Hsch. ψ 62, must be a cognate.

ψαμματίζω (glossed “feed, nurse”), a *hapax* at Hsch. ψ 61, is said there to mean ψωμίζω (“feed morsels”), and looks like a cognate of **ψάμμα** (another *hapax*) at Hsch. ψ 60 ψάμματα· σπαράγματα (“*psammata*: pieces torn off”), for which the *Dictionary* instead refers the reader to **ψάμμη** (“sand”; but see above).

The fish known as the **ψαμμῆτις** is said at Archestr. SH 153.1–2 = Archestr. fr. 23.1–2 Olson / Sens to be alternatively known as the ὕς (lit. “pig”).¹⁰ The same is not true of the **ψαμμοδίς** (mentioned only at Numen. SH 575), making it much less likely that the two are to be identified.¹¹

According to Hsch. ψ 63, **ψαμμοδύτης** (glossed “sand digger, fish that lives in sand”; better LSJ s. v. “sand-diver”, i. e. “fish that buries itself in sand”, since the second element in the name is < δύω, and it clearly emerged at times) was an alternative name for

9) **ψαμμοειδής** at Hp. Nat. Hom. 14 is the same word in an uncontracted form and did not need to be lemmatized and defined separately.

10) Archestratus does not treat ψαμμῆτις ὕς as a single name; instead, he says that the fish is known alternatively as the ὕς and the ψαμμῆτις ὀρυκτής (“sand-dwelling excavator”). ψαμμῆτις might be either a noun or an adjective used substantively.

11) Note also the ἀμαθῆτις mentioned at Epich. fr. 40.9, although the context suggests that this was a shellfish, as the reference to the “back meat” in the final verse of the instructions Archestratus offers for consuming his ψαμμῆτις makes clear that it is not.

the καλλιώνυμος. As LSJ s.v. II notes, this was also a term for a mole-rat (Cyr. 78).

The Egyptian king **Ψάμμυντος** or Ψάμμυνθος mentioned at Ael. NA 10.21 is otherwise unknown. Scholfield in the Loeb edition suggests that he should perhaps be understood as an avatar of the historical pharaoh **Ψαμμήνιτος** (Psammenitos) overthrown by the Persians in 525 BCE.

ψαρομαχία would be better capitalized, as the title of a work of literature (not just “battle of starlings”, but “*The Battle of the Starlings*”, a sub-Homeric poem apparently similar to the preserved Μυοβατραχομαχία, “*Battle of the Mice and Frogs*”).

LSJ Supplement notes that **ψάρος** / ψᾶρος is not only an alternative name for a **ψάρ** (“starling”), but also the name of some sort of fish (Cyr. 4.75.1–2) – presumably one that was speckled like a starling. Hsch. ψ 67 also knows a ψάρις (omitted), which is there glossed γένος στρουθοῦ (“a type of sparrow”); cf. Cyr. 3.53.2 ψάρος στρουθίον ἐστὶ κατάστικτον πᾶσι γνωστόν (“a *sparos* is a widely known small sparrow covered with speckles”).

ψαυκρός (glossed “*skimming over the ground*, i. e. *swift*”) is known only from two entries in Hesychius (ψ 80–1) and from the compound **ψαυκροπόδης** (“swift-footed”), which EM p. 817.45 (cf. Hsch. ψ 79 ψαυκρόποδα; Suda ψ 7 ψαυκροπόδης) reports was an epithet of the mythical horse Arion. The latter, along with the expression ψαυκρὸν γόνυ (“a swift knee”) at Hsch. ψ 79, are clearly poetic and = adesp. SH 1122–1123.

Deverbative nouns ending in -σις generally refer to the action itself, whereas those in -μα generally refer to the result of the action (e. g. πρᾶξις, “action”, vs. πρᾶγμα, “act”; both < πράττω). The default assumption is thus that **ψαῦσις** (< ψάω, “touch”) means “the act of touching” or “the sense of touch” rather than “*touch*, *contact*”, and this is certainly the case at Democr. 68 B 11 D.-K. ὄψις, ἀκοή, ὄδμή, γεῦσις, ψαῦσις (“sight, hearing, smell, taste, *psausis*”) and routinely in Hippocrates (e. g. Vict. 35.440 αἱ γὰρ αἰσθήσεις τῆς ψυχῆς ὁκόσαι μὲν δι’ ὄψιος καὶ ἀκοῆς εἰσίν, ὄξειαι, ὁκόσαι δὲ

διὰ ψαύσιος, βραδύτεραι, “however many of the soul’s senses are through sight and hearing, are immediate, whereas however many as are through touch, are tardier”), the only two authors from the classical period who use the word. Cf. below on **ψόφημα** vs. **ψόφησις**. The lack of an established classical **ψαῦσμα** (a Roman-period *hapax* at X. Eph. 3.2) perhaps led to the occasional use of ψαῦσις to mean “caress” in later authors.

ψαφαρία, < the adjective **ψαφαρός** (glossed “friable, dusty, dry”),¹² is a *hapax* at Dsc. 1.97.4 ἀμέτοχον ἄμμον ἢ ψαφαρίας (“free of sand or *psapharia*”). But the ending makes it clear that the word is an abstract and thus ought properly to be “dirtiness” rather than “dirt” (thus also LSJ s.v.). ψαφαρός at Hp. Coac. 7.572 οὔρον ὑδατῶδες ἢ τεταραγμένον ψαφερῆ¹³ τρηχύτητι (lit. “urine that is watery or is muddled with a *psapheros* roughness”) is glossed with the unexpected sense “of semiliquid substances *fluid, watery*”; cf. LSJ s.v. 3 “of semi-liquids, *thin, watery*”). But the word must mean “dusty” vel sim. here as well; note that the adjective does not modify the urine itself. So too at Coac. 7.596 τὸ ξηρὸν ψαφαρὸν ἄχλοον (“[excrement] that is dry, *psapharos*, discolored”; = the passage cited by LSJ s.v. 3, cited above), there is no reason to think that the sense is anything other than “friable”. At Hp. Gl. 1.10, finally, glands in general and the brain in particular are described as ψαφαρός (glossed “soft, flabby”, with reference to both passages); as LSJ s.v. 2 suggests, the sense in both cases is more likely “of loose texture”, i. e. ~ “friable, grainy”, roughly matching the normal meaning of the word.

ψαφαροχαίτης is a *hapax* at Hsch. φ 963, as a gloss on φυκιοχαίτης (lit. “seaweed-haired”).¹⁴ The word is glossed “having shaggy

12) Plato Comicus (fr. 126) is supposed to have used ψαφαρός in the unexpected sense ἀπαλός (“soft”), and thus cannot be cited for the common, standard meaning of the word. Precisely what Phil. AP 6.231.5 νάρδος ψαφαρή means, is unclear; but the basic sense is in any case not “*nard dust*”, but “dry *nard*”.

13) Treated (following LSJ s.v.) as a legitimate Ionic variant of the word. But Hippocrates elsewhere always uses ψαφαρός, and it is just as easy to think that this is a minor textual error.

14) Also a *hapax*. The *upsilon* is long, and the word would thus fit easily into e.g. dactylic hexameter or elegiac couplets (cf. κυανοχαίτης, βοτρουχαίτης, etc.), as ψαφαροχαίτης would not.

hair”, which might perhaps be the intended sense of φυκιοχαίτης. But “ψαφαρός-haired” ought really to mean “with dusty hair” and thus perhaps ~ “with an unoiled head”; cf. the occasional use of ἀύχμηρός (properly “dry”) in a similar sense (LSJ s.v. 2) and the similarly obscure ψαφαρόχροος at [E.] Rh. 716 ψαφαρόχρουν κάρα πολυπινές τ’ ἔχων (“having a squalid and *psapharochrous* head”; glossed “*having rough, wrinkled skin*”, but better again ~ “unoiled”?).

The basic sense of **ψεδνός** is seemingly “*sparse*”, and the point of Il. 2.219 ψεδνή δ’ ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη is thus not that Thersites was bald (φαλακρός¹⁵), but that his hair was thin, while at Aristid. or. 36.67 places that are ψεδνός are sparsely covered with trees or vegetation. The compound **ψεδνόθριξ** at Tz. H. 7.883 (etc.) is a reworking precisely of the passage from the *Iliad*,¹⁶ and the word ought accordingly to mean “thin-haired” (cf. LSJ s.v. “*sparse-haired*”) there rather than either “*shaven-headed*” or “*bald*”. This also appears to be the case with **ψεδνόθριξ** (glossed “*bald-headed*”, following LSJ s.v.) at Orph. L. 253, where a man who rubs his head every day with ground deer-horn is assured that his previously thinning hair will miraculously fill in as a consequence. Cf. Adam. 2.37, where one end of the scale for thickness of hair (πυκνότης τριχῶν) is **ψεδνότης** (glossed “*baldness*”, following LSJ s.v., but more logically “*thinness of hair*”); S. E. M. 1.255 ἡ δὲ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους κεφαλὴ ἐψεδνωτο ῥυεισῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν τριχῶν (“Heracles’ head *epsednôto*” – < **ψεδνόμαι**, glossed “*become bald*”, but better “*had become thin-haired*”; note the pluperfect – “when his hair fell out”).

ψέλιον (“*bracelet*” or “*anklet*”; perhaps “*bangle*”) is attested already at Phryn. TrGF 3 F 24 (assuming that the reference is to the tragic rather than the comic poet) and a number of times in late Hellenistic and early Roman-period inscriptions where dedications are in question (e. g. ID 442.201 [179 BCE]; Lindos II 2.87 ψέλια χρύσεια λιθόκολλα [“gold *pselia* set with precious stones”];

15) Supposedly also ψηνός (glossed “*bald*”, following LSJ s.v. and some ancient lexicographers, citing Semon. fr. 40). But Hsch. ψ 151–152 glosses the word ἀραιός (“*sparse*”) and ψεδνός, διάψιλος (“*psednos*, quite hairless”; cf. ψ 66 ψανός-ψεδνός).

16) The same is true of Luc. DMort. 30.1, where Thersites describes himself as ψεδνός (glossed “*bald*”, but once again better “*thin-haired*”).

99 BCE]). For the word meaning “bracelet”, e. g. X. An. 1.5.8 *ψέλια* *περὶ ταῖς χερσίν* (“*pselia* about their hands”, i. e. “their arms”). In the classical period, at least, *ψέλια* are worn only by barbarians, as are *στρεπτά* (“braided necklaces”, i. e. “torcs”), with which they are routinely paired (Hdt. 3.20.1; X. Cyr. 8.15.8).¹⁷ The rare **ψελιόω** (glossed “*gird*”, which misses the root sense of the verb) in the description of the Argive leader Ailianos, ὁ ψελιώσας / ἀχένα χρυσοδέτοις ἐκ πολέμου στεφάνοις (“who wore gold-bound garlands got from war about his neck like bracelets” – and who now looks back regretfully at his lost manhood) at Phil. AP 7.234.1 is thus most likely contemptuous. Whether the statue by Praxiteles of a *pseliomene* (i. e. *ψελιουμένη*) mentioned at Plin. Nat. 34.70 depicted a woman putting on – present rather than aorist tense, and thus not simply “with” – a bracelet, or one putting on an anklet, is impossible to say. To the two examples of the verb cited, add Tat. or. 34.3 to *ψελιούμενόν τι γύναιον* (a reference to the same statue, but using more contemptuous language).

ψελλισμός is glossed “*difficulty in pronunciation, stammering*”, following LSJ s. v. “*stammering*”). But cognate **ψελλότης** (defined “*difficulty or defect of pronunciation*”) is defined at [Arist.] Pr. 902^b24–5 as specifically ἐξαίρειν τι, ἢ γράμμα ἢ συλλαβὴν (“omitting something, be it a word or a syllable”, sc. from the word to be pronounced); the problem is often contrasted with and thus distinguished from having a lisp (e. g. Arist. HA 492^b32). “Stammering”, by contrast, appears to be what [Arist.] Pr. 902^b25–6 calls ἰσχυροφωνία, i. e. μὴ δύνασθαι ταχὺ συνάψαι τὴν ἑτέραν συλλαβὴν πρὸς τὴν ἑτέραν (“the inability to rapidly connect one syllable to the next”). **ψελλός** and its cognates in any case refer by extension to an inability to communicate clearly; cf. [A.] PV 816 τῶνδ’ εἴ τί σοι ψελλόν τε καὶ δυσεύρετον (“if any of these points is confusing for you or difficult to work out”).¹⁸ **ψελλισμός** is patently used in a figurative sense at Plu. Sull. 26.4 (= Strabo FG^{rH} 91 F 8) Σύλλα α...

17) The word has no etymology, and Beekes – as is his wont – takes it to be pre-Greek; given its restricted field of reference, more likely an Eastern loan-word?

18) “COM. CAF 393”, referring to the outdated Kock edition of the comic fragments, is cited as another example of this use of **ψελλός**. The passage in question is Ar. fr. 955 Kassel-Austin, which is correctly cited above as an example of the word in its literal sense “afflicted with a stammer”.

ἀλγημα ναρκῶδες μετὰ βάρους εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἐνέπεσεν, ὃ φησιν ὁ Στράβων ποδάγρας ψελλισμὸν εἶναι (“Sulla was afflicted with a numb pain and heaviness in his feet, which Strabo says was a *psellismos* of gout”). The Loeb editor Perrin translates ποδάγρας ψελλισμὸν here as “a premonitory gout”, which is seemingly followed in the *Dictionary* with “beginning of gout”. But the latter bears no relation to the Greek, and what Perrin must have intended was something like “an obscure sign of gout”, i. e. “the message ‘gout’, but which no one could understand”.

ψέλλιστής at Hippiatr. 10.4¹⁹ is glossed obscurely “*struck in the legs*”. The word actually refers to horses that have thick canons – equivalent to human shins – and develop hoof-problems in the stable.

ψευδαγγελέω at Ar. Av. 1340 ἔοικεν οὐ ψευδαγγελῆσαι γ’ ἄγγελος (“the messenger apparently did not *pseudangelêsai*”) is glossed “*be a false messenger*”, suggesting “someone who masquerades as a messenger, but is not”; better “be a messenger of falsehoods, be a lying messenger”, i. e. someone who offers false news. Cf. Il. 15.159 (Zeus to Iris) πάντα τάδ’ ἀγγεῖλαι, μηδὲ **ψευδάγγελος** εἶναι (“announce everything, and do not be a *pseudangelos*”, glossed “*lying messenger*”); X. Hipparch. 5.8 **ψευδαγγελίαι** (“false messages”, i. e. messages that consist of falsehoods).

Latin *pseudoanchusa*, i. e. Greek **ψευδάγχουσα**, at Plin. Nat. 22.50 is glossed obscurely “bot. *false anchusa*”. ἄγχουσα is *Alkanna tinctoria*, dyer’s alkanet, a plant whose root was used for dyeing. “Pseudo-alkanet” resembles alkanet, but (as Pliny notes) its roots produce no dye.

ψευδαλαζών is glossed “*boaster*”. But that is the sense of **ἀλαζών** alone, and the addition of the first element converts the meaning into something more like “a lying boaster, a boaster who relies on lies”. So too **ψευδαπάτης** is glossed “*impostor*”, but the first element requires that the sense be something more like “a lying impostor, an impostor who relies on lies”.

19) Cited as “10.40”.

ἀτράφαξυς is “orach” (a species of genus *Atriplex*), an edible plant. **ψευδατράφαξυς** (a *hapax* at Ar. Eq. 630) is thus a plant that looks like ἀτράφαξυς, but is not so good to eat (scarcely “*false darnel*”, darnel being a poisonous weed that infests wheat-fields); cf. above on ἄγχουσα vs. ψευδάγχουσα.

A κλητήρ is a “summoner” or “someone who attests that a summons was delivered”, and a **ψευδοκλητήρ** (a *hapax* at Theopomp. Hist. FGrH 115 F 281) is thus not just a “*false witness*”, but specifically someone who falsely testifies that a summons was delivered.

A **ψευδοκόρη** is literally a “*false girl*”. But Pollux – who preserves the only evidence for the word, which he uses repeatedly at 4.151–153 – makes it clear that this is a style of theatrical mask, i. e. a typical “New Comic” character of some sort, of which there were two different variants. For the specific sense of the word (referring to a rape victim, who must disguise her altered status? or a supposed girl who is actually a boy?), see Gilula, GRBS 18, 1977, 247–250.

ψευδομαρτυρία (glossed “*false witness*”) is better understood as the abstract “bearing of false witness, perjury”. Manuscripts routinely transmit ψευδομαρτυριῶν (a genitive plural form of this noun) in passages referring to legal charges of perjury. But editors – following the dictate of LSJ s. v.: “This form is perh. always corrupt in codd. of classical authors” – correct to ψευδομαρτυρίων (< the neuter form of the adjective **ψευδομαρτύριος**, understood to mean “a charge of perjury”) and emend a number of other forms transmitted as first declension to second declension (reading e. g. ἐν ψευδομαρτυρίοις for transmitted ἐν ψευδομαρτυρίαις at D. 57.53). The Dictionary acknowledges the issue at the end of s. v. ψευδομαρτυρία (“it is suspected that in the Classical period only ψευδομαρτύριον was used and -ίῶν should be read in the codd.”). It has nonetheless emended all the passages quoted back to -ίῶν and included them under s. v. ψευδομαρτυρία.

ψευδοπανικά (a *hapax* at Polyae. 3.9.32) is one in a long list of ‘false’ events that Iphicrates rehearsed with his soldiers, training

them ἵνα εἴ ποτε καὶ τοιοῦτόν τι γένοιτο, μηδαμῶς ἐκπλήσσοιντο, “so that if anything of this sort ever happened”, sc. in actuality, “they would not be at all upset”. A “pseudo-panic” is thus not an “*unfounded panic*”, but a “*feigned panic*” (better a “*simulated panic*”; LSJ s. v. suggests “*pretended panic*”). So too in the same passage, **ψευδοβοήθεια** is not “*false aid*”, but “*simulated aid*”, i. e. a mock offer of assistance;²⁰ **ψευδενέδρα** is not a “*false ambush*”, but a “*mock ambush*”; **ψευδοπροδοσία** is not a “*false betrayal*”, but a “*mock betrayal*”; and **ψευδαντομολία** is not a “*false desertion*”, but a “*mock desertion*”.²¹

ψευδόπιθος at IG XII Supplement 347, II.13 – cited, following LSJ s. v., from the original publication at BCH 50, 1926, 214 – is not an “*illegal pithos*” but a “*false pithos*”, i. e. one that has not been officially certified as to its capacity and may thus potentially give the wrong measure.

ψευδοποιέω is cited twice from Polybius – the earliest author known to have used the word – nominally with different senses: at 30.4.13 τὰ μὲν γὰρ εὐεργετήματα καὶ συνεργήματα ... τὰ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπειράτο ψευδοποιεῖν καὶ ταπεινοῦν, τὰ δὲ τῶν Ῥοδίων ἠϋξανε (“he tried to *pseudopoiein* and diminish the good deeds and assistance delivered by the others, but tried to augment those of the people of Rhodes”), where the word supposedly means “*falsify, alter*”, and at 12.25c.3 ὅταν ἐγχειρήσῃ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων δόξας διαστέλλεσθαι καὶ ψευδοποιεῖν, θαυμάσιός ἐστιν (“whenever he attempts to analyze and *pseudopoiein* the opinions of others, he is amazing”), where it is glossed “*to reveal as false, accuse of lying*”. In both cases, the verb has the same meaning, “*prove false, disprove*”, as also at 12.25.4 Τίμαιος ἐπεβάλετο καὶ τὴν κοινὴν φήμην ἀνασκευάζειν καὶ τὰς ἀποφάσεις τῶν ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων ψευδοποιεῖν, φάσκων μὴτ’ εἶναι τὸν ἐν Καρχηδόνι ταῦρον ἐξ Ἀκράγαντος μῆτε γεγονέναι τοιοῦτον ἐν τῇ προειρημένῃ πόλει (“Timaeus undertook to demolish the common report and *pseudopoiein* the statements of poets and prose authors, saying that there was no bull

20) Contrast X. Hipparch. 5.8, where the word does mean “*feigned offer of assistance*”.

21) **ψευδέφοδος**, by contrast, is correctly glossed “*simulated attack*”.

in Carthage from Akragas, and that there had never been anything of the sort in the city in question”).

ψευδόπτωμα (lit. “lying fall” or “false fall”; glossed “*feigned fall*, to deceive in a wrestling match”, the implication being that one pretends to fall and thus somehow catches one’s opponent off guard, so as to bring him down) is preserved only at Plu. Comp. Pel. et Marc. 1.9 (= Juba FGrH 275 F 25) and in a *scholion* on Ar. Eq. 571 (~ Suda α 310 ~ ψ 56). But the *scholion* – roughly paraphrasing the text of Aristophanes – says that a ψευδόπτωμα was a situation in which a wrestler fell, but then got up, dusted himself off (to remove any evidence that he had come into contact with the ground), and claimed that he had not fallen at all, making this thus ~ a “non-fall”. This also suits the context in Plutarch = Juba, where the claim is that certain supposed routs of Hannibal’s men by Marcellus were actually matters of no great significance.

A **ψευδορράφος** is a person who “stiches together (< ῥάπτω) lies”,²² not someone who “stiches falsely”, meaning that the first element in the word is not ψευδής but ψῆδος. The same must be true of **ψευδορκέω** and cognates (better “swear falsehoods” than “swear falsely”); of **ψευδουργός** (better “one who accomplishes lies, cheat” than “one who accomplishes things falsely”); of **ψευδόφημος** (“that pronounces lies”); and of **ψευδομότης** (“one who swears something false”, i. e. “*perjurer*”). Cf. below on **ψευδοστομέω**.

Hsch. ψ 130 = Suda ψ 58 (the only source for the word) define **ψευδοσέληνον** not as “*false moonlight*” but as ἡ ἀμαυρὰ σελήνη (lit. “the dark moon”, i. e. presumably “the ‘moon’ on nights when there is ‘no moon’”).

Ψευδοστιγματίας (the title of a comedy by Nicostratus; contents obscure) is glossed “*Deceptive Branded Slave*”. But the second element in the word much more likely means “tattooed” (< στίγμα), and the first is at least as likely to mean “falsely”, i. e. “wrongly”, i. e. the man is not the villain he is supposed to be.

22) Glossed “devising lies”, which is too far from the Greek to effectively capture the sense.

A **ψευδόστομα** is literally a “false mouth” of a river (Str. 17.1.18, in reference to mouths of the Nile smaller than the most widely known, standard ones; there is no suggestion that these mouths were “blind” in the sense of being dead ends that failed to lead back to the Nile itself). Although **ψευδοστομέω** (S. OC 1127, whence presumably the use of the verb at [Luc.] Ocyp. 8; glossed “*lie*”) is identified as derived from the noun, it is instead another example of a compound of **ψεύδος** rather than of **ψευδής** (cf. above on **ψευδορράφος**, **ψευδορκέω**, etc.).

ψεύστης + genitive (lit. “a liar of ...”) appears to mean “a liar about ...” at S. Ant. 1195 ὧν ἐς ὕστερον / ψεύσται φανόμεθ’ (“about which we will later be shown to be liars”); misdescribed as an example of the verb + “τινος *in someone*”. There is no such construction in the other passage cited (Arist. EN 1127^b16 ψεύστης ὃ μὲν τῷ ψεύδει αὐτῷ χαίρων, ὃ δὲ δόξης ὀρεγόμενος ἢ κέρδους, “one liar takes pleasure in the lie itself, whereas another is hungry for glory or profit”; offered as a comparandum by LSJ s.v., for unclear reasons), suggesting that the passage from *Antigone* is a bit of typical Sophoclean syntactic extravagance.

ψέφος is known exclusively from lexicographers and the like (e. g. Hsch. ψ 139, where the word is glossed σκότος, “darkness”). Gal. XIX.763 K. claims that it was used by Pindar (fr. 324; cited s. v. by LSJ), who has the adjective **ψεφηνός** of a person at N. 3.41 ὃς δὲ διδάκτ’ ἔχει, ψεφηνός ἀνὴρ ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ’ ἀτρεκεῖ κατέβα ποδί (“he who has learning [only], as a *psephennos* man breathing various winds, he never plants a stable foot”; in honor of Aristokleides of Aegina). That Galen’s claim reflects confusion with the adjective, is suggested by EM p. 818.33–34, which looks like a more complete version of the scholarly material preserved by Galen and Hesychius: ψεφηνός καὶ ψεφηνός²³ ἀνὴρ, σκοτεινός, οὐκ ἐπιφανής· ψέφος γὰρ τὸ σκότος· φησὶ Πίνδαρος Ἀριστοκλεῖ (“*psephennos* and a *psephēnos* man, one who is not notable; because *psephos* means darkness. Pindar says this to Aristokles”). Galen XIX.156 K. also glosses **ψέφος** – which must be either a cognate or a variant of **ψέφας** – as σκότος; Hsch. ψ 140, on the other hand, offers the

23) Thus the manuscripts of Pi. N. 3.41.

definition *καπνός* (“smoke”). Hsch. ψ 141 preserves in addition a verb **ψέφω** (in the third-person singular; omitted), which it glosses *δέδοικεν, ἐντρέπει. λυπεῖ. φροντίζει* (“is afraid, hesitates, grieves, mulls over”), to which LSJ s. v. compares Hsch. μ 1051 *μεταψέφειν· μεταμελεῖσθαι* (“*metapsephein*: to repent”), 1052 *μεταψέφω· μεταβουλεύομαι* (“*metapsephô*: I change my mind”). All of this makes it look like **ψεφεννός** means not “*gloomy, dark*”, but ~ “obscure” or “wrapped in thought”.

A *modius* that is **ψηκτός** (glossed “*full to the brim*”) is so because it has been “scraped” (*ψήχω*) to level its contents, rather than being heaped full (*κορυστής*, as at IG II² 1013.22, 24 *χοίνικι ... κορυστήι*); the sense of the adjective is thus closer to “full only to the brim, level full”.

LSJ s. v. **ψήκτρα** (followed by the *Dictionary*) claims that Hesychius preserves the otherwise unknown *ψηκτρίς* and *ψηκτρία* “as glosses on *ξύστρα*”. The reference is to Hsch. ξ 204 † *ξύστρα· ψυκτρίς, ψυκτρία* (thus the manuscript and Latte’s text). Vat. Gr. 23 – referred to by Latte as r – an antistoicharion apparently with interpolations from Hesychius and much cited by Latte, but considered of little worth by Cunningham, reads *ψηκτρίς* for the first gloss, and Stephanus conjectured *ψήκτρα* for the second. Latte comments that if the reading of r and Stephanus’ emendation are correct, the lemma should be emended to *ξύστρα*. LSJ and the *Dictionary* have thus introduced these words on the basis of an emendation of both the lemma and a gloss in Hesychius.

ψηλαφίνδα is glossed “at *blind fly*”, an obscure term for the children’s game generally referred to in contemporary English as “blind man’s buff” (thus LSJ s. v.) or “blind man’s bluff”, which is essentially a form of tag in which the person who is “it” wears a blindfold. But Phryn. PS p. 128.4–5 de Borr. describes *ψηλαφίνδα* as *παιδιά τίς ἐστιν, ἑνός τινος δεδεμένου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐν κύκλῳ ψηλαφῶντος καὶ λέγοντος ἐκάστου τοῦνομα* (“a game in which one person has his eyes bound and goes around in a circle, putting his hands on the others and saying each one’s name”, i. e. trying to identify them on the basis of what his sense of touch tells him). *μυίνδα* (omitted; described at Poll. 9.113) is similar; neither has much to do with blind man’s buff.

ψηγίζω at Ar. Eq. 523 πάσας δ' ὑμῖν φωνάς ἰεῖς καὶ ψάλλων καὶ πτερυγίζων / καὶ λυδίζων καὶ ψηγίζων (“emitting every sort of sound for you and playing a harp and flapping wings and talking Lydian and *psênizôn*”; a description of Magnes’ theater-career via reference to the identity of his choruses) seems to mean not “introducing wasps” but “playing the fig-wasp”, i. e. “buzzing” vel sim.

ψηροπυρίτας (a *hapax*; the second element is patently < πυρός, “wheat”, but the first has no obvious etymology that makes reasonable sense with it) is glossed αὐτόπυρος ἄρτος (“whole-wheat bread”) at Hsch. ψ 155. Hesychius’ spelling of the word seems to be an error for ξηροπυρίτας (“dry-wheat bread”), which is similarly glossed αὐτόπυρος ἄρτος at Ath. 3.114c (drawing on Amerias). Cf. Suda ψ 76 ψηρόν· ξηρόν. The lemma (also in LSJ) should be withdrawn.

In contemporary English, a “*juggler*” is an entertainer capable of keeping multiple balls or the like in the air at one time. A **ψηφός**, **ψηφοκλέπτης**, **ψηφολόγος**, or **ψηφοπαίστης** – the latter is apparently the classical term – by contrast, is a “sleight-of-hand artist”, and in particular one who can make a **ψῆφος** (“pebble”) appear and disappear (= cups and balls, or the shell game), the point generally being to extract money from a mark who believes he can out-think the conjurer and accordingly bets against him; cf. Sen. ep. 45.8.

A **ψηφολογεῖον** (a *hapax* at Ar. fr. 362.2) is not a “*tablet for calculations*”, but a Greek abacus, i. e. a counting board on which pebbles could be moved about to perform calculations of various sorts; cf. Hdt. 2.36.4 λογίζονται ψήφοισι Ἕλληνες μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ φέροντες τὴν χεῖρα (“the Greeks count with pebbles by moving their hand from the values on the left to those on the right”); Lang, *Hesperia* 26, 1957, 271 n. 1.

ψηφοπεριβουβήτρια (glossed “*jar full of pebbles*, perhaps used as a rattle”, following LSJ s. v.; a nonce-word at Eub. fr. 56.3) is part of an over-the-top description of a “Thericleian” drinking vessel, i. e. a cup rather than a jar, and not a toy. Hunter ad loc. comments: “certain drinking-cups had pebbles concealed inside the lip or the foot and these rattled when the cup was tilted”. Although the

word is treated as a noun here and in LSJ (lit. “round-about-pebble-boomer”), the context suggests that it is an adjective (“round-about-pebble-booming”).

ψηφοφορία at Arist. Pol. 1268^a2 does not mean specifically “*voting with pebbles*”, but refers generically to any system in which jurors simply voted “guilty” or “not guilty”, the contrast being with an imaginary system in which jurors have a *πινάκιον* (“tablet”) on which they can individually offer split verdicts, propose penalties for charges on which they wish to convict, etc. At [Arist.] Rh.Al. 1446^b22, the contrast is between *χειροτονία* (“voting by show of hand”, i. e. in an assembly) and *ψηφοφορία* (“voting by ballot”, i. e. in a lawcourt), with no suggestion that – despite the etymology of the word – pebbles in particular should be used in *ψηφοφορία*.

For *ψηφωτητής* (“layer of mosaics”; omitted), see IGLSyr 21,2 102.2 (ca. 535 CE).

For the idea s. v. **ψήχω** that “time wears down everything” (cited at AP 7.225.1), see already Simon. fr. 88 West² ὁ τοι Χρόνος ὀξύς ὀδόντας, / καὶ πάντα ψήχει (“Time is sharp-toothed, and he wears down everything”).

Although Hsch. ψ 103, 173 do define **ψεαί** and **ψαί** (both glossed “*foxes*”) as ἀλώπεκες, the word is used there in the specialized anatomical sense “loin muscles” (LSJ s. v. IV), making this simply a variant – i. e. probably nothing more than a misspelling (accent aside, all three variants eventually coming to be pronounced alike) – of ψυαί.

Although **ψιάς** is attested only three times (Il. 16.459; [Hes.] Sc. 384; Call. fr. 753) before the Roman-era grammarians and lexicographers, in each case it seems to mean not just “*drop*” (thus also LSJ s. v., following e. g. Hsch. ψ 169), but specifically “*drop of rain*”.

The manuscripts of the Epitome of Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* are divided between **ψίδιος** (C) and **ψύδιος** (E) in their quotations of Eub. fr. 136.1 and Anaxandr. fr. 73.2; Kassel-Austin, like

all previous editors, arbitrarily print the form in *iota* in both cases. Millis ad loc. observes: “The only solid evidence for the classical orthography is SEG IX 11.10 σταφυλὰ ψυθία, a fourth-century document from Cyrene; while one inscription from Cyrene may shed little light on Athenian orthographical habits generally, in this instance it provides the entirety of the evidence and ought to be followed.” For feminine ψυθία / ψυθία (ἄμπελος) referring to a grape-variety, see Poll. 6.82. Plin. Nat. 14.80 *psithium et melampsitium passi genera sunt suo sapore, non vini* claims that ψιθίος / ψυθίος οἴνος is actually a type of raisin-wine.

Comic terms for persons in -αξ are generally derogatory, abusive, mocking, or the like. This is probably also the case with Ar. fr. 922 **ψίλαξ** (“a ψιλός guy”, i. e. “a bald-head” or the like) as well as with the nickname **Ψόφαξ** (“Boisterous”) at GVI 1016.3–4, now = SGO 16/32/05.3–4 (a funerary inscription in iambic trimeter for a man who urges his friends to enjoy themselves as long as they are alive).

The second element in **ψιλόκουρος** is presumably not κουρά but κείρω; Phryn. ecl. 38 ἐν χρωῖ κουρίας φαθὶ καὶ μὴ ψιλόκουρος (“Say ‘with close-cropped hair’ rather than *psilokouros!*”) makes it clear that the compound means not “*clean-shaven*”, but “wearing one’s hair short”. The word thus both makes sense as a gloss for **ψιλοκόρησις** at Call. fr. 191.17 and suggests that the latter means not “*bald*” but again “close-cropped”; cf. **ψιλοκορρέω** (glossed “*be bald*”), a *hapax* at Diog. ep. 19, where the text is defective but the contrast is with *καρηκομῶω* (“wear one’s hair long”). Kassel-Austin treat ψιλοκόρησις (in place of the transmitted ψιλοκόρησις at Hsch. ψ 202 = Phot. p. 654.20 = Synag. ψ 20 = Suda ψ 103; omitted) as adesp. com. fr. *441. The lexicographers listed above take the word to mean φαλακρός (“bald”). But [Ptol.] de Diff. ψ 170 disagrees: ψιλοκάρησις μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ φαλακρός, ψιλοκόρησις δὲ ὁ σπανός (“because a *psilokarsês* is a bald man, but a *psilokorsês* is one who has only a limited amount of hair”), and the parallels above suggest that he is right at least about the latter point.

In Diophan. AP 5.309, Eros is called a **ψιλιστής**, which is not simply a “*robber*” but a specialized sort of robber – normally

referred to as a λωποδύτης – who mugs people at night for their clothing and thus renders them ψιλός: ψιλιστής ὁ Ἔρως καλοῖτ' ἂν ὄντως / ἀγρυπνεῖ, θρασύς ἐστίν, ἐκδιδύσκει (“Eros would be rightly termed a *psilistês*: because he stays awake [at night], is recklessly bold, and strips his victims”).

The discussion of **ψιλῶω** (“render ψιλός, strip”) is confused by a failure to recognize that the verb takes at least three different sorts of accusatives: (1) of that which is stripped of a covering, as at Hdt. 4.26 τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ψιλώσαντες (“they strip his head [of flesh]”, from a description of how a Thracian tribe handles the bodies of its dead; unhelpfully glossed “strip, depilate, shave someone’s head”;²⁴) (2) of that which is stripped from someone or something, as at Hdt. 2.151.3 ἐς δὲ τὰ ἔλαια ἔδοξε σφι διῶξαι ψιλώσαντας τὰ πλείστα τῆς δυνάμιος (“they decided to drive [him] into the swamps and strip most of his power [from him]”; see below); (3) an accusative of respect, as at X. Oec. 17.13 τῷ ἐψιλωμένῳ τὰς ρίζας²⁵ (“stripped in respect to its roots”, i. e. “that has had its roots stripped”). In constructions (1) and (2), the second object is generally in the genitive, as at Hp. Art. 1 εἴ τις ... ψιλώσειε ... τῶν σαρκέων τὴν ἐπωμίδα (“if someone were to strip the point of the shoulder of its flesh”). In the discussion of the use of the genitive with the verb, Hdt. 2.151.3 (quoted above) is cited as an example, but with αὐτόν to be supplied – anomalously – as a second accusative; it is easier to supply αὐτοῦ and translate “from him”.

ψιμυθός is “white lead”, applied to the face to create an attractively pale complexion. Nothing suggests that it was “*powdered*”, and the passages collected under s. v. **ψιμυθιον** leave little doubt that it was in fact a paste (e. g. Ar. Ec. 878 καταπεπλασμένη ψιμυθίῳ, “plastered over with *psimythion*”; X. Oec. 10.2 ἐντετριμμένην ... ψιμυθίῳ, “smeared with *psimythion*”; Eub. fr. 97.1 περι-

24) κατήγματα ἐψιλωμένα at Hp. Aph. 5.22 (unhelpfully included in a group of what are presented as examples of ψιλῶω meaning “*be left uncovered, undefended*”) are thus “compound fractures”, meaning that the bone “has been stripped of” – i. e. is protruding from – the flesh.

25) Misrepresented as ψιλωθῆναι ρίζας and translated “that the roots are left exposed”, as if ρίζας were the subject of the infinitive.

πεπλασμένα ψιμυθίους, “coated in layers of *psimythion*”). φῦκος, on the other hand, is not “lipstick” but some reddish substance that was smeared on the face like rouge (e. g. Philippid. fr. 19 τοῖς συκαμίνοις δ’ ἀντὶ τοῦ φύκου ὄλον / τὸ πρόσωπον, “his / her whole face ... with mulberries rather than with *phykos*”; Luc. Merc. cond. 33; [Luc.] Am. 41; Poll. 5.101–102; Phryn. PS p. 71.15–16).

The scholiasts and lexicographers agree that **ψίττα** means not so much “come on!” as ~ “move it!, get!” (e. g. Hsch. ψ 219 ψίττα· ταχέως, εὐθέως, “*psitta*: quickly, right away”) and that it is what shepherds in particular say to their animals to set them in motion (already at E. Cyc. 49 in the form **ψύττα**, unhelpfully glossed “*eh, oh*”; cf. **σίττα**, glossed “*hey up!, go on!*” at e. g. Theoc. 4.45–46; 5.100). Onomatopoeic. Paus.Gr. ψ 4²⁶ ~ Hsch. ψ 220 do not say that **ψιττάζω** means “summon someone”, but that it is “a shepherd’s interjection”; there is no indication that it is ever addressed to human beings, although it is used in some sort of children’s game called ψίττα Μαλιάδες ψίττα Ποιὰί ψίττα Μελίαι at Poll. 9.122. The claim at Ael.Dion. ψ 4 that **ψό** (an exclamation of disgust, “yuck!” vel sim.) was also “a call of shepherds”, appears to represent an ancient misunderstanding of a notice that Sophocles used the word in his Ποιμένες (“*Shepherds*”; = fr. 521 with Radt ad loc., citing Erbse).

ψιττάκια at Herod. 7.58 are not just “footwear”, but specifically “women’s footwear” (as Hsch. ψ 221 notes). Presumably they were the color of a parrot (**ψιττακός**; an Oriental loan-word that must have come to Greece along with the bird itself), i. e. bright green (thus Headlam ad loc.).

The reference to **ψοθοίος** (glossed “dirty” on the basis of Herodian’s ἀκάθαρτος and cognate **ψόθος**, “dirt”) at “COM. CAF 342.25”, i. e. to the third volume of the old Kock edition of the comic fragments, is actually to fr. 345.25 ψόθοιοις ἀκαθαρσίαι[ς πλέως in Austin’s *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*. Austin published this as a list of comic vocabulary, but only a few items were taken over into the eighth volume of Kassel–Austin,

26) Cited (following LSJ) from the old Schwabe edition as “fr. 331”.

a determination apparently having been reached in the meantime that most of the words were drawn from texts already known. Note vocative ψῖλοθειέ at adesp. tr. fr. 679.15.

Like ῥαχίτης (“associated with the ῥάχις, spine”), **ψοίτης** (“associated with the ψειαί / ψίαι / ψυαί”, i. e. the loin-muscles) is not a noun but an adjective.²⁷

The inscription cited, following LSJ, as BCH 29.430 (the original publication) is better identified as ID 104(26bis) face A.1.4, 6, 8, 10 (ca. 340 BCE), where **ψοιθός** is used repeatedly as what seems to be a color-term describing sacrificial animals. Durrbach, BCH 29, 1905, 431–2, cites Beaudouin for the suggestion that this is the word Hsch. ψ 15 gives in the form ψαιθόν (omitted) and that he glosses ὑποφοινίσσον. The lexicographers (e. g. Phot. p. 655.21 = Suda ψ 144) define ψοιθός as σποδός (“ash”), hence the definitions “*ash-colored*” (thus LSJ s.v.) and “*reddish*” (i. e. ~ “less than red, not quite red”).

The point of the poetic (primarily epic) adjective **ψόλοις** used in reference to lightning is not that the lightning is itself “*smoky, sooty*” (< ψόλος), but that it renders whatever it strikes this way, sc. by setting it on fire. The word seems accordingly to be used in archaic poetry only when someone or something is blasted or nearly blasted (Od. 23.330; 24.539; Hes. Th. 515; fr. 51.2; hAphr. 288; [Hes.] Sc. 422; Pi. N. 10.71).

ψολοκομπία (glossed “*cockiness, boastfulness*”) is a nonce-word at Ar. Eq. 696 ἦσθην ἀπειλαῖς, ἐγέλασα ψολοκομπίαις (“I’m pleased by your threats, I laugh at your *psolokompiai*”; the Sausage-seller mocks the blustering Paphlagonian). The second element in the word by itself means ~ “boastfulness”, and the first element patently adds something more. LSJ s.v. suggests “*thunderous talk, i. e. empty noise*”. But lightning rather than thunder is **ψολοεῖς** (see above), and the word is perhaps to be understood as

27) Perhaps a result of misreading LSJ’s “*ψοίτης μυελός, ὁ, lumbar portion of the spinal cord*”. LSJ’s “*ῥαχίτης, οὐ, ὁ, in or of the spine*” (also followed in the Dictionary), on the other hand, seems to be not just misleading but wrong.

relying on a colloquial sense of **ψόλος** parallel to the common use of **καπνός** (lit. “smoke”) to mean ~ “blather, nonsense” (LSJ s. v.).

ψυγεῖον at IG II² 1695.21 (pl.; in a catalogue of public cooking vessels and the like, with the weight of each individual object specified) is unhelpfully glossed “*refresher, cooler*”; Hsch. ψ 252 defines these as ἀγγεῖα, ἐν οἷς ὕδωρ ψύχεται (“vessels, in which water is cooled” or perhaps “kept cool”). That a ψυγεῖον is different from a **ψυκτήρ** (“vessel for keeping wine cool”)²⁸ is also apparent from the fact that the same inscription lists those separately (IG II² 1695.7–9). For ψυκτήρ, note also diminutive ψυκτήριον; these seem to be the normal words for the object in 4th-century BCE Attic (e. g. IG II² 47.12; 1424a.265). Which vessel – if either – is to be identified with the **ψυκτηρία** / **ψυγεύς** mentioned at Euphr. fr. 3.1 ἐπὶ δὲ καλέσῃ ψυγέα τὸν ψυκτηρίαν (“when someone refers to the *psyktêria* as a *psygeus*”), is unclear. Dialectal differences are at issue in the latter passage, and Alexis’ use of τρικότυλον ψυγέα (“a *psygeus* with a capacity of three *kotyloi*”) in fr. 65 must accordingly be marked, non-standard vocabulary.

Ψυδρεύς is well attested as the name of a month not just on Corcyra (IG IX,1 682.2; also the only reference given in LSJ s. v.), but on the mainland and further north, in Epeiros (e. g. SEG XXXV 665 block B.25; I. Bouthrotos 91.6–7) and Illyria (SEG XXXVIII 521.2).

ψυλλίζω is not “*seize fleas*”, but “*catch fleas*”, and thus in the middle “*pick fleas off oneself*”, as in the Life of St. Andrew the Fool App. 1.172 (seemingly the only attestation of the word outside of a dubious entry in the Suda).

EM p. 819.25 is cited s. v. **ψυχαγόγιον** for the definition “*place for the calling forth of the dead*”, while Gloss. Rhét., AB I p. 317 is cited for the definition “*cistern*”. Thus also LSJ s. v.; in fact, the two notes are identical, and each of them gives both definitions of the word.

28) Glossed in LSJ s. v. as “*wine-cooler*”, a term that has now been claimed in popular usage for a sweetened, often carbonated mixture of wine and fruit juice, and that is thus no longer available for the Greek vessel.

Phryn. PS p. 127.12–14 says that **ψυχαγωγός** was an Alexandrian term not precisely for a “*babysnatcher*” but for a slave-trader who specialized in children (τὸν τῶν παίδων ἀνδραποδιστήν).²⁹

ψυχολατρεία at Eusebius of Antioch, de Engastrimytho 3 does not mean “*worship of souls*” but is part of a description of what King Saul should have – but did not – resort to rather than visiting the Witch of Endor; thus “*spiritual devotion*” vel sim.³⁰

The notice at Phryn. PS p. 128.11 that tragedy uses **ψυχορροφεῖν** (a *hapax*³¹, glossed “*to suck out life*”) ἐπὶ τοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκροφεῖν διὰ κακῶν παρουσίαν (“in reference to slurping down the *psychê* through the presence of troubles”) = adesp. tr. fr. 602. The idea is apparently that one person drains another of life by making his or her situation miserable.

Philostr. Her. 51.7 reports that there were actually two scenes in the *Odyssey* known as the **Ψυχοστασία**, the first being Book 11, the second the Underworld scene in Book 24. The subject of Aeschylus’ play by this title, on the other hand, was an incident from the war at Troy which involved Zeus weighing Achilleus’ soul against that of either Hektor or Memnon.

ψυχουλκέομαι (glossed “*exhaling one’s last breath*”; cf. LSJ s. v. “*be at the last gasp*”) is attested only at III Macc. 5:25 οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι κατὰ τὸν ἀμερῆ ψυχουλκόμενοι χρόνον πολὺδακρυν ἰκετείαν ἐν μέλεσιν γοεροῖς τείνοντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐδέοντο τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ πάλιν αὐτοῖς βοηθῆσαι συντόμως (translated below) and in the lexicographers (e. g. Hsch. ψ 298), who preserve a scholarly note on the passage that claims that the participle means τὰς ψυχὰς ἐλκόμενοι. The RSV (following LSJ) translates “But the Jews, at their last gasp, since the time had run out, stretched

29) LSJ s. v. “*kidnapper*” recalls the original, now outdated sense of the word, which referred specifically to abducting children to convert them into servants, generally in the New World (i. e. “*kid-nabbing*”).

30) Paired with συχνοτέρᾳ δεήσει (“more constant prayer”) and modified by the adjective καρτερᾶ (“strong, staunch, potent”); a reference to fasting?

31) Pl. Com. fr. 292 ψυχορροφεῖν (“to gulp down cold wine”) is from ψύχος rather than ψυχή.

their hands toward heaven and with most tearful supplication and mournful dirges implored the supreme God to help them again at once". Inter alia, this garbles the syntax, and the sense must be something more like "But the Jews, *psychoulkoumenoi* throughout the whole time" – i. e. during the period when the persecution they were awaiting was being set up, as described in the immediately preceding verses, hence the imperfect main verb that follows – "stretching their hands to heaven as a tearful lament accompanied by mournful dirges, were imploring etc." The second element in *ψυχουλκείομαι* is < ἔλκω, which in the middle suggests not breathing out but breathing in, and thus something like "gathering their spirits, summoning up their courage", which would also appear to be what the gloss τὰς ψυχὰς ἔλκόμενοι is intended to communicate.

ψυχρός (lit. "cold") can function as a term of aesthetic evaluation ("awkward, clumsy, stilted"), hence the cognate verb **ψυχρεύομαι** ("attempt awkward word-play") at Herm. Id. 1.6.154–155 (misleadingly glossed "*make the style chilly*", which in contemporary English suggests "cold, impersonal" vel sim.). *ψυχρεύομαι* at Σ Pi. N. 7.1a (of the poet supposedly trying to hint at a connection between the personal name Σωγένης and the adjective σωγενῆς) and Σ Ar. Th. 80a (of an anonymous person who might foolishly try to connect τρίτη and τρισκαιδεκαταία) is thus not "*say witticisms*" (sic), but once again a judgmental "make a clumsy pun" vel sim. Eustathius' **ψυχρογραφέω** is similarly not "*write in a cold style*", but "write in an awkward style", while adesp. com. fr. 442 **ψυχροκόμψευμα** (glossed "*chilly arrogance*") must depend on the same sense of the adjective; note that this is a *μα*-noun, and LSJ's "*a frigid conceit*", i. e. "a bit of clumsy cleverness", is likely closer to the mark. Note also **ψυχρολογέω** at Luc. Pseud. 27 (glossed "*say puns*" (sic) "or *nonsense*"), where the speaker is acknowledging that the joke he has just made falls flat – but is appropriate as an attack on someone who specializes in absurdly clumsy language – as well as **ψυχρομυθουργία** (glossed obscurely "*cold account*") at Tz. H. 2.743 πλατύς μοι λῆρος φαίνεται καὶ ψυχρομυθουργία ("it seems to me to be flat-out nonsense and clumsy fabrication").

The second element in **ψυχρόπορος** (a *hapax*, glossed "*cold in its attack*") at Apollin. Met.Ps. 2.106.38 ψυχροπόρου θανάτιο

κατήλυθον ἄχρι πυλάων (“I descended as far as the gates of *psy-chroporos* death”) would seem to be *περάω* rather than *πείρω*, hence Lampe’s more convincing “*cold in its onset*”, i. e. ~ “cold when it arrives, chilling”.

The **ψυχροπότης** (glossed “*drinker of cold water*”) at Plu. Mor. 690b is a devotee of luxury (τρυφῶν) who keeps calling for colder water at a dinner party. There can thus be little doubt that what he wants is not merely cold water but cold water to mix with his wine, so that here at least the word means “drinker of cold beverages” or perhaps specifically “person who prefers his wine cold”; cf. Stratt. fr. 60; Alex. fr. 145.10 with Arnott ad loc. (on drinking wine as cold as possible, even mixed with snow). Whether this is also the case of the cognate verb **ψυχροποτέω** at Plu. Mor. 60a (a man is accused of ruining his voice by ψυχροποτῶν), is unclear.

ψυχροσταγής makes no sense at Aret. SD 2.7, which is why Hude suggested **ψυχροπαγής** there. The former cannot in any case mean “*congealed*” and is instead “dripping cold” vel sim.

ψωμόλεθρος (glossed “*ruin of bread*”; better “ruin of crumbs”, but see below) is defined at Suda ψ 135 as meaning πολυφάγος (“glutton”); as LSJ s. v. notes, the word looks like e. g. a nickname for a parasite, in which case the idea is perhaps ~ “a pest who dines on crumbs”, but more wittily phrased. Cf. **ψωμολεθρία** (an abstract noun, wrongly glossed “fem. of ψωμόλεθρος”), which Zon. p. 1879.3 defines as πολυφαγία (“gluttony”).

Minneapolis, MN

S. Douglas Olson