

**THE ETYMOLOGICAL LEXICON  
IN COD. AMBROSIANUS C 222 INF., f. 209v:  
A NEW WITNESS OF THE *ETYMOLOGICUM GUDIANUM***

**STEFANO VALENTE**

Byzantine Greek manuscripts often transmit anonymous short lexica or excerpts derived from broader compilations created according to the interests of their compilers. Occasionally, identifying the source of one of such lexica can provide valuable insights into the transmission and creation of knowledge in the Greek Middle Ages.

This is the case of the manuscript *Ambrosianus C 222 inf.* It is a complex codex, probably dating from the years 1180–1186 and produced in Constantinople within the circle of John Tzetzes, as Carlo Maria Mazzucchi suggested.<sup>1</sup> This extensively studied manuscript transmits, among others, works by Aeschylus,

---

\* I have studied the *Ambr. C 222 inf.* and its relationship with the *Etymologicum Gudianum* within the long-term project *Etymologika. Ordnung und Interpretation des Wissens in griechisch-byzantinischen Lexika bis in die Renaissance. Digitale Erschließung von Manuskriptproduktion, Nutzerkreisen und kulturellem Umfeld* under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Hamburg with funding from the Academies' Programme (Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities) at the University of Hamburg. This paper have been finalised within the project *LexMan – Collecting, Reshaping and Transmitting Knowledge in Greek and Byzantine Lexicographic Manuscripts* (Ricerca Scientifica di Ateneo 2024, University of Rome Tor Vergata). I thank Eva Wöckener-Gade and Alessandro Musino for their valuable notes on a previous version of this paper. – I use the standard *sigla* for the manuscripts of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*: **a** (*Par. gr.* 2630), **b** (*Par. gr.* 2631), **d** (*Vat. Barb. gr.* 70), **e** (*Petropol. gr.* 114 + *Sinait. gr.* 1201 + *Sinait.* NE gr. M 186), **j** (*Vat. gr.* 1708), **z** (*Par. suppl. gr.* 172).

1 The bibliography concerning this codex is quite extensive: see, among others, K. ALPERS, *Theognostos Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας. Überlieferung, Quellen und Text der Kanones 1–84*. Diss. Hamburg 1964, 10; C.M. MAZZUCCHI, *Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore*. *Aevum* 77 (2003) 263-275; ID., *Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore*. *Aevum* 78 (2004) 411-440; C. NUOVO, *Un 'nuovo' trattato de soloecismo et barbarismo (Ambr. C 222 inf., f. 212<sup>v</sup>)*. *Aevum* 98 (2024) 391-412: 393-394 with previous bibliography. Additional references can be found on Pinakes (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/42485/>). A complete digitisation of the manuscript is available at <https://ambrosiana.comperio.it/opac/detail/view/ambro:catalog:31695> (last accessed: 09/05/2025).

Pindar, Aristophanes, Lycophron, Theognostus, and several shorter grammatical and lexicographical texts.

Among these, a short anonymous lexicon is preserved on f. 209v, lines 7–28, titled ἐτυμολογικὸν κατὰ στοιχεῖον and consisting of 70 entries. Following the detailed analysis by Eva Villani in 2007,<sup>2</sup> a renewed investigation reveals that the text is a brief excerpt from the *Etymologicum Gudianum*. All entries in this excerpt occur in the cod. *Vaticanus Barberinianus* gr. 70 (**d**), the original manuscript of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*,<sup>3</sup> or in its apographs, when **d** is defective.<sup>4</sup>

Generally, the entries in *Ambrosianus* C 222 inf. are significantly shortened. For example:<sup>5</sup>

<p>ζ 43 ζῆθι· κατὰ ἔκτασίν ἐστιν ἡ ‘θι’          συλλαβή· ἔστι γὰρ ἄω, τὸ πνέω, καί          μετὰ τοῦ ‘ζα’ ζάω, ζᾶ καὶ κατὰ κρᾶσιν          Δωρικὴν τοῦ ‘α’ εἰς ‘η’ ζῆ κτλ. <b>d</b></p>	<p>ζῆθι· ἐκ τοῦ ζῆ καὶ ἐπεκτάσει τῆς ‘θι’.          τὸ δὲ ζάω ἐκ τοῦ ἄω, τὸ πνέω. <i>Ambr.</i>          C 222 inf.</p>
--	--

Regarding its affiliation, *Ambr.* C 222 inf. displays some separative errors against the other apographs of **d**, but cannot be a copy of any extant manuscript. For instance, consider the following examples:<sup>6</sup>

- 
- 2 E. VILLANI, Un lessico etimologico bizantino (*Ambr.* C 222 inf., f. 209v). *Aevum* 81 (2007) 405-427 studied and published the text in its entirety. However, she did not acknowledge that it is an excerpt of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*. The *apparatus fontium* reflects her misunderstanding of the nature of the text.
- 3 See, among others, R. REITZENSTEIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz. Leipzig 1897, 91-103; V. CAPOCCI, *Codices Barberiniani Graeci*, I. Codices 1-163. Vatican City: In Bibliotheca Vaticana 1958, 77-78; S. MALECI, Il codice Barberiniano Graecus 70 dell’*Etymologicum Gudianum* (*Bollettino dei Classici, Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Supplemento*, 15). Roma 1995; E. SCIARRA, Note sul codice Vat. Barb. gr. 70 e sulla tradizione manoscritta dell’*Etymologicum Gudianum*, in: R.M. PICCIONE – M. PERKAMS (eds), *Selecta colligere*, II. Beiträge zur Technik des Sammeln und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zum Humanismus. Alessandria 2005, 355-402: 359-363. See also the bibliography listed on Pinakes (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/64618/>).
- 4 In her *apparatus fontium*, VILLANI, Un lessico (see n. 2) does not identify the following entries as coming from *Et. Gud.* (in bracket, the correspondence in **d** or in some of its apographs): ο 2 (in **d**, f. 104v), σ 3 (in **a z**), σ 6 (in **a z**), υ 1 (in **d**, f. 132r), υ 2 (in **d**, f. 132r), υ 4 (in **d**, f. 136v).
- 5 For the sake of brevity, I will only mention the most relevant examples, selecting them from my complete collation of the text. The critical text with commentary can be read in the digital edition of the *Etymologika* project (<https://zeta.etymologika.uni-hamburg.de/webapp>).
- 6 Manuscripts of the *Etymologicum Gudianum* dating after the 12th century will not be considered for the present investigation, as they are later than *Ambr.* C 222 inf. and thus

- 17,2 De Stefani] gl. praeb. **d aj** *Ambr.* C 222 inf. (s.v. ἀγρός) : om. **z** | ἀροτριῶ  
 ἄρος **a** (in lac. **d**) : ἀρόσω *Ambr.* C 222 inf. : om. **j**  
 30,6 De Stefani] ἦδω **aj** *Ambr.* C 222 inf. : εἶδω **z**  
 64,10 De Stefani] ἀκηδιῶ **d j** *Ambr.* C 222 inf. : ἀηδῶ **a z**  
 180,7 De Stefani] εἶω **d j<sup>pc</sup> z** : οἶω **a** : ἴω **j<sup>ac</sup>** (ut vid.) : ὤς **b** : εἶμι *Ambr.* C 222 inf.  
 266,10 De Stefani] τοῦ τόπου **d abej z** : ποταμοῦ *Ambr.* C 222 inf.  
 272,11 De Stefani] ἐπιάσθησαν **abej z** : κρατηθῆναι *Ambr.* C 222 inf.  
 507,33 Sturz] Σελαμῶν **d z** *Ambr.* C 222 inf. : Σελομῶν **d<sup>1</sup>** (o sscr.) **abej**

Therefore, the excerpt in *Ambr.* C 222 inf. derives from **d**, either directly or via a lost intermediate exemplar.

In a few cases, this 12th-century manuscript helps in reconstructing the missing parts of **d**. For example, *Ambr.* C 222 inf. preserves the entry ἄημα· ἐκ τοῦ ἄω, τὸ πνέω, ἀήσω, which is missing not only in **d** (due to material loss) but also in **abej**. De Stefani printed it *in petit* as it is only preserved in **z** (30,20 De St.): ἄημα· σημαίνει τὸ πνεῦμα· γέγονε δὲ παρὰ τὸ <ἄω, τὸ> πνέω, ὁ μέλλον ἀήσω, ὁ παρακείμενος ἄημα, ὁ παθητικὸς ἄημα, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἄημα.<sup>7</sup> However, there is a cross-reference to this lemma in the core text of **d** (*Et. Gud.* 255,13 De St.: ἄω· εἰς τὸ ἄημα κτλ.).<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the entry ἄημα was likely part of the core text of **d**.

In some instances, the correct readings in *Ambr.* C 222 inf. against **d** can be explained as conjectures, probably based on the text of neighbouring entries in **d** itself, such as:

- 391,14 De St.] βραγχιάζω *Ambr.* C 222 inf. (fort. ex 391,13 βρογχιάζω vel 391,14 βραγχιάσω), suppl. De St. coll. Choer. Epim. Ps. 155,18 et Et. Parv. ε 29<sup>9</sup> : non habet **d**  
 520,8 De St.] ἐρευνῶ· ἐκ τοῦ ἐρέω, τὸ ζητῶ, ἐρευνῶ πλεονασμῶ τοῦ ‘υ’ καὶ ‘ν’ κτλ.  
**d** : ἐρευνῶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐρῶ εὔ τῶ νῶ *Ambr.* C 222 inf. (εὔ τῶ νῶ may be an etymological explanation based on the verb ἐρευνῶ in the *interpretamentum*)  
 526,32–33 Sturz] τερθρεία **abej z** : τερθρεία φλυαρία *Ambr.* C 222 inf. (the supplemented synonym seems to be an adaptation of the previous τὸ φλυαρεῖν in the same *interpretamentum*)

---

cannot be relevant for assessing its affiliation.

- 7 Interestingly, *Ambr.* C 222 inf. may confirm De Stefani's supplement <ἄω, τὸ>. However, it cannot be excluded that the producer of this excerpt took ἐκ τοῦ ἄω from another entry: *Et. Gud.* 30,10 or 30,23 De Stefani  
 8 See also *Et. Gud.* 30,9 De Stefani  
 9 I would exclude a collation of one of these lexica in this single occasion. By the way, *Ambr.* C 222 inf. (along with **d**) shows separative errors against *Et. Parv.* β 13 Pintaudi in *Et. Gud.* 272,7 De Stefani.

More generally, the criteria used for selecting the materials from the *Etymologicum Gudianum* are difficult to determine. Since the excerpted entries within each alphabetic section neither follow the alphabetic order nor appear in the same sequence in any surviving manuscript, it seems safer to suggest that the selection was made somewhat arbitrarily while reading the lexicon.<sup>10</sup> The interests of the anonymous scholar influenced the choices made.<sup>11</sup>

All in all, this etymological excerpt in *Ambr. C 222 inf.* does not come from any of the apographs descending from the original manuscript **d**. Its value especially lies in preserving entries that are now missing in **d** due to material damage. More importantly, *Ambr. C 222 inf.* also confirms the circulation of a manuscript of the *Etymologicum Gudianum* in the central part of the Byzantine empire during the 12th century. It may be no coincidence that the *Etymologicum Magnum* was likely produced around the same time and in the same geographical area using both the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum Gudianum* as two main sources, among others.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, this excerpt in *Ambr. C 222 inf.* may be linked to the manuscript used by the producer(s) of the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

*Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata*

10 Interestingly, the third entry in the alphabetic section delta reads: χορδή· παρὰ τὸ χωρεῖν τὴν ἐδωδὴν. Apparently, it is misplaced, but it comes from *Et. Gud.* 343,5-7 De Stefani δεκαχόρδω· παρὰ τὸν δέκα ἀριθμὸν καὶ τὸ χορδή. τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ χέω τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ κενοῦν χεορδή καὶ χορδή, τὸ χέον ᾠδὴν· ἢ παρὰ τὸ χωρεῖν τὴν ἐδωδὴν, ὃ σημαίνει τὴν τροφήν. Conversely, the next item in *Ambr. C 222 inf.* δίνη· ἐκ τοῦ ἴω τὸ πορευόμεαι comes from an entry in section epsilon: *Et. Gud.* 553,1 De Stefani εὐδίνητον· σημαίνει τὸ εὐστροφον (...): δίνη δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἴω, τὸ πορευόμεαι, ἴνη καὶ δίνη κτλ.

11 In one instance, we find an interesting remark by the compiler: at the end of the entry taken from *Et. Gud.* 298,7-11 De Stefani γαστίμαργος· Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ Περὶ ζώων (fr. 361 Rosen<sup>2</sup> = 292 Gigon) μέμνηται τούτου, λέγων εἶναι ζῶον μάργον γεννώμενον ἀπὸ σήψεως μεταξὺ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος. καὶ ζῆται τὸ ὅλον ἐκεῖ, the final note ‘and look for the whole passage there’ (καὶ ζῆται τὸ ὅλον ἐκεῖ) appears to advise the reader to locate and consult the entire passage within the treatise of Aristotle cited.

12 See e.g. REITZENSTEIN, *Geschichte* (see n. 3), 241-243; ID., *Etymologika*. *RE VI/1* (1907) 807-817: 816; K. ALPERS, *Difficult problems in the transmission and interrelation of the Greek etymologica*, in: G.A. XENIS (ed.), *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History. Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos*. Stuttgart 2015, 293-314: 295, 303-306 (= K. ALPERS, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Die griechischen Etymologika*, ed. by S. VALENTE – A. MUSINO. Göttingen 2025, 161-187); S. VALENTE, *Byzantine Greek [Lexicography]*, in: J. CONSIDINE (ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography*. Cambridge 2019, 247-266: 259-260.

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines a short anonymous etymological lexicon preserved in ms. *Ambr.* C 222 inf., f. 209v, demonstrating its origin as a selective excerpt from the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, not related to other known copies of the original manuscript, *Vat. Barb. gr.* 70. This manuscript witnesses the circulation of the *Etymologicum Gudianum* in the central part of the Byzantine empire during the 12th century.

