

Stefano Valente

# Creating an Original of a Greek Lexicon in the Middle Ages: Notes on the Manuscript *Vaticanus Barberinianus* gr. 70 of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*

**Abstract:** The creation of a lexicon in the manuscript culture of the Greek Middle Ages was a complex and difficult enterprise. It required access to different manuscript sources and to writing materials in which the selected information could be copied and structured. To illustrate this practice, some features of the manuscript Vatican City, BAV, *Vaticanus Barberinianus* gr. 70 (eleventh century CE?) transmitting the original of the so-called *Etymologicum Gudianum* will be investigated.

## 1 Introduction

‘Lexicography is an endless task’,<sup>1</sup> wrote Robert Scott on 9 April 1862 in a letter to the German classical scholar Wilhelm Dindorf. Scott is the co-author – with Henry George Liddell – of the seminal Greek-English lexicon (first edition: Oxford 1843) that remains the most authoritative lexicographic tool for the study of Ancient Greek.<sup>2</sup> More generally, Scott’s sentence is consonant with almost every kind of lexicographic work produced in every time and culture.<sup>3</sup> However, this ‘endless task’ applies not only to the intellectual act of collecting, selecting, and explaining lexical items, but also concerns the material operations of transferring and transmitting them in a written artefact.

In this regard, the activity of a lexicographer working in the medieval Greek manuscript culture was particularly challenging and required access to different

---

1 Stray 2019b, 11 (and n. 1 for the source: ‘Robert Scott letter books, OUP Archive’).

2 Usually abbreviated ‘LSJ’, viz. ‘Liddell, Scott, Jones’, the latter being Henry Stuart Jones (1867–1939), who authored the revision of the lexicon. On the different editions of and supplements to the *Greek-English Lexicon*, see Stray 2019a. Dindorf himself and his brother Ludwig were also experts in lexicographic matters, since they were part of the team of scholars in charge of updating the nine volumes of Stephanus’ *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Paris 1831–1863): see e.g. Müller 1903, 706.

3 For an overview on some lexicographic cultures of the past, see the papers collected in Considine 2019 with further literature.

manuscript sources, to writing materials, and sufficient time to select and organise the contents. To illustrate some aspects of this complex scholarly activity, I will focus on a single manuscript which lends itself as an exceptional case study for understanding how an original of a lexicon was created.

The history of Greek lexicography begins in the Hellenistic Age (from about the third century BCE onwards):<sup>4</sup> for centuries, manuscripts containing lexica of various kinds have been produced and copied for different purposes. Not only did scribes and scholars copy already existing lexica of the past, with every new manuscript being a more or less faithful adaptation of the contents to the needs of the producers and/or users, but they also compiled new lexica using previous works as sources of information. The huge number of extant Greek lexicographic manuscripts offers a fruitful field of investigation for studying adaptation processes through the centuries and within different scholarly communities. That said, few surviving manuscripts allow us to perceive and to reconstruct how the material process of creating a brand new lexicon took place: such written artefacts represent provisional and preliminary textual stages, thus constituting one stage in a complex intellectual and material work-in-progress.<sup>5</sup>

## 2 How to compose a new lexicon? Some theoretical remarks

Creating a new lexicon in the Greek Middle Ages was a complex enterprise. Firstly, the producers were confronted with the difficult task of gathering information from different manuscript sources, in particular previous lexica, commentaries to literary texts, grammars, and other specialised literature, as well as from manuscripts transmitting literary works. They then had to select the information they considered interesting and necessary for their purposes. Afterwards, this selection was transferred into a new manuscript and converted into a usable form. Alphabetical order was adopted to aid quick consultation of this new text.<sup>6</sup> The lexical items were thus arranged according to different degrees of alphabetisation, from the easiest, i.e. to the first letter of the lemma, to the most

---

<sup>4</sup> See among others Ferri 2019 and Valente 2019 with further literature.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Valente 2017, 45.

<sup>6</sup> For an overview of alphabetisation in Greek and Latin Antiquity and Middle Ages, see Daly 1967 and Alpers 1975. See also Valente 2014.

refined, i.e. the full alphabetisation.<sup>7</sup> In Antiquity and the Middle Ages, this latter lexicographic structure was a difficult and expensive task in terms of time, intellectual energy, and material costs.

The German classical scholar Carl Wendel (1874–1951) described such a painstaking operation in his entry in the *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* on the Late Antique grammarian Orion from Thebes in Egypt (fifth century CE).<sup>8</sup> Orion compiled the first Greek etymological lexicon that has survived, collecting grammatical-etymological explanations of words he found in different source texts.<sup>9</sup> As already acknowledged, some of these source texts were not alphabetically arranged. As Wendel suggests, it is possible that the lexicographer had a separate set of sheets or quires for each letter of the alphabet, in which he copied the different etymologies he found in his sources according to their first letter.<sup>10</sup> The lexicographer performed the process of extracting information from his source texts in sequence (that is to say first exploiting a source, then a second one, etc.). This perhaps explains how groups of entries originating from one and the same source (originally not alphabetically arranged) appear in the same sequence within each alphabetic section of Orion's lexicon.<sup>11</sup>

Starting from this working hypothesis, an even more complex compositional process is required for creating an original of a fully alphabetised lexicon.

---

7 Generally, surviving Greek and Byzantine lexica are arranged up to the third letter, many others just according to the first or second one: see Valente 2014.

8 On this lexicographer, see Wendel 1939; Ippolito 2008; Matthaïos 2015, 287–288.

9 On etymology in Greek antiquity, see e.g. Sluiter 2015 with literature. It should be noted that ancient etymologies have nothing to do with modern linguistic studies.

10 Wendel 1939, 1086–1087: 'Da die meisten der von O[rion] benutzten Werke selbst nicht alphabetisch geordnet gewesen sind, haben wir uns sein Verfahren so vorzustellen, daß er für jeden Buchstaben des Alphabets ein besonderes Rollenstück vor sich niederlegte und bei der Lektüre die ihm begegnenden Etymologien, so weit sie ihm wichtig erschienen, auf diese Blätter übertrug. So entstand eine nach den Anfangsbuchstaben der erklärten Worte alphabetisch angelegte Kompilation, die weder Eigenes enthält noch irgendeine der Vorlagen in ihrem ursprünglichen Zusammenhang wiedergibt'. On this hypothesis, see also Daly 1967, 89 n. 1: 'This description is based purely on inference from the character of the text of Orion rather than on any direct evidence, but it is plausible in the light of the evidence cited above [*ibid.* 85–89, but see also Wilson 1969, 366 on p. 88]'. Wendel mentions the use of papyrus rolls, but there is no evidence for what kind of material support Orion really used. However, it seems more likely that the lexicographer worked with single sheets or loose quires. For further literature and another hypothesis concerning the composition of a version of the so-called Zonaras's lexicon (first half of thirteenth century), see Alpers 1981, 19 with n. 23. On the compositional methodology of Guarinus Favorinus Camers' lexicon, see Ucciardello 2017, 181.

11 See Kleist 1865, 16; Wendel 1939, 1086; Theodoridis 1976, 16f.

Each list of entries for every alphabetic letter must be revised, the items checked many times, then, in a further step, they can be copied according to a more or less refined alphabetical order into a new manuscript. Bringing together different sources transmitting similar materials also caused problems in terms of locating the information correctly, by introducing new lemmata or extending the explanations of already existing items. Mistakes such as placing an entry in the wrong position were common and had to be corrected by revising the text or producing a new version of it. The longer a text, the more complicated this process turned out to be.

### 3 From theory to practice: the case of MS Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Barb. gr. 70

Thus far the theory. In reality, the possibility of verifying this hypothesis in a manuscript and of studying how such an intellectual and material process took place during the production of a given written artefact is limited and relies upon the very few manuscripts that preserve drafts of lexicographic texts. One such text is the manuscript Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 7 (diktyon: 66638), dated to 1310: it contains the first five letters of the Greek alphabet (from *alpha* to *epsilon*) of a lexicographic collection compiled by Georgios Phrankopulos, a scholar active in Constantinople at the beginning of the fourteenth century.<sup>12</sup> The scribe of this manuscript – possibly Phrankopulos himself – supplemented the main text by adding further materials in the margins and in extra sheets that he glued or bound to the original manuscript. The other manuscripts containing the remainder of this collection are unknown or lost. Furthermore, there are no traces of the Vatican manuscript ever having been copied.<sup>13</sup>

Another manuscript that preserves a working copy of a lexicon is now kept in the Vatican Library as well: the Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Barb. gr. 70 (diktyon: 64618), possibly to be dated to the eleventh century.<sup>14</sup> It is a small manuscript

---

<sup>12</sup> See Mercati and Franchi de' Cavalieri 1923, 4f.; Ucciardello 2007, 431–435; Gaul 2008, 178–181; Ucciardello 2013 (in particular, 12–16); Valente 2017, 52. A full digitisation of the manuscript is online: <[https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.gr.7](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.7)> (all internet sites mentioned in the present article were accessed on 24 Feb. 2021).

<sup>13</sup> For another manuscript fragment with a preliminary version of a lexicon, see Ucciardello 2021.

<sup>14</sup> On this manuscript, see Reitzenstein 1897, 91–103; Capocci 1958, 77–78; Maleci 1995; Sciarra 2005, 359–363; Arnesano and Sciarra 2010, 430–433. For an earlier dating to the end of

(c. 200 × 170 mm) now composed of 22 parchment quires (quaternions). In its present state, there are some quires and some leaves missing<sup>15</sup> and most of the remainder is also damaged, especially near the margins. This makes the deciphering of the writing in these parts of the manuscript particularly difficult.<sup>16</sup> The general consensus among the Greek palaeographers and scholars who studied this manuscript is that at least six different scribes co-operated in writing its different textual layers, working together in the same place and at the same time.<sup>17</sup>

With the exception of the last quire,<sup>18</sup> the surviving leaves transmit the text of a Greek etymologicon with conspicuous additions in the margins and between the lines, written at subsequent stages and by different scribes.<sup>19</sup> The German classical scholar Richard Reitzenstein (1861–1931) was the first to study this manuscript in-depth and to acknowledge its pivotal importance as the original of a seminal Byzantine etymologicon known under the name of *Etymologicon Gudianum*.<sup>20</sup> In his pioneering *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, published in Leipzig in 1897, Reitzenstein highlighted the main manuscriptological and textual features of the *Barberinianus* and was able to trace the main

---

the tenth century, see Alpers 2015, 295–296. This topic is currently under investigation within the project *Etymologika*. A full digitisation of the manuscript is online: <[https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.70](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.70)>.

**15** See Maleci 1995, 13–25.

**16** In these cases, the later manuscripts descending directly or indirectly from the *Barberinianus* are essential for reconstructing the text.

**17** The production place is still to be identified with certainty. According to the *communis opinio*, the manuscript was produced in Southern Italy, namely in Salento (Terra d'Otranto): see e.g. Maleci 1995, 33–45, Sciarra 2005, 355–359 and 363–371. This has recently been questioned by Ronconi 2012, 86. Further investigations are needed in order to clarify the exact origin of this codex and the number of scribes.

**18** The final quire (fols 149–155, the first folio is lost) transmits a lexicon of synonyms: see Reitzenstein 1897, 90–91; Nickau 1966, LIII–LIV; Palmieri 1987; Maleci 1995, 24, 71–72; Sciarra 2005, 363. This lexicon is alphabetically arranged to the first letter. Among the quite extensive production of synonymic lexica from the Antiquity and Middle Ages still preserved, the text of the *Barberinianus* turns out to be a *unicum* and may be a product of the same cultural *milieu* as the etymologicon, since the same compositional process that was used in the first part is recognised (for this, see below). Furthermore, in some cases, the scribes of the main text and of the marginal annotations are the same ones as those of the rest of the manuscript.

**19** Reitzenstein 1897, 91–92; Maleci 1995, 24, 45–67; Sciarra 2005, 359–363.

**20** On this lexicon, which is the most widespread etymologicon in Greek manuscript culture, see Reitzenstein 1897, 70–155; Cellerini 1988; Sciarra 2005; Alpers 2015, 295–296.

lines of textual transmission of this etymologicon. His later studies, and those of other scholars, refined the picture.<sup>21</sup>

For the purposes of the present paper, it should be emphasised that the *Barberinianus* is a multi-layered manuscript, as revealed by the different strata of annotations. As previously mentioned, a group of learned scribes, likely working in the same workshop, revised and augmented the main text by consulting not only further manuscript sources, but also re-using the same ones as those used for compiling the main text. An examination of any folio of this manuscript leaves one with the impression of facing a creative but organised chaos.<sup>22</sup>

But what can we say about the main text itself? And is it ultimately possible to reconstruct what lies behind it, i.e. the earlier composition stages of this lexicon? It has been acknowledged that three scribes are responsible for copying the main text of the lexicon.<sup>23</sup> All three – but in particular the first scribe – used a quite calligraphic handwriting, while the scribes of the supplements in the margins and between the lines used more informal and cursive handwriting.

Let us try a thought experiment. If the margins of the *Barberinianus* had remained blank – that is, if there were no additional material in the free spaces – we would face a well-written manuscript that we would probably consider to be an accomplished piece of scholarship. It is only because of the later layers of writing that we perceive this written artefact to be a working manuscript of an anonymous group of scholars. If we disregard for a moment these successive layers, we can try to understand the first layer as the main text, without the later additions and corrections.

Firstly, the main text seems to be the result of an act of copying ‘in one take’, that is to say, a text copied from a model and not produced during its writing. In particular, we observe that entries are almost fully alphabetised; a few minor misplacements can be detected towards the end of the lexicon but these were usually corrected by the main scribe.<sup>24</sup> Consequently, we can assume

---

21 Especially Reitzenstein 1907, 814–815. See Alpers 2015.

22 Further examples of other scholarly works in van der Valk 1971, XII–XXIV; Alpers 1981, 20.

23 Reitzenstein 1897, 92 (see also Capocci 1958, 77) and Maleci 1995, 33–45 (esp. 45 for an overview) distinguished three scribes, but do not agree in the distribution of their work. See also Sciarra 2005, 360 n. 16.

24 See Reitzenstein 1897, 93: ‘Die Reihenfolge der Glossen im Haupttext ist [...] streng alphabetisch, und zwar nach allen Buchstaben des Lemmas; wo diese Ordnung einmal gestört ist – besonders oft im letzten Teil – hat häufig der erste Schreiber selbst durch Zeichen und Zahlen eine beabsichtigte Umordnung der Glossen angedeutet’. Alessandro Musino (*per litteras*, 6 March 2020) remarks that something similar also occurs in relation to the marginal notes of the

a careful intellectual operation of selecting and structuring scholarly materials from different manuscript sources in order to compile a new lexicon. While a source text can be recognised with a degree of certainty for many entries, there are many others where this is not the case.<sup>25</sup> In general, the text of the first layer does not seem to be a copy of any preserved lexicon that had already existed.<sup>26</sup> We can deduce, therefore, that the main text of the *Barberinianus* represents a copy of an original work. This means that we can also assume that there may have been at least one previous working stage in a now lost manuscript preceding the first textual layer of the *Barberinianus*. As Reitzenstein suggested, the *Barberinianus* would therefore represent the neat copy of a prior working manuscript whose form was probably similar to that of the *Barberinianus* itself.<sup>27</sup>

Some new evidence for this can be found when considering a textual feature that, to date, has received scant attention. Many entries of the main text do not include an etymology of the lemmatised word, but rather feature a cross-reference to one or more entries occurring above or later in the text in which the

---

*Barberinianus*: for instance, on fol. 141<sup>v</sup>, a scribe adds numerals from α' (1) to η' (8) next to the lemmata in the text and in the left margin to indicate the correct positions for inserting the entries from the margin into the main text in the correct alphabetical order (from χεῖρα to χεῖρον). As he properly remarks, this marks a further step towards the production of a new, fully alphabetised manuscript of this lexicon.

**25** See the first apparatus of De Stefani 1909–1920 for details concerning the letters *alpha* to *zeta* (beginning). See also the specimen published by Reitzenstein 1897, 109–136.

**26** Reitzenstein 1897, 104 also suggested this as one of two working hypotheses for explaining the production of the *Barberinianus* (for the other one, see below, n. 27): 'Kopierte der Schreiber des Haupttextes im wesentlichen nur ein vor seiner Zeit schon entstandenes älteres Werk und existierte eine Urform des Etymol. Gudianum schon vor ihm, so beweist die zwar begonnene, aber nie vollständig durchgeführte und oft durch Zeichen erst nachträglich hergestellte streng alphabetische Ordnung, daß er dasselbe erheblich umgestaltet hat' (see also above, n. 24).

**27** Reitzenstein 1897, 105 (see above, n. 26): 'Ist er [i.e. the scribe of the *Barberinianus*] dagegen selbst zugleich, wie ich glauben möchte, der Verfasser des Werkes, das erst durch ihn entstand, so ist bei der klaren und zierlichen Schrift wie des ganzen Textes, so auch derjenigen Glossen, welche sich uns als schon bei ihm aus mehreren direkt benutzten Quellen kontaminiert erweisen werden, wenigstens das eine sicher, daß unserer Handschrift ein Entwurf, ein Unreines, voraus liegt, welches ähnlich wie jetzt die erweiterte Handschrift ausgesehen haben mag. Eine sichere Entscheidung vermag ich nicht zu geben'. Some years later, Reitzenstein gave the preference to this latter hypothesis: 'Ein älterer, sehr kurzer Text, der schon abgeschlossen war und daher kalligraphisch sorgfältig auf einem relativ kleinen Teil der Seiten eingetragen ist, ist von mehreren (fünf?) Schreibern nachträglich überarbeitet und erweitert worden (etc.)' (1907, 814).

cross-referenced word is mentioned and/or commented on. For instance, let us consider the following entry:<sup>28</sup>

γῆρυς· εἰς τὸ κῆρυξ καὶ διακηρυκεύεται.

*gêrys* ('voice'): [see] at the entry *kêryx* ('herald') and at the entry *diakêrykêyetai* ('it is proclaimed by a herald').

The cross-references are correct, since we find the meaning of the lemmatised poetic name for 'voice' in the other two entries mentioned: in both of them, it is explained as φωνή (*phōnê*, 'voice'), the more common word for this.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, as the case below demonstrates, some entries contain an accumulation of such information:<sup>30</sup>

γῶ· εἰς τὸ γαστήρ καὶ γεγῶσα καὶ γῆ καὶ γυνή καὶ γωρυτός καὶ διακηρυκεύεται καὶ ἐγγυαλίζω καὶ ἐγγύη καὶ χθών.

*gô*:<sup>31</sup> [see] at the entries *gastêr* ('belly'), *gegôsa* ('she, who has become'), *gê* ('earth'), *gynê* ('woman'), *gôrytós* ('quiver'), *diakêrykêyetai* ('it is proclaimed by a herald'), *engyalízô* ('to put into the hand'), *eggýê* ('surety') and *chthôn* ('earth').

All but one of the cross-references are correct.<sup>32</sup> Such a coherent and precise system pointing both backward and forward in the text should therefore be seen as the result of an intense engagement with the contents of the lexicon. It served the needs of both the producers and the users of this new lexicon, assisting them in navigating the manuscript to easily find the information they were looking for. The producers created a compact network of information within their original. Furthermore, this careful system of cross-references presupposes at

**28** De Stefani 1909–1920, 310.8. The entry occurs on fol. 44<sup>v</sup>, l. 11 of the main text: for a digital reproduction, see <[https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.70/0078](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.70/0078)>. I do not discuss here either the literary source identified by De Stefani or the meaning of the marginal *siglum* in the manuscript.

**29** Respectively fol. 98<sup>v</sup>, main text, ll. 11–16, esp. 15–16 (text partly in Sturz 1818, col. 320.32–41, esp. 38–41) and fol. 48<sup>r</sup>, main text, l. 2 from below–48<sup>v</sup> l. 2 from above (text in De Stefani 1909–1920, 365.20).

**30** Fol. 44<sup>v</sup>, main text, l. 11, text in De Stefani 1909–1920, 327.5.

**31** It is a fictive verbal form created by ancient grammarians for the sake of explaining the origins of different words (see LSJ s.v.). The grammarian Philoxenus (first century BCE) may have treated this form in his treatise *On monosyllabic verbs* (*Περὶ μονοσυλλαβων ῥημάτων*): see Theodoridis 1976, 8–9, 129–131 (frags 79–82) and 133 (frag. 88).

**32** The reference to γεγῶσα (De Stefani 1909–1920, 301.15) is mistaken, the correct one should be to γεγαυῖα (De Stefani 1909–1920, 300.7).



least one preceding textual layer in manuscript form in which it could have been implemented while revising the text. Otherwise, it would have been quite difficult to know exactly what information would be present in still unwritten subsequent alphabetic entries. We can deduce, then, that the scribes of the main text did not compose it while writing the *Barberinianus*; rather, they reproduced it from another manuscript, in which such a consistent cross-reference system had already been developed.<sup>33</sup>

As already remarked, Reitzenstein suggested that the manuscript used as a model for producing the *Barberinianus* may also have been a working manuscript that looked similar to the *Barberinianus* in its current appearance.<sup>34</sup> Such a manuscript may have been conceived within the same cultural *milieu*. There is evidence for this in the fact that the producers of the *Barberinianus* often used the same source texts for entries both in the main text and for supplements; that is to say, they had access to the same manuscripts over a certain span of time. Furthermore, they continued to supplement entries in the main text with further cross-references, taking into account the additional materials they had added into the margins.<sup>35</sup>

A number of entries provide further textual evidence that the scribe of the first layer was not creating the text for the first time but rather copied it from a model. For instance, let us consider an entry under the letter *zeta*.<sup>36</sup> It occurs on fol. 75<sup>r</sup>, ll. 11–14, and reads (De Stefani 1909–1920, 580.1):<sup>37</sup>

ζαχρειῆς<sup>38</sup> κυρίως ζαχρειές ἐστί τὸ βιαίως ταῖς χερσὶ πραττόμενον· παρὰ γὰρ τὰς χεῖρας πεποιήται ἢ λέξις· ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν βοῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους μάχης μὴ συμφώνως ἐργαζομένων· ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ πολλακίς, ὅταν ἔλκωσι, κάμνοντες ἐπερείδουσι τὸ βᾶρος πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

raging (*zachreiês*, masc. and fem.): properly, the adjective *zachreiês* (neutrum) is what is accomplished by violence with the hands: in fact, the word is formed from the term ‘hands’ (*cheîras*), just as (*hōs*) from the struggle of oxes against each other, when they do not work harmoniously: for when they draw (the plug), they often push the weight mutually on each other when getting tired.

<sup>33</sup> A similar complex system of cross-references is also attested in Stephanus of Byzantium’s geographic lexicon (see Neumann-Hartmann 2014; Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann 2017, 162–163) and in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (see Reitzenstein 1897, 49–53).

<sup>34</sup> Reitzenstein 1897, 105 (see above, n. 27).

<sup>35</sup> See below, p. 596 with n. 63.

<sup>36</sup> This is the sixth letter of the Greek alphabet.

<sup>37</sup> See the digital image at <[https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.70/0120](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.70/0120)>.

<sup>38</sup> I print the accent as in the manuscript. The right form according to grammar is ζαχρειῆς. See also below, nn. 41 and 48.

The explanation is difficult to understand as it stands. In the first half, the adjective *zachreiés* ('raging') is explained as being derived from the root of the word χεῖρ (*cheír*, 'hand'). The source for this information is an earlier etymologicon, the so-called *Etymologicum Genuinum* (produced in the mid-ninth century in Constantinople).<sup>39</sup> The relevant entry reads (overlaps underlined):<sup>40</sup>

ζαχρειῆς<sup>41</sup> οἷον ἔμπης δ' ἐγρομένοιο σάλου ζαχρειῆσιν αὔραις,<sup>42</sup> κυρίως ζαχρειές ἐστι τὸ βιαίως ταῖς χερσὶ πραττόμενον· παρὰ γὰρ τὰς χεῖρας πεποιήται ἡ λέξις ζαχερός καὶ ὑπερθέσει<sup>43</sup> ζαχερός καὶ ζαχρειῆς κτλ.

raging [*zachreiés*, masc. and fem.]: such as in the verse 'Nevertheless, when a swell was awakened by the raging winds'.<sup>44</sup> Properly, the adjective *zachreiés* [neutrum] is what is accomplished by violence with the hands: in fact, the word *zacherés* is formed from the term 'hands' [*cheîras*]: with a transposition of letters, it becomes *zachreés* and then *zachreiés* [etc.].

The producers of the *Barberinianus* selected only the information from the longer entry of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* that they considered useful for their new lexicon. They omitted some learned materials such as a literary quotation from the *Argonautica* by the Hellenistic poet Apollonius Rhodius (third century BCE).

What follows after the particle ὡς (*hōs*) in the *Barberinianus*, however, is puzzling and does not occur in the aforementioned entry of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. Moreover, the content seemingly bears no relation to the lemma. The last editor of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Edoardo Luigi De Stefani, was right in emphasising that this explanation comes from another entry of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* concerning the verb ζυγομαχεῖν (*zygomacheîn*, lit. 'to struggle with one's yoke-fellow'). In it, we find part of the explanation that is used in the *Barberinianus* (overlaps underlined):<sup>45</sup>

<sup>39</sup> See Reitzenstein 1897, 1–69; Alpers 2015.

<sup>40</sup> See also De Stefani 1909–1920, 580 in his apparatus.

<sup>41</sup> I print the text as in Vat. gr. 1818 (diktyon: 68447), fol. 162<sup>r</sup>; the right accent ζαχρειῆς occurs in Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, S. Marco 304 (diktyon: 16882), fol. 121<sup>r</sup> both in the main text (as a correction for ζαχρηεῖς) and in the margin. On this point, see nn. 38 and 48.

<sup>42</sup> These words, omitted in Laur. S. Marco 304, are a literary quotation from Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* (Book 1, verse 1159) to illustrate the use of the lemmatised adjective. The form ζαχρειῆσιν is however metrically mistaken instead of the right ζαχρηέσιν.

<sup>43</sup> Laur. S. Marco 304 reads καθ' ὑπερβιβασμόν, having the same meaning of ὑπερθέσει ('with a transposition of letters').

<sup>44</sup> See above n. 42 for the reference.

<sup>45</sup> I print the text of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* as in Vat. gr. 1818, fol. 163<sup>v</sup> and Laur. S. Marco 304, fol. 123<sup>r</sup>.

ζυγομαχεῖ: στασιάζει, ὡς οἱ βόες ἐζευγμένοι. μετῆκται δὲ ἡ λέξις ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν βοῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους μάχης καὶ μὴ συμφώνως ἐργαζομένων· ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ πολλάκις,<sup>46</sup> ὅταν ἔλκωσι, κάμνοντες ἐπερείδουσι τὸ βάρος πρὸς ἀλλήλους κτλ.

‘to struggle with one’s yoke-fellow’ [*zygomacheîn*]: to quarrel, as the oxen when they have been yoked. The word is borrowed from the struggle of oxes against each other and when they do not work harmoniously: for when they draw (the plug), they often push the weight mutually on each other when getting tired [etc.]

Here, the explanation is inserted into a much more consistent context<sup>47</sup> and the previously puzzling text of the *Barberinianus* becomes intelligible.<sup>48</sup> But how can we explain this mistake?

It is difficult to assume that the scribe of the first textual layer of the *Barberinianus* made this mistake while copying the text directly from the manuscript of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* he was consulting, since the two entries in the latter are written quite distant from each other.<sup>49</sup> Rather, the mistake becomes easier to explain if we assume that the two entries appeared in this very sequence in another manuscript that later served as a model for the *Barberinianus*. Alphabetisation may not have been completely achieved in such a working manuscript and was possibly limited to the first letter with several entries for this letter extracted from one source followed by corresponding excerpts from other sources. Thus, the order of the working manuscript may have reflected the sequence in which different sources were consulted, according to the methodology mentioned above (p. 585–586).

We can try to reconstruct the genesis of the error as follows. When preparing the text of this working manuscript, a scribe first copied the entry ζαχρειῖς (*zachreîês*).<sup>50</sup> After having written the word λέξις, *léxis* (‘word’), he overlooked

<sup>46</sup> Instead of πολλάκις, Laur. S. Marco 304 has the false reading πολλούς (‘many’, acc. m. pl.)

<sup>47</sup> In turn, this entry of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* has a complex origin. A full account of it would go beyond the scope of the present paper. See Theodoridis 1998, 245, apparatus to the entry ζ 57 in Photius’ lexicon for details.

<sup>48</sup> Concerning the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, De Stefani was well aware of the textual problem while critically editing the text. He therefore suggested the radical solution of splitting the entry in two, adding the lemma ζυγομαχεῖν (*zygomacheîn*) on the basis of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. In so doing, however, he disregarded the strong alphabetical order, since the new item begins with ζυγ- (*zyg-*) in the series of entries beginning ζαχ- (*zach-*). For reason of consistency, he was also forced to delete the particle ὡς (*hōs*, ‘just as’): see below, p. 594.

<sup>49</sup> Respectively Vat. gr. 1818, fols 162<sup>r</sup> and 163<sup>v</sup>, Laur. S. Marco 304, fols 121<sup>r</sup> and 123<sup>r</sup>: see above n. 41 and n. 45.

<sup>50</sup> He also reproduced the wrong accent of the lemma ζαχρειῖς as in the excerpts from the *Etymologicum Genuinum* he had at his disposal.

the beginning of the new entry ζυγομαχεῖ (*zygomacheîn*) and omitted its lemma together with the beginning of the explanation. It may not be a coincidence that the missing text ends with the same word λέξις (*léxis*) also occurring at the end of the previous explanation; indeed, this is a common copying mistake called *saut du même au même* (omission by *homoioteleuton*). This working manuscript thus contained quite heterogeneous explanations merged in one gloss that turned out to be difficult to understand. Such a working manuscript was later used by the scribe of this part of the *Barberinianus* who did not recognise the exact mistake but tried to straighten out the text by introducing the particle ὡς (*hōs*, ‘just as’).

These considerations may give a glimpse at the complexity of this manuscript not only in terms of acknowledged later additions, but also in terms of the problems of reconstructing previous material and textual stages.

Another entry from the letter *zeta* on fol. 75<sup>v</sup> offers us an example of the scholarly work relating to the production of the *Barberinianus*.<sup>51</sup> It concerns the substantive ζῆλος (*zēlos*), which covers a broad spectrum of meanings, including ‘zeal’, ‘desire’, ‘emulation’, ‘jealousy’, and ‘pride’.<sup>52</sup> The text of the first layer of the *Barberinianus* without supplementary information reads as follows:<sup>53</sup>

ζῆλος καὶ ζηλοτυπία διαφέρει· ζηλοτυπία μὲν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν μίσει ὑπάρχον, ζῆλος δὲ ἡ μίμησις τοῦ καλοῦ· ‘ζηλοῖ δὲ γείτονα γείτων’.

zeal (*zēlos*) and jealousy (*zēlotypía*) have different meanings: for jealousy is a feeling consisting of hate, zeal is the imitation of the good. ‘The neighbour competes with the neighbour’.<sup>54</sup>

This entry concerns the disambiguation of two terms that may be considered synonyms. In Greek Antiquity and the Middle Ages, many lexica with synonym-distinctions circulated, most of them re-elaborations of the first lexicon of this type written by the grammarian Herennius Philo in the first/second century CE.<sup>55</sup>

51 See the digital image at <[https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.70/0119](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.70/0119)>.

52 See LSJ s.v.

53 The Greek text is also available in the printed (but non-critical) edition by Sturz 1818 based on the later manuscript Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 29–30 *Gud. gr.* (a. 1293; diktyon: 72073–72074), now preserved in two volumes, transmitting a strongly re-worked version of the text: see Sturz 1818, col. 231.7.

54 Quotation from Hesiod’s *Works and days*, verse 23, to illustrate the use of the verb ζηλόω (‘to compete with’). In this paper, I will not analyse the relation between literary and lexicographic text in depth.

55 On these lexica, see e.g. Matthaios 2015, 286–287.

In fact, the producers of the *Barberinianus* gathered this entry from one of those synonymic lexica:<sup>56</sup>

ζῆλος καὶ ζηλοτυπία διαφέρει. ζηλοτυπία μὲν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν μίσει ὑπάρχον· ζῆλος δὲ ἡ μίμησις τοῦ καλοῦ· ‘ζηλοῖ δέ τε γείτονα γείτων’. ζηλοτυπεῖ δὲ ἡ Ἥρα τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὴν Σελήνην καὶ τὴν Σεμέλην.

zeal (*zēlos*) and jealousy (*zēlotypía*) have different meanings: for jealousy is a feeling consisting of hate, zeal is the imitation of the good. ‘The neighbour competes with the neighbour’. Hera is jealous of Hercules, Selene and Semele.

The entry in the *Barberinianus* reproduces the source text almost verbatim, except for the last part, since the mythological example for the use of the verb ‘to be jealous of’ (ζηλοτυπέω, *zēlotypéō*) is missing. On the other hand, the anonymous quotation from the poem *Works and Days* of Hesiod (eighth/seventh century BCE) concerning the related verb ‘to compete with’ (ζηλόω, *zēlóō*) is preserved.<sup>57</sup>

While revising the main text, a different scribe was able to access another manuscript of a different synonymic lexicon, namely the one later attributed to the grammarian Ammonius.<sup>58</sup> In it, we read a similar, but more extensive entry, albeit with some significant differences:<sup>59</sup>

ζῆλος καὶ ζηλοτυπία διαφέρει. ζηλοτυπία μὲν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος ἧγουν τὸ ἐν μίσει ὑπάρχειν· ζῆλος δὲ μίμησις καλοῦ, οἷον ζηλοῖ τὸν καθηγητὴν ὁ παῖς. ‘ζηλοῖ δέ τε γείτονα γείτων’, Ἡσίοδος<sup>60</sup> ἐπὶ καλοῦ. ζηλοτυπεῖ δὲ ἡ δεῖνα τόνδε.

zeal (*zēlos*) and jealousy (*zēlotypía*) have different meanings: for jealousy is the passion itself, that is to say the feeling consisting of hate; zeal is imitation of good, such as in the phrase ‘the pupil emulates the master’. Hesiod says ‘and the neighbour competes with the neighbour’ for what is good. ‘Some woman is jealous of this given man’.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Text in Palmieri 1988, 174, entry no. 83.

<sup>57</sup> See West 1978, 96 (apparatus on v. 23).

<sup>58</sup> See Nickau 1966, L–LIII.

<sup>59</sup> Text in Nickau 1966, 55 (entry no. 209). This may also be considered as the source of the entry in the synonymic lexicon in the *Barberinianus* (see above, n. 18): *Barb. gr.* 70, fol. 150<sup>v</sup> l. 9 (Palmieri 1987, 56, entry no. 58): ζῆλος ζηλοτυπίας διαφέρει. ζῆλος μὲν γάρ ἐστι μίμησις καλοῦ, ζηλοτυπία δὲ τὸ ἐν μίσει ὑπάρχειν ἐτέρου.

<sup>60</sup> See above, n. 54.

<sup>61</sup> The last sentence serves to explain the syntax of the verb, i.e. that it is constructed with an accusative. This is a quite common exegetic pattern in Greek lexicography and grammar.

The scribe who supplemented the main text in this part collated the text of the *Barberinianus* with the help of a second manuscript transmitting Ammonius' lexicon. He was thus able to supplement the missing information in the interlinear space. He also marked with dots the articles in the phrase 'zeal is the imitation of the good' (ζῆλος δὲ ἡ μίμησις τοῦ καλοῦ, *zēlos dē hē mīmēsis toū kaloū*). Such critical signs usually serve to indicate that letters or words should be deleted. In this particular case, however, I would tend to interpret them as critical signs indicating that the marked articles were absent in the text the scribe was collating. The following text is the result (supplements are underlined, dotted words in double square brackets]):

ζῆλος καὶ ζηλοτυπία διαφέρει· ζηλοτυπία μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν μίσει ὑπάρχον, ζῆλος δὲ [[ἡ]] μίμησις [[τοῦ]] καλοῦ οἷον ζηλοῖ τὸν καθηγητὴν ὁ παῖς· 'ζηλοῖ δὲ τε γείτονα γείτων' ἐπὶ καλοῦ· ζηλοτυπεῖ δὲ ἡ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα.

zeal (*zēlos*) and jealousy (*zēlotypía*) have different meanings: for jealousy consists of hate, zeal is [[the]] imitation of [[the]] good, such as 'the pupil emulates the master'. 'And the neighbour competes with the neighbour' for what is good. 'Some woman is jealous of some man'.<sup>62</sup>

The scribe therefore intended to update the first layer by adding further information that would later assist in producing a new manuscript featuring a 'final version' of the lexicon.

This intention is also visible in many other entries in which the same scribe who wrote the main text inserted a cross-reference after the colon which usually marks the end of the item. Let us take the short entry on ζωγράφος (*zōgráphos*), 'painter':<sup>63</sup> after the explanation of the meaning 'he who paints by imitating living beings (*zōa*)', the scribe added 'and see below at the entry "historiographer" (*ιστοριογράφος*, *historiográphos*)'. In fact, we find this entry later in the manuscript on fol. 93<sup>v</sup>, ll. 22–25. In it, there is a similar but not identical definition of the term 'painter': 'he who paints images of living beings'.<sup>64</sup> When copying the entries beginning with the letter *iota*, the scribe noticed the similarity of

<sup>62</sup> The source text shows a little difference: 'somebody else' (τὸν δεῖνα) vs. 'this man' (τόνδε). This change may be regarded as intentional, in order to make the syntactic construction clearer, or as a mistake (τὸν δεῖνα => τόνδε).

<sup>63</sup> Fol. 76<sup>r</sup>, main text, l. 4 from below: ζωγράφος· (another hand adds here the particle διὰ) ζῶα μιμούμενος γράφει (the same scribe of the main text corrected the verb into the infinitive form γράφειν and added after the colon the words καὶ εἰς τὸ ιστοριογράφος). Text also in Sturz 1818, 233.28–29.

<sup>64</sup> Text also in Sturz 1818, 283.55: (...) ζωγράφος δὲ ὁ ζῶων εἰκόνας γράφων.

the definitions and referred back to the already copied entry in the letter *zeta* where he then added a cross-reference to the entry ‘historiographer’ in order to guide the readers through the meanders of the lexicon.

The practices described provide evidence for the continuous scholarly activity performed on this manuscript by a group of scholars who worked together and with access to a number of lexicographic and literary manuscripts. These manuscripts served as a source-texts for producing a new scholarly work that would have been useful for their own cultural interests.<sup>65</sup>

The *Barberinianus* is only a snapshot of a more complex intellectual operation. More generally, this manuscript allows us to enter a medieval scholarly workshop and to understand how intellectual procedures for creating originals were performed within the boundaries of a concrete and multi-layered written artefact.

### Acknowledgements

This paper was conceived within the framework of the project *Etymologica. Ordnung und Interpretation des Wissens in griechisch-byzantinischen Lexika bis in die Renaissance* under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Hamburg with funding from the Academies Programme at the University of Hamburg. It presents some preliminary results from the ongoing researches.

I thank Christian Brockmann, Daniel Deckers, Alessandro Musino and Eva Wöckener-Gade for their useful comments on a first draft of this paper.

## References

- Alpers, Klaus (1975), Review of Daly 1967, *Gnomon*, 47: 113–117.
- Alpers, Klaus (1981), *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros. Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 4), Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Alpers, Klaus (2015), ‘Difficult problems in the transmission and interrelation of the Greek etymologica’, in Georgios A. Xenis (ed.), *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History. Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 293–314.
- Arnesano, Daniele and Elisabetta Sciarra (2010), ‘Libri e testi di scuola in Terra d’Otranto’, in Lucio Del Corso and Oronzo Pecere (eds), *Libri di scuola e pratiche didattiche. Dall’Antichità al Rinascimento*, Cassino: Edizioni dell’Università degli Studi di Cassino, 425–473.
- Billerbeck, Margarethe and Arlette Neumann-Hartmann (2017), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnika*, V, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Capocci, Valentino (1958), *Codices Barberiniani Graeci*, I: *Codices 1–163*, Vatican City: In Bibliotheca Vaticana.

---

<sup>65</sup> See also Sciarra 2005, 363.

- Cellerini, Alberto (1988), *Introduzione all'Etymologicum Gudianum* (Bollettino dei Classici, Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Supplemento, 6), Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Considine, John (2019), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daly, Lloyd W. (1967), *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Collection Latomus, 90), Brussels: Latomus.
- De Stefani, Edoardo Luigi (ed.) (1909–1920), *Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur*, 2 vols (α–ζεῖα), Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ferri, Rolando (2019), 'The Greco-Roman World', in Considine (ed.) 2019, 84–105.
- Gaul, Niels (2008) 'Moschopulos, Lopadiotes, Phrankopulos (?), Magistros, Staphidakes: Prosopographisches und Methodologisches zur Lexikographie des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts', in Eric Trapp and Sonja Schönauer (eds), *Lexicologica Byzantina. Beiträge zum Kolloquium zur byzantinischen Lexikographie. Bonn, 13.–15. Juli 2007* (Super alta perennis. Studien zur Wirkung der Klassischen Antike, 4), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht / Bonn: Bonn University Press, 163–196.
- Ippolito, Antonella (2008), 'Orion', in Franco Montanari, Fausto Montana and Lara Pagani (eds), *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, now Brill's *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278\\_Orion\\_it](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Orion_it)> [online since 2015].
- Kleist, Heinrich (1865), *De Philoxeni grammatici Alexandrini studiis etymologicis*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Maleci, Stefano (1995), *Il codice Barberinianus Graecus 70 dell'Etymologicum Gudianum* (Bollettino dei Classici, Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Supplemento, 15), Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Matthaios, Stephanos (2015): 'Philology and Grammar in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity. An Historical and Systematic Outline', in Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos (eds) 2015, 184–296.
- Mercati, Giovanni and Pio Franchi de' Cavalieri (1923), *Codices Vaticani Graeci, I: Codices 1–329*, Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis.
- Montanari, Franco, Stephanos Matthaios and Antonio Rengakos (eds) (2015), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden: Brill.
- Müller, Georg (1903), 'Dindorf, Karl Wilhelm', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 47: 705–707 (<[daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008405/image\\_707](http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008405/image_707)>, accessed on 24 Feb. 2021).
- Musino, Alessandro and Stefano Valente (2021), 'On some manuscripts of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*: Par. gr. 2630 and Vind. phil. gr. 23; Matrit. 4559 and 4645', *Scripta. An International Journal of Codicology and Palaeography*, 14 (forthcoming).
- Neumann-Hartmann, Arlette (2014), 'Die *Ethnika* des Stephanos von Byzanz im Lichte von Querverweisen in der Epitome seines Werkes', *Eikasmos*, 25: 263–290.
- Nickau, Klaus (ed.) (1966), *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig: Teubner.
- Palmieri, Vincenzo (1987), 'Il lessico di sinonimi greci nel cod. Vat. Barb. gr. 70', *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana*, n.s. 36: 27–92.
- Palmieri, Vincenzo (ed.) (1988), *Herennius Philo. De diversiis verborum significationibus*, Naples: M. D'Auria.
- Reitzenstein, Richard (1897), *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologica. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Reitzenstein, Richard (1907), 'Etymologica', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VI/1, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 807–817.



- Ronconi, Filippo (2012), 'Quelle grammaire à Byzance? La circulation des textes grammaticaux et son reflet dans les manuscrits', in Giuseppe De Gregorio and Maria Galante (eds), *La produzione scritta tecnica e scientifica nel Medioevo: libro e documento tra scuole e professioni*, Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sul Medioevo, 63–110.
- Sciarra, Elisabetta (2005), 'Note sul codice Vat. Barb. gr. 70 e sulla tradizione manoscritta dell'*Etymologicum Gudianum*', in Rosa Maria Piccione and Matthias Perkams (eds), *Selecta colligere, II: Beiträge zur Technik des Sammelns und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zum Humanismus*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 355–402.
- Sluiter, Ineke (2015), 'Ancient etymology: a tool for thinking', in Montanari, Matthaïos and Rengakos (eds), 896–922.
- Stray, Christopher (2019a), 'A note on the History of the Lexicon', in Stray, Clarke and Katz (2019), xvii–xviii.
- Stray, Christopher (2019b), '*Liddell and Scott* in Historical Context. Victorian Beginnings, Twentieth-Century Developments', in Stray, Clarke and Katz (2019), 3–24.
- Stray, Christopher, Michael Clarke and Joshua T. Katz (eds) (2019), *Liddell and Scott. The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sturz, Friedrich Wilhelm (ed.) (1818), *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita (...)*, Leipzig: J.A.G. Weigel.
- Theodoridis, Christos (ed.) (1976), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 2), Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Theodoridis, Christos (ed.) (1998), *Photii Patriarchae lexicon, II: E–M*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ucciardello, Giuseppe (2007), 'Nuovi frammenti di oratori attici nel Vat. gr. 7', *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, 14: 431–482.
- Ucciardello, Giuseppe (2013), 'Il "lessico retorico" di Eudemo di Argo e alcuni frammenti inediti di Lisia e Iperide nei *marginalia* del Vat. gr. 7', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 71: 9–44.
- Ucciardello, Giuseppe (2017), '1523. Guarini Favorini Magnum Dictionarium Graecum', in Concetta Bianca, Saulo Delle Donne, Luigi Ferreri and Anna Gaspari (eds), *Le prime edizioni greche a Roma (1510–1526)*, Turnhout: Brepols, 171–204.
- Ucciardello, Giuseppe (2021), 'A Fragment of the oldest manuscript of the Suda', *Eikasmós. Quaderni bolognesi di filologia classica*, 32 (forthcoming).
- Valente, Stefano (2014), 'Alphabetical Dictionaries: From Antiquity to the Byzantine Period', in Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, I, Leiden: Brill, 100–103.
- Valente, Stefano (2017), 'Old and New Lexica in Palaeologan Byzantium', in Andrea M. Cuomo and Erich Trapp (eds), *Toward a Historical Sociolinguistic Poetics of Medieval Greek*, Turnhout: Brepols, 45–55.
- Valente, Stefano (2019), 'Byzantine Greek Lexicography', in Considine (ed.) 2019, 247–266.
- van der Valk, Marchinus (1971), *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi*, I, Leiden: Brill.
- Wendel, Carl (1939), 'Orion [3]', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, XVIII/1, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1083–1087.
- West, Martin L. (ed.) (1978), *Hesiod. Works and Days, ed. with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wilson, Nigel (1969), 'From Alpha to Omega (review of Daly 1967)', *The Classical Review*, 19: 365–366.

