The υ-Recension of St. Cyril’s Lexicon

† MARK NAOUMIDES

It has become an axiom of modern scholarship that a thorough investigation into the history of the transmission is a necessary prerequisite for a truly critical edition of a text. The present study will, it is hoped, illustrate this point adequately. For although A. B. Drachmann’s Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars\(^1\) was a pioneer work for the manuscript tradition of St. Cyril’s Lexicon, it fell short of the basic goal of any such study: that of determining as closely as possible the history of the transmission and of setting forth, as clearly and indisputably as possible, the method of a future edition. Drachmann’s work suffers primarily from his predilection for old manuscripts\(^2\) and arbitrary elimination of many good witnesses of the tradition; from lack of clear and rigorous criteria in determining relationship of mss., families, and recensions; and to a lesser degree from an apparent hopelessness, shared by many others before and after him, when confronted with the almost infinite variations which the mss. present. It is hoped that the present study, a part of a general investigation into all known mss. of the Lexicon, will afford a better and more secure basis for the solution of the problem of relationship of the mss., and eventually of the extant recensions. The conclusions arrived at are based on (a) an exhaustive codicological study of all the witnesses of our tradition, however late; and (b) a minute analysis of Stichproben taken from three different parts of the Lexicon (θ, ξ, χ). Because of space limitations, some details have been deliberately omitted. I reserve them for my forthcoming study of the entire tradition.

---

\(^{1}\) Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. XXI.5 (Copenhagen, 1936), henceforth referred to simply as Drachmann.

\(^{2}\) Drachmann also had the tendency to misdate some of his mss. Thus he assigned F to the X s. and J (dated in the year 1317) to the XI–XII s. Conversely he dated S (a ms. written ca. 1000) in the XIII s.
LIST OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE RECENSION

B = Vatican, Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, gr. 2130. Vellum, 276 (-280) × 216 mm., vii + 285 fols. Early XII s. Contents a*-d*, description of contents by Jo. Pastritiuss in 1694; f-g, two letters (dated 6 and 27 April 1688) on the sale of the ms. by a certain Antonio Bulifone to Mons. Giovanni Ciampini; 6 i*-154f, St. Cyril's lexicon; 154f-, 218*, 236*-256*, minor lexica; 7 219*-236*, metrologica; 256-278*, 282*-285*, Theodosius Grammaticus, Commentary on canons (hymns); 8 279f-282*, treatise on breathing marks. The codex


4 The last seven folios (paper, XV s.) were added to replace the missing end of the volume. Two folios are missing from the main body of the ms., one after fol. 7 (the last of quire a, replaced with a seemingly blank vellum leaf), and one between 199-200 (the last of quire κέ). The last two quires have been bound in reverse order and some of their leaves are misplaced, the proper order being 261-263, 272-276, 264, 277, 278, 265-271.

5 Giov. Pastrizio († 1708), Theology Lecturer in the Collegio Urbano de Propaganda Fide. Autobiographical notes and lists of his books have been preserved in the following ms. of the Vatican Library: Borg. lat. 62, 475, 480, 746.


7 On these minor lexica which in our mss. commonly follow St. Cyril's Lexicon cf. Drachmann, 53-58. See also my edition of the ‘Ῥητορικά Λέξεις (above, note 3), 26 f.

bears numerous marginal notes in the Sicilian dialect, but written in Greek characters, which together with the inclusion among the lexica minora of a lexicon to the life of St. Elias the Younger, testify to the S. Italian—Sicilian origin of this ms. Fols. 1 and 285 bear the *ex-libris* of Jerónimo Zurita. Schow and Schmidt refer to it as “codex Caitani Marini”. For pertinent bibliography cf. Canart-Peri, 687; Naoumides, “Symmeikta,” 374; *Rhet. Lex.*, 9–11.

**Ba** = Eton College, cod. 86 (formerly Bk. 6.13; cf. James, p. 29). Paper, 270 × 197 mm., ii + 97 fols. (unnumbered). Contents: St. Cyril’s lexicon. According to a note on one of the fly leaves this codex was copied in 1689 (not in 1679, as James has it), “ex codice ms. in Bibliotheca I II et Rev. D(omi)ni Joannis Ciampini Romae . . .” An even cursory comparison with B plainly confirms this. It is noteworthy that the original fol. 8 was already missing from B when the copy was made. The ms. once belonged to E. Betham who donated it to Eton College in 1775.

**C** = Grottaferrata, ms. Z. a, XXX (Rocchi, 458–459). Vellum of very poor quality, 200 × 160 mm., 115 fols. Early XII s. Contents: 1–70, St. Cyril’s lexicon with the beginning missing; 70–end, minor lexica and metrologica, as in B. Illumination and extensive

---


12 I am grateful to Mr. P. L. Strong, Keeper of the Eton College Library and Collections, for sending me a copy of the above note and for informing me that the donor’s note is by the hand of Betham himself.

13 Fols. 2 and 3 have erroneously been bound there in place of some of the missing leaves of the quire, which was the second of the original volume. One folio is missing between fols. 38–39, with the beginning of the λ-section. Only one folio remains from the last preserved quire. Fols. 96–38 have been bound upside down and in reverse order.

14 Rocchi erroneously dated the ms. in the year 991. On the date of the VI archetype cf. below.


**G** = Cephallenia, *Movirs Ay. Περασιμού*, No. 3 (Lambros, 389). Vellum, 230 × 188 (–190) mm., 106 fol.16 Early XII s., by a hand closely resembling that of F and H. Contents: 1r–75v, St. Cyril’s lexicon with the beginning missing; 75r–end, minor lexica. In the margins and the last two fol. there are several signatures, some of whom at least may have been past owners or may have been affiliated with monasteries which possessed the ms. Some of the surnames are clearly Cephallenian. Bibliography: Drachmann, 8 f.; Benediktsson, 247; Naoumides, “Symmeikta,” 374; *Rhet. Lex.*, 12.


---

15 The first and last folios of quire 1 are missing. Also one folio between 54–55, another between 60–61 (the first and last of quire 7); two between 139–140 (the last of quire 7 and the first of 8), four between 140–141 (i.e., from the middle of quire 8), eight between 149–150 (the last of 8 and the first seven of 9), four between 152–153 (middle of 9), one between 162–163, and another between 168–169 (first and last of 10). The last preserved quire (10) has at present only three fol. but no visible lacuna.

16 The first three quires and an undetermined number from the end are missing. The last two fol. are mere fly leaves.
fols.\textsuperscript{17} Written between 1100 and 1123,\textsuperscript{18} possibly διὰ χειρός K\nu (στε)ντ (ύου) πρεσομβυτέρου (cf. fol. 230\textsuperscript{v}).\textsuperscript{19} Contents: 1\textsuperscript{r}–118\textsuperscript{v}, St. Cyril's lexicon; 119\textsuperscript{r}–183\textsuperscript{v}, 184\textsuperscript{r}–196\textsuperscript{v}, 225\textsuperscript{r}–230\textsuperscript{r} minor lexica and metrologica; 184\textsuperscript{r}–v, Easter Tables (1355–1408); 196\textsuperscript{v}–225\textsuperscript{r}, Theodosius, Commentary on the canons (cf. above, B); 230\textsuperscript{v}–231\textsuperscript{r}, Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer; 232\textsuperscript{r}–end, Easter Tables of 1499–1492, written by a XIV s. hand. Former owners: A. E. Seidel, Thomas W. Coke, Earl of Leicester, and his heirs. Bibliography: W. Roscoe, "Some Account of the Manuscript Library at Holkham, in Norfolk . . .", \textit{Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature} 2, 1834, 362 f.; R. Förster, "Handschriften in Holkham," \textit{Philologus}, 42, 1884, 161; H. Schenkl, \textit{Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica} ("Sitzb. Akad. Wien, Philos.–hist. Classe," 133.7), 80; C. W. James, "Some Notes Upon the Manuscript Library at Holkham," \textit{The Library}, Fourth Series, 2, 1921–1922, 225 f.; Drachmann, 8; Benediktsson, 247; M. Naoumides, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 17), "Symmeikta," 374; \textit{Rhet. Lex.}, 12 f.

I =

Mt. Athos, \textit{Μ. Μεγίστη Αλήφας} 74 (Spyridon Lavriotes–Eustratiades, p. 229, No. 1361). Paper, 26 × 17 cm., 238 fols., XVII s. Contents: 1\textsuperscript{r}–127\textsuperscript{v}, St. Cyril's lexicon; 128\textsuperscript{r}–180\textsuperscript{v}, grammaticalia; 181\textsuperscript{r}–end, minor lexica.

J =

Rome, Bibl. Vallicelliana, E 37 (Martini, II, 113–116, No. 71). The volume consists of three separate parts (1–91,\textsuperscript{20} 92–127, 128–153), of which only the first part interests us here. Paper (Western), 290 x 215 mm.\textsuperscript{21} Written διὰ χειρός ... πέτρου τουσκάν(ο)υ in 1317 (cf. fol. 91\textsuperscript{v}). Contents: 1\textsuperscript{r}–66\textsuperscript{v}, St. Cyril's lexicon; 66\textsuperscript{r}–89\textsuperscript{v}, 91\textsuperscript{r}, minor lexica; 90\textsuperscript{r}–91\textsuperscript{r} dodecasyllables attributed to St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Isidore, Arsenius. For Bibliography cf. A. Turyn, \textit{Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy} (Urbana, Illinois, 1972), pp. 129 f. and Pl. 101; Naoumides, \textit{Rhet. Lex.}, 15 f.  

\textsuperscript{17} Four leaves have been cut off between fols. 183–184 containing, as it appears, Easter Tables to the year 6862 (= 1354); cf. my article "The Date, Scribe and Provenience of Cod. Holkham Gr. 112 (olim 298)", \textit{Scriptorium} 28, 1974, 65–68.

\textsuperscript{18} I.e., between the date of the archetype and that of F, an apographe of H (cf. below).

\textsuperscript{19} Miss Barbour, however, considers fols. 229–230 as written by another hand. In my opinion the difference in appearance between the two "hands" is due to the poor quality of the vellum of fols. 229–230 and to the fact that they are badly wrinkled. See also my article cited above (note 17).

\textsuperscript{20} Actually 92, since there are two folios numbered 5 (i.e., 5 and 5\textsuperscript{bis}).

\textsuperscript{21} Some leaves of quire \varepsilon have been bound in wrong order, the proper order being 32, 34, 35, 33, 38, 36, 37, 39.
K = Paris, Bibl. Nat., suppl. grec 1146 (Omont, III, 387; Astruc—Concasty, 294—296). Paper, 199 × 145 mm., 189 fols. Written in Jerusalem in 1562 (cf. fol. 175r). Contents: 1r—v, didactic verses mixed with prose in vulgar Greek, written by a XVII s. hand (probably that of Christopher Stro gia, according to Concasty); 2r—34r, ἐπιμνησία of three canons by St. John of Damascus; 35r—81r, minor lexica; 82r—175r, St. Cyril's lexicon; 23 175r—181r, Dionysius Thrax, Ars grammatica; 182r—187r, lexicographical excerpts. Former owners: Hieromonk Dionysius, hieromonk Christopher Stro gia of Corfou (cf. fol. 26v), the deacon Daniel, son of Nicholas, also of Corfou (fol. 188r), hieromonk Dionysius of Crete (1782; cf. fol. 187v). It was bought by Al. Sorlin Dorigny from the book-dealer Rigopoulos at Constantinople in 1894 (cf. fol. 26v). Bibliography: Naoumides, Rhet., Lex., 14.

Ka = Bucharest, Bibl. Akadem. Romane, gr. 612 (Litzica, 305). Paper, 21 × 15 cm., 225 fols. Written in the monastery of St. Anastasia near Sozopolis (Sozopol) by the priest Gabriel on 18 December, 1625 (cf. fol. 219v). Contents: 1r—v, 226r—225v and passim, Greek—Rumanian lexicon; 2r—9r, Disticha Catonis translated by M. Planudes; 10r—18r, Pseudo-Phocylidea; 18r—48r, Hesiod, Erga with interlinear and marginal interpretation; 49r—77r, Aphthonius, Progymnasmata; 82r—217r, St. Cyril's lexicon with the same beginning as in K; 25 217r—219r, lexicon of plants. On some pages, left blank by the original scribe, a later hand wrote a poem in political verse.


22 One folio is missing between 49—50 and another between 55—56. The next-to-last quire is complete but the text clearly continued beyond. The last quire is written by a different hand on paper with different watermarks from the rest of the volume and comes from another ms.

23 The Lexicon begins with the introductory note Δει εἰδέναι found in Hesychius and Par. gr. 2655 and other ms. (cf. Drachmann, 17—18, Latte, xiii). This admonition is a feature of the first family of the shorter version of Pseudo-Zonaras' Lexicon; cf. my article, cited below, on ms. Q. The interpolation is limited to the beginning of the Lexicon.

24 The scribe's name written as a monogram in a dodecasyllabic line at the end of the subscription: ιθ(ε)οὐ τοῦ δῶμου Γαβρηλ θ(θ)ρ(ου) π(δ)ν(os), was overlooked by Litzica.

25 The Lexicon was apparently written independently from the rest, since the quires containing it bear a separate numbering.

26 This note is confirmed by a letter written by the Marquis of Villeneuve, French

M = Vatican, Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, gr. 2164. Paper, 332 × 230 mm., iv + 126 fols. To judge from the watermarks (Briquet 492, 13888), the ms. was written probably in Italy, in the XVI s. Contents: 1r–73r, St. Cyril's lexicon; 74r–117r, voces hebraicae; 119r–v, metrologica. The ms. was one of the "codices Columnenses" sold in Rome in December, 1820. Bibliography: Drachman, 21; Canart–Peri, 689.


O = Paris, Bibl. Nat., suppl. grec 659 (Omont, III, 291 f.). This ms. consists of three parts (1–150, 151–169, 170–185) of which only the first interests us here. Vellum, 142 × 110 mm., XIII s.

ambassador in Constantinople, to the count of Maurepas, dated October 28, 1734; cf. H. Omont, Missions archéologiques françaises en Orient aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, II (Paris, 1902), 681–683. The Prince of Moldavia referred to is Constantine Maurokordatos, son of Nicholas Maurokordatos, Prince of Wallachia. For the attempts of the French to acquire the library of Nicholas and (after his death) Constantine M., see Omont, op. cit., passim.

27 Fols. 120–126 are blank. There are two folios numbered 117 (117a and 117b).


29 Probably a whole quire is missing from the beginning. In the midst of the δ-section (fol. 11r) a number of glosses beginning with κ appear. They properly belong to the Lexicon Octateuchii (fol. 79r), as the rubricator has rightly remarked in the margin. There was apparently a misplaced folio in N's exemplar.


Q = Sinai, Μονή Ἁγίας Αλκατερών gr. 1205 (Gardthausen, 249 f.). Paper, 154 x 105 mm., i + 377 fols. XIV s. Contents: 1r-278v, Ps.-Zonaras, Lexicon; 279r-282r, short lexicon; 282v-301v, St. Cyril’s lexicon (abbreviated); 301v-302r, brief excerpt from St. John of Damascus; 303r-310v, 325v-368v, minor lexica; 311r-325r, Commentary on canons of St. John of Damascus and Cosmas Maiuma; 369r-371r, Anacreontic poem by the emperor Leo VI with alphabetical acrostic; 371r-end, Agapetus Diaconus, Capita admonitoria (with the end missing). Bibliography: M. Naoumides, “The Shorter Version of Pseudo-Zonaras, Lexicon,” Serta Turyniana, Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in honor of Alexander Turyn, Urbana, U.I. Press, 1974, 487.

R = Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Gr. class. f. 114. Vellum, 165 x 137 mm., vii + 228 fols. 32 XI s. Contents: 1r-93v, St. Cyril’s lexicon with the beginning missing; 94r-154v, Homeric lexicon similar to the one found in SU and published in part by V. de Marco 33; 154v-end, minor lexica. In the lower margin of fol. 1r, illegible signature, apparently of a former owner. The ms. betrays


32 Fols. 215-228 are mere fly-leaves. The first two quires and the first leaf of quire Ϝ are missing. Also one leaf between fols. 6-7. The proper order of the folios from 199 to 214 is: 199, 208-213, 206, 207, 200-205, 214, i.e., the inside leaves of quires Ϝ, ϖ have been transposed mutually.


S = Selestat, Bibl. municipale, cod. 105 (Michelant, 593). Vellum, 170 × 135 (–140) mm., 183 fols. Written ca. 1000, probably in S. Italy. Contents: 3r–81v, St. Cyril’s lexicon; 81v–96v, 134r–158v 162r–169v, minor lexica; 97v–134r, Homeric lexicon; 159r–160v, Theodosius Grammaticus, Commentary on canons (with the end missing); 161r–v, grammatical fragment; 170r–end, Ps.-Nonnus, Interpretatio historiarum Gregorii Nazianzeni. In the upper margin of fol. 5r the familiar ex-libris of Beatus Rhenanus. A note written at the end of St. Cyril’s lexicon (fol. 81v) states that the ms. was corrected by J. Conan of Nuremberg at Padua in 1501. Bibliography: Drachmann, 15; V. de Marco, op. cit. (above, note 33), vii ff.; P. Adam, op. cit. (above, note 35), 112 f. and Plate viii; Pertusi, Leonzio Pilato, 483, and note 1; idem “Aspetti organizzativi,” 418 and n. 3; idem “Leonzio Pilato e la tradizione di cultura Italo-Greca,” Byzantino-Sicula, Quaderni, 2, Palermo, 1966, 77; Naoumides, Rhet. Lex., 15.


34 Fols. 1, 2, 183 are mere fly-leaves. Fols. 157–161 should be placed after fol. 169. Three folios are missing after 160, and at least one between 176–177.

35 “sum Beati Rhenani nec muto dominum. Basileae MDXIII.” This is therefore one of the mss. which he inherited from J. Conan, upon the latter’s death on 21 February 1513. On B. Rhenanus, his friendship with Conan, and his library, cf. P. Adam, L’humanisme à Sélestat (Sélestat, 1962) and the bibliography cited there.

36 One folio is missing between 1–2 and another between 5–6.
fols., XIV s. Contents: St. Cyril’s lexicon. Former owners: Hier. Chalcus (cf. fol. 1r) and George Merula38 (cf. fol. 1r). A partially-legible note written in red ink in fol. 88v attests that the ms. belonged to the monastery Τῆς υψηλῆς πέτρας. Bibliography: Drachmann, 19.


X = Mt. Athos, M. Βασιλείου, cod. 418 (Eustratiades–Arcadios, 81).

37 Single fols. are missing between 19–20, 41–42, 116–117, 191–192. Since there is no lacuna in the corresponding sections in Va, these fols. must have been lost after the copying of Va or its immediate ancestor.


39 There is no fol. 41, however. Fols. 142v–143r are left blank, apparently to indicate a lacuna in the exemplar. Another hand subsequently wrote the credo in Greek on 142v. The drawing of a bearded man with the title οὐκείον ἐπίσκοπος καὶν (?) καὶ αὐθεν(τῆς ?) fills the other blank page.

40 On Altaemps cf. C. Frati, op. cit. (above, note 11), 16 f.

41 With the new numbering of fols. Some fols. are missing between 478–479 and 574–575. Fols. 498, 588v, 592, 593, 598v, 599 are blank. Fols. 595v–598v are written by another hand.

42 This is the title of Ps.–Zonaras’ Lexicon. The ms. indeed has many marginalia from Ps.–Zonaras. On account of its title Tittmann (Joannis Zonarae Lexicon . . ., Leipzig, 1808, p. xli) listed it among the mss. of Ps.–Zonaras.
Vellum, 152 \times 115 \text{ mm.}, 63 fols.,\textsuperscript{43} XIII s. (X s., according to Eustratiadios). Contents: St. Cyril’s lexicon with the beginning and end missing.

\text{Y = Athens, Βυζ. Μουσείον, cod. 186 (Pallas, 77–79). The main part of the ms. (fols. 1, 44–45, 56–134, 147) was written on vellum in 1296–1297 and belongs to the g-recension. Fols. 2–43, 46–53 (containing the missing part of St. Cyril’s lexicon) were copied on paper from a ms. of the v-recension in the XVII s. The same hand also copied fols. 136–146. The ms. formerly belonged to the Monastery (of the Transfiguration) τοῦ Μητριωτοῦ (cf. fol. 2\textsuperscript{r}).}

\text{Z = Grottaferrata, Z. a, VI (Rocchi, 444). Vellum, 21 \times 16 \text{ cm.}, 42 fols.,\textsuperscript{44} XIII s. Contents: St. Cyril’s Lexicon with the beginning and end missing. In the right-hand margins a contemporary hand added further explanations. This ms. was in all probability written in S. Italy. Marginal notes in fol. 16\textsuperscript{r} and 32\textsuperscript{r} testify that it once belonged to the Monastery of St. Mary “del Patir”. Bibliography: A. Batiffol, L’ Abbaye de Rossano: Contribution à l’histoire de la Vaticane (Paris, 1891), 60; A. Rocchi, op. cit., 280; Pertusi, Leonzio Pilato, 484 and n.1; idem, “Aspetti organizzativi,” 419 and n.3; idem, “Leonzio Pilato,” 77.}

\text{Γ = Paris, Bibli. Nat., grec 2656 (Omont, III, 19–20). Vellum, 210 (–216) \times 140 (–145) \text{ mm.}, 128 fols. Written in early XII s., probably in S. Italy.\textsuperscript{45} Contents: 1\textsuperscript{r}–103\textsuperscript{r}, St. Cyril’s lexicon; 104\textsuperscript{r}–end, minor lexica. Bibliography: Drachmann, 20.}

\text{Δ = Paris, Bibli. Nat., grec 2659 (Omont, III, 20). Vellum, 175 \times 125 \text{ mm.}, 182 fols., year 1515–1516. Contents: 1\textsuperscript{r}–154\textsuperscript{v}, St. Cyril’s lexicon; 154\textsuperscript{r}–180\textsuperscript{r}, minor lexica; 180\textsuperscript{r}–end, theological treatise (sermo synodos). In the margins there are extensive additional glosses from the Etym. Gudianum. Bibliography: H. Omont, Catalogues des manuscrits grecs de Fontainebleau sous François 1\textsuperscript{er} et Henri II (Paris, 1889), p. 115, No. 340; idem, Fac-similés des manuscrits grecs datés de la Bibliothèque Nationale du IX\textsuperscript{e} au XIV\textsuperscript{e} siècle (Paris, 1891), p. 9 and Pl. 44; R. Reitzenstein, Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika (Leipzig, 1897), 84–87; Drachmann, 20; Latte, IL.}

\textsuperscript{43} The first five quires, the last folio of quire B together with quire C (between fols. 55–56), and an undetermined number of quires after fol. 63 are missing.

\textsuperscript{44} Six complete quires are missing from the beginning, two more between fols. 32–33, and an undetermined number from the end.

\textsuperscript{45} As can be inferred from the writing, quality of vellum, rubrication, and extensive use of yellow ink wash.
\( \Theta = \) Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., gr. 298 (Hardt, III, 231). Vellum, 185 (–189) \( \times \) 138 (–140) mm., ii + 138 fols. Written in the XII s.,\(^{46} \) probably in S. Italy.\(^{47} \) Contents: St. Cyril’s lexicon with the end missing. Bibliography: Drachmann, 20; Naoumides, “Symmeikta,” 376.

\( \Lambda = \) Mt. Athos, M. Μεγίστης Λαύρας, 20 (Spyridon Lavriotes–Eustratides, p. 33, No. 260). Vellum, 19 \( \times \) 13 cm., 224 fols.,\(^{48} \) XIV s. Contents: 1\(^{r} \)–10\(^{v} \), fragment of a lexicon;\(^{49} \) 11\(^{r} \)–179\(^{r} \), St. Cyril’s lexicon; 179\(^{v} \) ταυτολεξία; 181\(^{r} \)–end, ὅροι καὶ ὑπογραφαὶ κατὰ στοιχεῖα.

\( \Sigma = \) Mt. Athos, M. Ξενοφώντος, 83 (Lambros I, 71, No. 785). Paper, 206 \( \times \) 136 mm., 170 fols.,\(^{50} \) XV s. Contents: St. Cyril’s lexicon with the end missing.

\( \Pi = \) Florence, Bibl. Laurenz., plut. 5.20 (Bandini, I, 43–44). Vellum, 236 \( \times \) 165 (–169) mm., 151 fols., XIII s. (XII according to Bandini). Contents: 1\(^{r} \)–149\(^{r} \), St. Cyril’s lexicon; 149\(^{r} \)–end, minor lexisa.

\( \Xi = \) Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., gr. 230 (Hardt, II, 497; 502). Paper (oriental), 244 (–248) \( \times \) 170 mm., 314 fols.\(^{51} \) Written in the XIII s., in part διὰ χειρός Νιφώνος (μον)εχ(ο)ῦ (cf. fol. 291\(^{r} \) and 311\(^{r} \)).\(^{52} \) Contents: 1\(^{r} \)–246\(^{r} \), St. Cyril’s lexicon; 246\(^{r} \)–286\(^{v} \), minor lexisa; 286\(^{v} \)–end, varia grammatica, theologica, etc. The following note appears in the margin of fol. 197\(^{v} \): ἕ τῇδε βῆ | βλος πέλει | κονσταντὶ | νου ἰμβη | ὁτου καὶ ὑ | ποιργοῦ τοῦ | ξενώνος | τοῦ κράλη.\(^{53} \) Bibliography: Vogel-Gardthausen, 334; Drachmann, 20.

\(^{46} \) The date σφακ’ (1212–1213), which appears in fly-leaf i\(^{r} \), is by another hand and need not be the date of the ms.

\(^{47} \) This is inferred from the writing, illumination, and quality of the vellum. Note also the following notes by a XIII s. hand: Νόσος ῥιζουλοι σούμους ἄφοντε μέγα γρε (fol. ii\(^{v} \)), γεδυφή σοῦραον σύστημα (fol. 38\(^{v} \)).

\(^{48} \) One folio is missing between 223–224 and one from the last quire of the volume (\( \kappa \)Ξ). The first ten folios come from another ms., since the numbering of the quires begins with fol. 11.

\(^{49} \) The arrangement is basically alphabetical, but the order of the larger sections seems disturbed (N, \( \Xi \), O, M, N, A, M, E).

\(^{50} \) One folio is missing between 2–3, and an undetermined number from the end.

\(^{51} \) Numbered 1–311, but there are two extra folios (numbered 3\(^{a} \), 3\(^{b} \)), and a third unnumbered folio between 126–127.

\(^{52} \) To judge from the position and phrasing of the subscription, Niphon wrote fols. 1–12 and 291–311. Note that the main body of the ms. begins with a quire marked Β, i.e., Niphon apparently supplemented the missing beginning and end of the volume.

\(^{53} \) On the ξενών τοῦ κράλη, situated near the Blachernae Palace in Constantinople, cf. A. Premerstein in the preface of the facsimile edition of the Vienna Dioscurides, Codices

\( \Phi_a = \) Utrecht, Univers. Bibl., cod. 14 (Omont, 209, No. 49). Paper, 212 x 165 mm., 504 pages, XVII s. Contents: St. Cyril's lexicon. This is clearly an apograph of \( \Phi \).


\( \Omega = \) Vatican, Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, gr. 869. This is a composite ms., the first part of which (fols. 1–68) is written on oriental paper in the XIII s. and contains theLexicon of St. Cyril (from \( \alpha \) to \( \tau \)). Fols. 69–82 were added in the XV s. to supplement the missing end of the Lexicon. They also contain a small number of the familiar minor lexica. Bibliography: cf. Canart–Peri, \textit{Sussidi}, 505.

Three mss. which properly belong to a recension akin to what is commonly called \textit{Lexicon Bachmannianum} (Athens, \textit{Ἐθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη} 1197; \textit{Σπουδαστήριον Ἰστορικῆς Θεολογίας}, 47; and Vat. gr. 1869) contain in the \( \theta \alpha \)-section a text that closely resembles that of our \( \nu \)-mss.

**Affiliations of the Manuscripts**

BCFGH, Drachmann’s best and almost exclusive representatives of the entire recension, form a closely-knit group (vi), as can be observed both by their readings and the arrangement of their contents. Among their exclusive readings are not only the usual errors of text corruption, spelling,

---

\(^{54}\) To judge from the script, quality of vellum, and extensive use of ink wash.

and accentuation,\textsuperscript{55} but omissions and additions of entire entries as well.\textsuperscript{56} All but one (χ67) of the omitted glosses occur in more or less the same form in at least one recension outside v. On the other hand, of the eleven glosses attested by v\textsubscript{1} alone, only one (ξ32) seems to be a truly Cyrillean gloss found in exactly the same form in the a, g, and n recensions. Some are in reality but duplicates of genuine glosses (compare ξ24 with ξ28, ξ43 with ξ25, and χ6 with χ43). It is noteworthy, however, that the additional glosses in the χ-section have parallels not in the extant Cyrillean recensions but in Hesychius. In one of them (χ19) a citation from a lost Sophoclean drama (omitted by Hesychius) is preserved (a rarity for this lexicon), while χ158 is clearly a dialectal gloss of the kind found frequently in Hesychius. Such glosses are usually and almost routinely attributed to the lost lexicon of Diogenianus, the progenitor of Hesychius' Lexicon. Since, however, the hypothesis of a fuller Diogenianus seems to me to lack satisfactory proof, I am inclined to attribute them to a fuller (or pre-abbreviated) version of Hesychius.\textsuperscript{57} It is significant in this connection that the home of this family seems to be in Southern Italy (cf. below), where Laurent. plut. 57.39 (= Drachmann's 5) and the constellation of Matrit., Bibl. Univ. Z-22 No. 116, Haun. 1968, and Messan. S. Salv. 167\textsuperscript{58} seem to have originated.\textsuperscript{59}

Besides the internal, i.e., textual, relationship, four of the above mss. (BFGH) share a number of external features which seem to suggest that they were the product of the same scriptorium. All four mss. seem to be fine editions of the Lexicon, written in the same format, with the same color of ink and with identical purple-colored rubrication. The script is regular, formal, and impersonal, resembling print rather than handwriting. Ligatures and abbreviations are rare. Besides, the writing of FGH is very similar, as if all three were written by the same hand.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{55} Cf. θ7, 9, 12, 13, 25; ξ5, 10, 13, 18, etc.—most of the errors are confined to v\textsubscript{1}. In one case the word order within the entry has been changed (χ126). In another, a word has been misplaced (cf. χ110, 111). In the ξ-section two related entries have been conflated into one (ξ30, 31).

\textsuperscript{56} Omitted entries: θ20, 21, χ67, 77, 94, 95. Additional glosses: ξ8, 24, 32, 43, χ6, 19, 31, 90, 93, 157, 158. χ92 has been expanded considerably with additional matter. There are also minor additions and omissions within the entries: cf. χ62, 73, 121, 132.

\textsuperscript{57} Cf. my article "New Fragments of Ancient Greek Poetry," \textit{Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies} 9, 1968, 267–290.

\textsuperscript{58} On the S. Italian provenance of this ms., cf. Pertusi, \textit{Leonzio Pilato}, 484; and S. G. Mercati, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 9), 9.

\textsuperscript{59} Other mss. of the v-recension which are of S. Italian origin are S and Z. I intend to treat the question of the S. Italian copy of Hesychius more fully elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. my articles cited above (notes 3 and 17).
Within the family two groups can easily be distinguished: FH and BG. The special bond that ties F and H is both external (script and lay-out of the text) and internal, i.e., textual; cf. especially χ19 (ολαφεῖ), 82 (νέος for νέος), 92 (addition of ἰμάτιον after λεπτόν), 149 (προσχῶν for προσχών), and conflation of ξ43, 44. Since F is younger and shows a further deterioration of the text, it seems likely that it is a copy of H. The view of direct dependence is amply supported both by the writing and by θ24, where F seems to have misunderstood a pen correction of H in reading θατέρον for θατέρον.61

The special relationship of B and G is shown in a number of strikingly corrupt readings that these mss. share: cf. θ22 (θάττοντες vs. θάττον), 24 (repetition of the word θατέρον), 25 (use of the singular for the plural), etc. Since both mss. seem to be roughly contemporary, their exact relationship can be determined only from the evidence of the text. B has many separative errors and of such a nature that they could not have been corrected by the scribe of G,62 whereas the opposite seems to be true in the case of G vs. B. Furthermore, B seems to have adopted the marginal or supralinear readings of G as well as corrections effected by the original scribe and/or the rubricator. At any rate, even if B is not a copy of G it seems to have no independent value except in the sections that are missing from G.

C stands between G and H but is generally closer to the former than to the latter. It is, however, marred with an enormous number of spelling errors. Therefore, agreement of C with either of the above mss. should indicate the reading of the family archetype (v1). This archetype was written ca. 1100, as is shown by a reference to that year incorporated in the discussion of what is περίοδος τοῦ ἀλφα and how to compute the intercalary period κατὰ λατύνως; and it was written in all probability in S. Italy, as is shown not only from the almost-certain S. Italian provenance of BC but also from the inclusion of the λέξεις ἐκ τοῦ ξίου τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἡλία τοῦ Νέου, a S. Italian saint.63 This lost ms. had a good number of errors in spelling and accentuation, omissions and other scribal errors, which were faithfully reproduced by its descendants. But to compensate for it, it was interpolated with occasional glosses from a reputable lexicographic source, most probably the unabridged lexicon of Hesychius.

61 Similarly, in the α-section F’s reading μηράτητα (vs. μηράτητα in H) can be explained as a failure on the part of the scribe to distinguish the iota from the accent of the word ἵπεγκαν just below it. Cf. also my Rhet. Lex., 23.

62 Cf. θαμπιδος (θ7), χεδροπην vs. χεδροπόν (χ56), μέρον vs. χιμέρον (χ92), change from the singular to the plural (χ87), omission of the article (θ7, χ62), etc.

63 Cf. my articles cited above (notes 3 and 17); cf. also Rhet. Lex.
The family stemma can be drawn as follows:

```
VI
   /|
  H C G
 /|
F B
|
Ba
```

Closely related to VI is the v2 family, which consists of ten mss. (IJKKaLMNOPQ), none of which is earlier than the XIII s. With the exception of J and M, these mss. have been completely ignored by both Drachmann and Latte, and no assessment of the value of this family for the recovery of the archetype of the recension has ever been made.

The origin of the family cannot be traced as easily as that of VI. Two of the earliest mss., J and N (both dated) come from S. Italy, while all the others, with the possible exception of M, were either written in or came from various places in the East. The difference in provenance does not coincide with the two basic groups into which they are divided (cf. below). Since, however, both branches have early representatives in S. Italy and since the family is generally close to VI, the possibility of a S. Italian origin should seriously be reckoned with.

Although there is greater discrepancy between the individual members of the family, the general characteristics seem clear. There are only three glosses omitted by all the mss. (in addition to those found only in VI), θ11, 23, and χ71; and no interpolations except those appearing in individual mss. (mostly J). The family has few exclusive readings attested by all mss., the most characteristic of which are found in the following glosses: ε39 (addition of σύνθημα before σήμειον, omission of τυί), 47 (ἐξω for ἐξωθεν), χ25 (ἀθλίως vs. ἀθρόως), 43 (χάρις vs. χύσων) and the conflation of χ67, 68 into one entry. To these one may add a few more that seem to go back to the archetype, although they are not attested by all v2 mss.64

64 Cf. ε21 (ἐμβαίνει, but ἐμβαίνει in Ka O), χ16 (ἔχων, but ἔχουσα L), 26 (ἐπένευ [εἰς πεῖναν K Ka L], but πεῖν M); cf. also χ16 (χαλεπῶ or χαλεπῶς for χαλκῶ), and note 67 below.
The family is neatly split into two groups, the first of which is made of five mss. (JKKaLM), the other of four (NOPQ). For the sake of convenience I call the first group v21, the second v22. The most characteristic reading of v21 is the change of θαλφίς (θ3) to θαλφός, which subsequently (in all except M) by wrong division was transferred to the next entry (θ4), of which it became the lemma. Also in χ23 four of the five mss. (KKaLM) have extended the lemma by one syllable, χαματεταιρίς. The particular relationship of the v21 mss. is illustrated in the following stemma:

\[\text{v21}\]

\[\text{M} \quad \text{J} \quad \text{L} \quad \text{K} \quad \text{Ka}\]

L as well as M are comparatively free from individual errors—indeed their readings are occasionally superior to those of all other v2 mss. Both are corrected mss. (with different degrees of success), as one might expect from so late and possibly learned copies. This becomes evident from instances of false correction, especially in the case of L. J and K (and Ka) have been interpolated, especially at the beginning of the Lexicon, but from different sources.

The second group (v22) seems to be in general more remote from the family archetype. Thus, it shows omissions of entire glosses (ξ33, 41, χ14, 85, 91), addition of an extraneous gloss (ξυνωρίδα: ξυγήρ) after ξ29, reversal of the order of glosses (ξ31–32 and χ138–139), together with

65 I have no precise information about I besides a hasty examination of the ms. during my visit to Mt. Athos in the summer of 1970, but it seems to be part of the first group.

66 M actually reads χαματεταιρίς. I consider J's reading χαματαταρίς as due either to emendation or haplography. The readings of the v21 mss. clearly reflect an original supralinear correction, χαματεταιρίς or χαματαταρίς.

67 To the examples given above (note 64) add the following: χ69 (χίλη M: χύμη ν), 148 (πεμμάτων M: πελμάτων ν2); ξ42 (ξυνοδόκος Λ: ξυνοδόκος ν1, ν21), 45 (κυραμός Λ: κυνιμός ν2); χ107 (οιστρις Λ: οιστρις οιστρις ν2).

68 Cf. especially χ21, where χαμεστετεί was mistaken for a verbal form and the explanation adjusted accordingly (ταπεινός ἢ χαμαι κέιται), and 58, where the unintelligible τοῦ ἄδου τῆς θάρας (for τοῦ οἴκου τῆς θ.) was changed to τῆς θάρας τοῦ ἄδου. Cf. also Lex. Rhet., 24 f.
spelling errors and other variants. Occasionally its readings are superior to those of virtually all \( \nu \)-mss. (cf. \( \chi \omega \alpha \varsigma \) in \( \chi 100, \chi \rho e \omega \mu e \nu o \varsigma \) in \( \chi 122, \) and \( \chi v \delta \alpha \iota o \varsigma \) in \( \chi 145 \)). They should be attributed to emendation. Within this group O and P form a distinct subgroup, which displays side by side corrections or improvements of corrupt readings and outright blunders. Neither seems to be dependent on the other, as is particularly shown by individual omissions. The last member of the \( \nu 2 \) family (Q) seems to be close to OP, but it is further abridged and interpolated.

On the whole and apart from separative errors and readings, \( \nu 2 \) seems to be closely related to \( \nu 1 \). The two families share a number of glosses that are absent from all other \( \nu \)-mss. (\( \xi 11, \chi 11, 32, 36, 125, 150, 151 \)), whereas in some entries their explanation is “fuller” than that of the others (cf. \( \xi 44, \chi 30, 46, 73, 74, 81, 120 \)). The two families also display a few common errors and/or readings; cf. \( \theta \alpha \lambda \eta \sigma i a \) (\( \theta 6 \)), \( \xi \nu e i o n \) (\( \xi 23 \)), \( \eta \lambda i \xi \) (\( \chi 35 \)), \( \tau \omega \rho \omega \varepsilon i \) (\( \chi 53 \)), \( \chi o v \delta \rho i t \omega n \)\(^{69a} \) (\( \chi 102 \)), \( \pi e l \mu \acute{a} t o n \) (\( \chi 148 \)); cf. also \( \chi o r i \acute{s} a t e \) (\( \chi 153 \)), where \( \nu 22 \) is probably corrected. It is therefore quite likely that they descend from a common exemplar. The fact that \( J \) has preserved the lexicon of life of St. Elias the Younger may suggest that the common ancestor of these two families was also written in S. Italy. In this case it would be interesting to know how the family proliferated also in the East.

The third well-defined family of the \( \nu \)-recension (\( \nu 3 \)) consists of ten mss. (\( \Gamma A \Theta \Delta \Sigma \Pi \Sigma \Phi \alpha \Phi b \)), some of which are as early as the beginning of the twelfth century. The origin of the family is obscure but some claim may be made by S. Italy in view of the possible S. Italian origin of some mss. and the particular link with the Etym. Gudianum.\(^{69} \)

The general characteristics of the \( \nu 3 \) family include: (a) addition of entire glosses. These fall into two main categories: those common to all \( \nu 3 \)-mss. as well as to \( \Gamma \); and a good number of the etymological glosses attested by all \( \nu 3 \)-mss. except \( \Gamma \) and listed by \( \Delta \) in the margins. (b) Omissions of entire entries or of parts thereof.\(^{70} \) More often than not the shorter entries agree with the corresponding entries of the \( \gamma \)-recension,\(^{69a} \chi o v \delta \rho i t \omega n \) in FHOP.

\(^{69a} \) On the reciprocal influence between the Gudianum and \( \Delta \), cf. Reitzenstein, \( op. \ cit. \), 84 ff. That a m.s. of the \( \nu 3 \) family was the source of the Cyrillean glosses of the Gudianum, is amply confirmed by such common readings as \( \theta \alpha \mu i \varsigma e i : \pi u k \nu \acute{a} i e i , \sigma u n e \varsigma \acute{a} i e i \) (cf. \( Etym. Gud. \) p. 255,42 Sturz), \( \chi a m a i t u s i o n : \tau \omega n \) \( \pi o l d \) \( \mu e t e x h \acute{a} t o n \) \( \tau \omega n \) \( \sigma u n o n s i o n \) (cf. 962,27), and by the inclusion in the series of Cyrillean glosses listed together in the \( \theta \)-section of some of the original \( \nu 3 \)-additamenta, e.g., \( \theta \alpha \lambda \eta \) \( \varepsilon u d \acute{a} n \acute{a} i \), \( \theta \acute{a} l e i a : \sigma o m a \) \( M u t o s s \) (255,38–39).

\(^{70} \) Entries omitted: \( \theta 17 \); \( \xi 14, 38; \chi 1, 67, 69, 71, 72, 79, 89, 145, 155, 156. \) Shorter entries (in addition to those found in all independent mss.) \( \theta 11, 18; \xi 12, 13, 20, 37; \chi 14, 17, 18, 25, 33, 35, 41, 45, 60, 68, \) etc.
and consequently cannot be dismissed as either blunders or deliberate omissions.  

(c) Additions and other changes within the entries. Perhaps the most revealing of these are the instances of double lemmata (θ₁, χ₄₈, 56), where what seems to be a correction appears beside the original corrupt reading. (d) There is finally ample evidence of text corruption, most notably the conflation of two unrelated entries (χ₁₁₅, 116) into one, and of errors in spelling and accentuation. Because of the extent of Bearbeitung and corruption, as shown above, the readings of this family should be admitted into the text with great caution and only if they find confirmation from the independent mss. of v and/or the related recensions g and a.

Within the v₃ family there is a good degree of differentiation. This appears chiefly in the number of additional entries admitted by each ms. as well as in the order of both regular and additional glosses. To take the θα-section as an example, Γ lists all the v entries minus 6 and 17 (the latter is missing from all v₃-mss.). The order of glosses is identical with that of v₂, except that gloss θεα γαρ appears among the θα-glosses. The additional glosses common to all v₃ mss. and R are listed together in one batch between 11 and 12; and a new addition (θάνατος) appears before 18. Δ shows two more additional glosses in the main text, θαλερός (between 2 and 3) and θάττον (between 21 and 22); has somewhat dispersed the original additamenta, and has kept all the new (etymological) glosses in the margins. It has also moved 9 between 4 and 5. Θ agrees with Γ in the order of the common glosses but additional glosses θαλερός and θάττον are not in the same place as in Δ. The marginal glosses of Δ appear in batches in the text without much regard for the alphabetical order. Finally Θ has a number of additional glosses not found in Δ but attested in ΕΠΣΦΦα. The other mss. (referred to henceforth as v₃2) list the original, i.e., v-glosses in a slightly different order from the usual one, but have kept the original v₃ additamenta together as a batch, between 10 and 13. The other additional glosses found in Θ and in the margins of Δ have been distributed so as to fit an alphabetical order based on the first three letters of the lemmata. Gloss θαλερός (cf. supra) appears after 2 (as in Δ), but θάττον has been dropped and two new glosses added. Gloss θειάξω, which appears for the first time among the θα-glosses in Θ,

71 Only the following "omissions" have no parallels in the g-recension: ε37 (ἡ χρήματα), χ35 (καὶ δλεθρον), 53 (τῶν δακτύλων), 68 (καὶ αἰγὸς), 133 (προσκνάται).
72 Additions: cf. θ1, 22; χ39, 48, 53, 56, 87, 103, 126, 139, 152. Transpositions: cf. θ4, 5; χ34, 60, 62, 124. Changes: cf. θ12, 16, 23; ε17, 46; χ8, 22, 49, 56, 60, 70, 87, 114, 129, 133; some of them have parallels in R or V W.
is also found in the same place in these mss. Codex $\Sigma$ has added one more new gloss unattested in the other $\nu_3$ mss. The same general situation also prevails in the $\xi$- and $\chi$-sections.

Despite appearances neither $\Delta$ nor $\Theta$ seem to be the direct ancestors of $\nu_3 \Sigma$, but the latter group seems to have evolved from the common ancestor of $\Delta \Theta$ through correction, possible interpolation, and a certain degree of Bearbeitung. This accounts not only for the absence of a few errors common to $\Gamma \Delta \Theta$ and hence presumably of the family archetype, but also for the conflation or elimination of similar entries.\(^73\)

On the basis of the distribution of the additional entries as well as of their readings, the branching out of the mss. of this family can be sketched as follows:

\[^73\] Thus add. gloss $\chi_\epsilon\rho_\omega\nu\alpha\zeta$ has been eliminated, but its explanation has been added to that of gloss $\chi_5 \Sigma$. Conversely, the explanation of $\chi_4 \Gamma$ has been appended to that of add. gloss $\chi_\rho_\omega\nu\delta_\mu$. The omission of $\chi_\delta \Gamma$, $\nu_1$ is clearly due to the presence of similar entries among the additamenta.
Besides the three larger families described above, there are a number of mss. which can be called independent. Some of them fall into small groups. The first such group consists of T and U. Their most striking common feature is the order in which they list the glosses. Indeed a rearrangement has been carried out with the intention of achieving stricter alphabetical order. Thus θ15 has been placed before θ1, θ25 before θ23, ξ7 before ξ6, ξ34 after 42, ξ4 after ξ9, ξ17 before ξ12, etc. However, the rearrangement is only partial. Thus θ5 and 6 still precede θ7 and 8, ξ4 is before ξ5, ξ35 before ξ37, etc. The result of the rearrangement has been to effect an alphabetical order which is based on the first three or even more letters. Another by-product of the new arrangement is the occasional combination of related entries, e.g., ξ20 with 31 and (erroneously) χ61 with 85.

Besides the order of the entries, the two mss. share a number of readings that appear to be either restricted to them alone or are found only in one or more independent mss.; cf. the addition in χ76 and the spellings πολυκυτών (χ22), ἧλυξ (χ35), etc.

A comparison of their individual readings shows convincingly that T, although younger and in many respects inferior to U, is independent from the latter ms. Thus T lists χ107, which U entirely omits, as well as δε in θ4, θερμῶν in θ5, the article in χ62 and ως in χ82; cf. also the following readings of U, all involving corruption of the text which attempts at emendation could not remove: ξεστών for ξεστόν (ξ12), συζυγή for ζυγή (ξ20), χάζεο: ἀνακώρει for χάζεο: ἀνακώρει (χ3)74a, and χαμαυτύπη for χαμαυτύπη (χ24). It becomes, therefore, clear that T descends not from U, but from a better and more complete ms., possibly U’s exemplar. However, because of innumerable scribal errors, T is of little use for the restoration of the text of v beyond the evidence that it provides about the history of the transmission. U, on the other hand, occasionally offers superior readings, which must be due to emendation rather than to a better tradition (cf. θ6, ξ19, χ66). It has indeed a number of corrections by the first hand75 and numerous additional glosses from another Cyrillean ms. at the end of the Lexicon.

The second group of closely related mss. consists of R and S. Their special relationship emerges clear from a number of common features that are restricted to these two mss. and which can hardly be considered accidental. These include the apparent conflation of θ23, 24, additions in the explanations of χ127, 139, omission of the lemma in θ20, and such

74 Found also in W and originating from the g-recension.
74a T however omits this entry.
75 Such corrections appear, for example, in θ18 (ἀποκτείνη [ei ex?]), χ23 (χαμαυτύρεις and corr. in marg. ρεις).
readings as ξυνάσιον for ξυνάρον (ξ35), χιθρός (χιθρός R) for χιλός (χ83) and βραχυόλην for βραχυόλιον (χ96). Besides these the two mss. omit (in agreement with other independent mss. or with ν3) a number of glosses (χ69, 72, 156) and have shorter explanation in θ22, χ30, 35, 38, 60, 81, 109, 121. They also list two additional glosses in the ξ-section (ξυμφορά, ξυναχοῖτο). These common features are all the more remarkable, since R seems clearly interpolated from an outside source.

Interpolation in R takes the form of additional glosses which for the most part are identical with the original additamenta of the ν3 family (i.e., essentially the additional glosses of Γ). The distribution of these new glosses among the ν-glosses varies. In the θα-section they are all listed together as a group at the end of the ν-glosses, i.e., after θ25. In the ξ- and χ-sections, however, they appear among the regular ν-glosses in approximately the same places as in ν3 (especially Γ). In fact, additional gloss ξυσανον in the ξ-section has taken the place of the original ν-gloss (ξ14), while the latter appears between ξ7 and 9, out of the alphabetical order. In the same section there are two sets of duplicate glosses: ξυνάω-ξυνάω and ξυνάρον-ξυναύσιον. Gloss ξυνάω is actually the corrupt counterpart of ξυνάω (ξ33) in ν3, while ξυναύσιον is the corrupt form of ξυνάρον (ξ35) in S. R lists ξυνάω before and ξυνάρον after ξ34, while ξυνάω is listed together with ξυναύσιον following gloss ξ39 and the additional gloss ξυναχοῖτο. It is clear that here as in the case of ξ14 the ν3 glosses were given precedence over the S-glosses.

In so far as the text is concerned, R generally agrees with S, but its text is in several instances superior, even though S may agree with T and U. R has also adopted a number of the peculiar readings of ν3; (cf. θ1 and χ22, 30, 43, 48, 53, 56, 58, 62, 68, 100, 114, 126, 128, 129, 130, 133). Some of these involve omissions of words within the explanation, but the majority are of such a nature as to preclude anything but direct influence. It becomes, therefore, clear that R is a contaminated ms., i.e., it has combined the readings of two different strains of the tradition, one represented by S, the other by ν3. It is noteworthy that in the earlier part of the Lexicon the scribe seems more reluctant to admit the ν3 readings and keeps the ν3 glosses apart, whereas in the latter part he shows impartiality and even admits the shorter entries of ν3 without supplementing them from S.

A third group consists of three mss., V, Va, and W. These share two basic characteristics: a rearrangement of their entries to fit a stricter alphabetic order, and a large amount of additional glosses not found in ν. Most of these additions are identical with glosses found in two mss. of the g-recension to which Drachmann assigned the sigla Γ and Λ, i.e.,
Cryptensis Z.α.V and Laurent. plut. 59.16. The new arrangement of the glosses, based on the first three letters of the lemmata, has resulted in an order which is not identical to that of TU.\textsuperscript{76} This group is also distinguished for its occasional superior readings (cf. ξ40, χ1, 60, 67, 104, 147), which however (in view of the extensive revision that it has undergone) must not be genuine but are due either to emendation or to contamination. Let me add that the additional glosses of V, Va, and W form a group also found in U (as an appendix), as well as in g1.

The dependence of Va on V is complete. Va’s text, however, is considerably inferior to that of V because of omissions and errors. The number of these blunders as well as an unexplained lacuna in the text of Va\textsuperscript{77} indicate that it is not a direct copy of V but is removed from it by at least one intermediary.

The relationship of VW in the ξ- and χ-sections is unmistakable: cf. especially ξ5, 37, χ12, 15, 22, 24, 38, 41, 45, etc. Both also have many additional glosses. In the θα-section, however, the two agree very rarely and even then the agreement is not exclusive.\textsuperscript{78} Besides, the additional glosses which each of the two displays are entirely different. W’s readings as well as some of its additional glosses show a clear influence from an outside source independent from V.\textsuperscript{79} This source can be identified with a distinct group within the g-recension which consists of the following mss.: Athens, Byz. Museum, No. 186, in its original or vellum part (see above); Hauniensis 1970; Laurent. plut. 58.30; and Vindob. phil. gr. 319. Here are the most striking examples of the agreement: θ14 (add ἀλλεπάλληλα), additional gloss θαρσοῦβ, ξ33 (add κοινὼν), χ54 (κεχειρισμένα for κάκιστα), χ129 (add ἡ δῆλωσις) and additional gloss χροὸς ἀδην. In many more cases the readings adopted by W independently from V are

\textsuperscript{76} This is true for the ξ- and χ-sections. For the order of W in the θα-section, cf. note 78 below.

\textsuperscript{77} Va omits 70-odd entries between χ54 and 101 without apparent reason. Neither the beginning nor the end of the lacuna coincide with the beginning or end of a page in V. If Va was copying directly from V, the omission would not be due to a purely mechanical error.

\textsuperscript{78} The most striking is the reading ὑπεγύμνος (θ18), found also in OP. Neither ms., however, shows any of the striking separative errors of the other. Note also that the order of the v-entries in this section is different in the two mss., that of W resembling closely the order of TU.

\textsuperscript{79} There is some external evidence to that from the cramming of some of the additional glosses and the additions within the entries in the space between the text and the inner margins which would otherwise be left blank. The outer margins also have numerous additions. All these were probably due to the original scribe.
found in g, but they are not restricted to the above mss.: cf. θ7, 20, 23; ξ12 (om. γεγλυμμένον), 17, 36; χ30 (ἢ ὁ μικρὸ ῥώκες), 76, 94, 111, 121 (om. βῆσει οἶνον), 127, 140, 143; also in listing ξ32, an entry absent from all v-mss. except v1 but occurring in g. The manner in which W incorporates the new readings can be illustrated by the following examples. In χ96 it has adopted the g-reading (κόσμον πέρι τῶν βραχίωνα [sic]) and then added supra lineam ἦ τῶν τράχηλοι, i.e., the part of the v-entry missing from g. In χ149 it introduces the g-reading at the end of the entry as a variant (ἀλλαχοῦ εἰσθαν προσχοῦν τὰ τείχη).80 Because of the extent of outside influence81 W’s exact relationship to V cannot be determined.

For the convenience of reference as well as because the mss. R through W share a number of common features, I refer to them sometimes in the critical apparatus with the sign v4.

The remaining mss. (XYZΩ) are too fragmentary to allow (as of now) any judgement about their exact relationship to one another and to the other mss. of the recension. However, in the one section (of the three under consideration here) which they have in common,82 they agree in omitting φόβος in θ11 and ἦ ἀποκτεῖνη in 18,83 both of which are also omitted by v3.84 Note also the spelling ὄρεγομένως in θ18.

There is further agreement between YZ, shown by the omission of δε in θ485 and of θαρσαλέως in θ20.86 Furthermore, Y and Ω agree in error in reading θασσός in θ25. Finally, X and Z agree in listing θ25 after θέα γάρ, the first entry of the θε-section.

Z is the best ms. of the group. It is also noteworthy for occasional interpolations from a ms. of what I call an unabridged version of Hesychius: perhaps the same ms. that provided the learned interpolations of v1 (RS: additional gloss ἡμιφόρα), and of the three closely related mss. (which

80 The formula ἀλλαχοῦ is also found in χ147 and 136 (in the latter case ἀλλαχοῦ ἡπ.).
81 This is not restricted to one source only. Besides etymological additions (cf. θ7, χ5, 49, and in many marginal glosses which were clearly taken from the Lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras), there are readings which are restricted to some g-mss. (especially Par. gr. 2617, which besides Cyrilillus also contains Pseudo-Zonaras) but have no parallel in the four mss. listed above.
82 The χ-section is missing from three mss., while in the fourth (Ω) it has been replaced from another ms. XY also lack the χ-section.
83 ΥΩ omit θ18 altogether.
84 Also by g, with the exception of a few mss. which have φόβος.
85 Ω omits the gloss altogether.
86 Also missing from v3, Ω. X agrees here with RS in omitting θαρσαλέως and making θαρσαλέως the lemma of the entry.
properly belong to the g-recension), Madrit. Bibl. Univ. Z-22 No. 116; Haun. 1968; and Messan. S. Salv. 167.\(^{87}\)

X is also useful, despite omissions (\(\theta_2, 15, 21\) and part of 22) and scribal errors, especially when in agreement with Z, serving as a check of the readings of the archetype, since both mss. (XZ) seem to branch out from near the top of the stemma (cf. below). Y despite its late age presents a better and fuller text than \(\Omega\), which is marred with omissions and arbitrary tampering with the text.\(^{88}\)

A careful analysis of all variants of the mss. shows a consistent agreement of \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) (especially in the number and size of entries) as against \(v_3\), with the remaining or independent mss. splitting their allegiance between the two extremes. Indeed XYZ\(\Omega\) seem to side always against \(v_1\) \(v_2\), whenever the latter shows a “fuller” text as compared to that of \(v_3\) and g. This extends also to entries where \(v_1\) \(v_2\) find support for their longer entries in some of the independent mss. (cf. \(\theta_11, 18; \xi_12, 13, 37\)). It is reasonable to assume that this agreement extended also to the \(\chi\)-section (now missing from all of these four mss.), where the cases of disagreement between \(v_1\) \(v_2\), on the one hand, and \(v_3\), on the other, are more numerous.

The case of RSTUVVaW is more complicated. These mss. side with \(v_1\) \(v_2\) more often than not when these two groups disagree with \(v_3\) g.\(^{89}\)

It is not clear, however, whether these seven mss. emanated from one and the same source. RSTU have a number of common errors that may seem decisive in favor of a common exemplar, from which the progenitors of the pairs RS and TU were copied. Note especially the reading \(\tau\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\nu\) (for \(\tau\rho\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\nu\nu\)) in \(\chi_94\)\(^{90}\) and \(\chi\delta\theta\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\) (\(\chi_144\)), attested by all four mss.

One may also add the following readings which, although confined to STU, may be considered as descending from the common source but avoided by R under the influence of its second exemplar: \(\theta\lambda\alpha\mu\mu\omicron\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\) (\(\theta_7\)), \(\theta\alpha\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (\(\theta_25\)), \(\xi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (\(\xi_15\)), \(\chi\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron\) for \(\chi\lambda\omicron\omicron\) (\(\xi_25\)), \(\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\iota\xi\)

---

87 On the interpolation of these three mss., cf. my article (above, note 57).
88 Thus \(\Omega\) lists a number of \(\theta\)-glosses before \(\theta\alpha\), completely out of the alphabetical order; it often adds (in an unnecessary and often illogical manner) such trivial words as \(\lambda\gamma\epsilon\omicron\), \(\gamma\omicron\alpha\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\), \(\tau\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\), \(\kappa\alpha\), simply for the sake of variation; it also joins unrelated entries into one long period; finally, it rephrases and adds outside matter in the entries.
89 Cf. \(\theta_11, \chi_1, 14, 17, 18, 25, 33, 35, 41, 45, 155\); cf. also \(\xi_12, 37; x_30, 100, 107, 127, 128, 129, 133, 143, 144\), where the addition is attested by all but one of the seven independent mss. (W).
90 Other common errors are less decisive, because they are of an orthographic nature: cf. \(\theta_3\) (\(\theta\alpha\lambda\pi\omicron\rho\omicron\eta\)) \(\chi_4\) (\(\kappa\omega\mu\nu\)), \(35\) (\(\rho\alpha\gamma\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)).
(χ15), κυλώδεις (χ18), χθόνος (χ80). In the common traits one should also add the inclusion by RSU of the alphabetical Homeric Lexicon, published in part by V. de Marco,91 which is unattested from elsewhere.

The view of a common exemplar is, however, confronted with a most serious objection: How to explain the presence in TU of some additamenta found also in v1 v2 but absent from RS v3 (and furthermore from g)?92 Their absence from RS cannot be explained as accident,93 because of their number and extent and because of the fact that some of these are found at the beginning or middle of the explanation. An examination of these additamenta shows that they originated from marginal or supralinear explanations added by the scribe or a subsequent reader of the archetype; cf. χαρίην for χαρίεσσαν (χ38), χεραίν ἔργαξομένην for ἀπὸ χερῶν ζώσαν (χ60), ἀναδευ καὶ κάτωθι ἐμέτος for ἐκκρίσις διὰ στόματος καὶ γαστρὸς (χ109), βήσει (actually written βίσει) for ἡχον τῷ στόματι ἀποτελεῖ (χ121). The process of insertion of such marginal notes into the text can be seen at work in θ20, where the variant θαρμαλέως, absent from v3 YZΩ, has ousted the original reading θαρμαλέως in RSX, but is listed side by side by v1 v2 TUVW; and furthermore in χ128, where the addition μαντευόμενα (omitted by v3 RW) appears before προλεγόμενα in v1 TUV but after it in v2 and S.94 The omission of χ69 (omitted by v3 RSVW but attested by g), of χ72 (apparently a corrupt counterpart of χ71), and of χ156 with the unintelligible lemma χώτα (for χρώτα) may be deliberate. For accidental omissions cf. above, note 93.

All in all, the hypothesis of a common ancestor for RSTU is, I believe, more probable than a recourse to another split of the stemma, which would presuppose that the elimination of the common errors of RSTU further down in the stemma is due to emendation. A further comparison of the readings of VW with those of RSTU shows that they are close to TU, despite extensive correction helped by the use of a g-type ms. which served as a second exemplar (cf. above). For all these reasons I have assigned a special siglum (v4) to all these mss.


92 Cf. χ35 (καὶ χάσαμα), 38 (χαρίην), 60 (χεραίν ἔργαξομένην), 72 (entire gloss, omitted by T), 81 (ὑπήρχα—προντόμενος), 109 (ἀναδεύ—ἡγον), 121 (βήσει, ὁλον), 156 (entire gloss).

93 Accident, however, cannot be altogether excluded; compare the omission of ἐνσπληι in §14 by TU; the omission of θ̃18 by RS, and quite possibly of the word βαλάσσων in χ35.

94 Cf. also χ60 (πενιχράν) and 139 (χρυσόφωρα).
The final stemma of the family can therefore be drawn as follows:

How old is the recension? On purely palaeographical grounds it must be older than 1000 A.D., since some of our mss. (especially S) can be dated around that year. I should like to suggest that the exact date is fixed by a reference to the year 876, incorporated into a treatise of how to compute the cycles of the sun and moon and preserved in the v1-mss. and in J. This evidence is corroborated by the acrostic of a short epigram which refers to the reign of Basil, undoubtedly Basil I the Macedonian. Both the epigram and the reference to the year 876 were transmitted to the various descendants of v together with the minor lexica and other material following, and in a way supplementing, the Lexicon and thus forming a corpus, as it were, which can be called the Cyrillean corpus. Since both the reference to the year 876 and that to the emperor Basil are not found among the minor lexica of the other extant recensions, we may safely, I believe, consider them as indicating the date of the formation of the v-recension.

95 Cf. my articles cited above (notes 3, 17), and Rhet. Lex., 25-27.
96 This epigram in nine dodecasyllables with the quadruple acrostic, 'Ev theo vòν | ο βασιλέω | βασιλεύει | βασιλεύος, was published by G. S. Mercati in Studi Bizantini e Neellenici 3, 1931, 294 f. Mercati was not sure, however, whether the epigram referred to Basil I or Basil II, but would prefer the former.
Appendix: The Text

The text of the sections on which the present study was based is given below not in its pure form, i.e., in the form in which it presumably appeared in the lost archetype of the recension, but with all subsequent accretions as reflected in the text of v1. In order to distinguish, however, the original from the extraneous matter, I have employed square brackets for the latter. Corrupt readings have been retained in the text (unless corrected in some of our mss.), whenever it was felt that this was the reading of the archetype. Some of them have parallels in g or other recensions. In a critical edition, however, these should be eliminated: here they merely illustrate the state of the archetype.

For similar reasons, the critical apparatus is not confined to important or true variants, but has been expanded to include all variant readings, even trivial ones, so far as they illustrate the relationship of the mss. and their families, regardless of their value for the recovery of the "original" text. Accordingly, this is not a specimen edition but an appendix or supplement to the preceding discussion. Certain restrictions, however, have been set, in order to eliminate the obvious or insignificant. Thus spelling errors have not been listed for the most part, especially when occurring in secondary mss. If they are widespread but of no significance for the relationships of the mss., they have been listed with the indication nonnulli without further specification. All readings of Ba, Ka, Q, Va, Φa, Φb and the extravaganzas of Ω have been eliminated entirely for obvious reasons. The readings of I (and of Λ in the ξ- and χ-sections) have not been recorded for lack of collations. Parentheses have been used to indicate that the reading of a ms. is not entirely identical with the reading recorded but either presuppose it or has been derived from it.
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Appendix

Ἀρχή τοῦ θ' στοιχείου

1. θάκων: θρόνων, καθεδρῶν
2. θάκοις: θρόνοις

Codd.: BCFGHKLMNOPRSTVWXYZΓΔΘΛΞΠΘΩ (Ba, Ka, Q, Va, Φa, Φb lectiones omisi)
1. Glossam om. Ω θάκων ο Ρ θάκων καὶ θάκων ν3 Ρ καθεδρῶν nonnulli
2. Glossam om. Υ Ω θάκοις ο Ρ

97 However, all additional glosses of individual mss. or subgroups, as well as the etymological glosses of ν3, have been entirely omitted.
3. Glossam om. O \( \text{θαλπορή} \) v1 (N) R S (T) U X, \( \text{θαλπωρί} \) Γ \( \text{θάλψις} \) om. J K L θάλπος pro θάλψις M
4. Glossam om. Ω \( \text{θάλλος} \) O P V Y Ω \( \text{θάλλος} \) cett. \( \text{θάλπος} \) ante \( \text{θάλλος} \) add. J K L δε om. U V Y Z ο \( \text{τής} \) ελαιας κλάδος v3
5. \( \text{περισκηπάσα} \) nonnulli \( \text{συντηρήσα} \) nonnulli, \( \text{συντηρήσα} \) B S Γ θερμάναι om. U, θερμάναι compl. θερμάναι ante \( \text{περισκηπάσα} \) v3, ante \( \text{συντηρήσα} \) V
6. Gloss. om. X Γ \( \text{θαλώσια} \) S Y A Δ Ε Σ Ω, \( \text{θαλώσια} \) v1 ν2 T
7. \( \text{θαλαμύπολος} \) v1 R Z, \( \text{θαλαμύπολος} \) (S) (T) U \( \text{ο} \) om.\( B \) \( \text{άναστρεφόμενος} \) v1 καὶ \( \text{φυλαττόμενον} \) \( \text{ειρήνης} \) \( \text{δε} \) \( \text{παρά} \) \( \text{τὸ} \) \( \text{θάλειαν} \) \( \text{άμα} \) add. W
8. \( \text{θαλάττης} \) C F H T, \( \text{θαλάσσης} \) Λ Π Σ
9. \( \text{θάλα} \) v1 Z \( \text{ευσχία} \) v1
10. \( \text{θαλαμών} \) v3 (exc. Σ) \( \text{νεότατον} \) (νεότατον Σ) v1 ν3 (exc. Π)
11. Gloss. om. ν1 \( \text{φοβός} \) om. ν3 X Y Z Ω
12. \( \text{άκανθάδες} \) v1 N \( \text{λέγεται} \) δে (και add. ν3) βατός v3 V: \( \text{ο} \) \( \text{λέγεται} \) βάτος cett.
13. \( \text{θεμά} \) ν22 T W Y Ω, \( \text{θάμα} \) S U Z, \( \text{θάμα} \) v1 \( \text{πυκνός} \) ante \( \text{συνεχώς} \) V
14. \( \text{αὐλεπάλληλα} \) add. W
15. Gloss. om. X A leg. βασιτή
16. Gloss. om. Φ Ω \( \text{θαμάζει} \) (O) P \( \text{ἀγέ} \) (λέγει \( \Sigma \)) \( \text{συντήρησα} \) pro \( \text{έχει} \) ν3
17. Gloss. om. ν3 Ω \( \text{ο} \) om J T \( \text{άποκτενων} \) M T, \( \text{άποκτενών} \) S W, \( \text{άποκτενών} \) L
18. Gloss. om. L R S T Y Π Φ Ω \( \text{όρεγόμενος} \) X Z, \( \text{όρεγόμενος} \) O P V W \( \text{ή} \) \( \text{άποκτεινει} \) om. ν3 X Z, \( \text{άποκτεινει} \) U V W, \( \text{άποκτεινουσι} \) (J) O P
19. Gloss. om. Ω
20. Gloss om. ν1 \( \text{θαρσαλέως} \) om. R S X \( \text{θαρσαλέως} \) om. ν3 W V Z Ω \( \text{εὐθάρασως} \) nonnulli \( \text{εὐθάρασως} \) \( \text{αnte} \) \( \text{αὐρέως} \) W
21. Gloss. om. ν1 X \( \text{θαρσαλέως} \) pro \( \text{άρσος} \) ν3
Άρχη τοῦ ξ στοιχείου

1. ξαίων: νήθω, σωρεύω
2. ξαθήν: πυρροειδή
3. ξαθίζεσθαι: κοιμείσθαι τὰς τρίχας
4. ξενοσύνην: ξένην φιλίαν
5. ξείνοι: οἱ ἀπὸ ξένης φίλοι
6. ξειγαγόν: ὁ τοὺς ξένους ἄγων, ἀδηγών, ξενοδοχών
7. ξείνοι: φίλου
[8. ξέσας: γράφας]
9. ξενίαν: καταγωγίαν, κατάλυμα
10. ξενιζοῦσαν: ἀλλόφυλον, ἀήθη
[11. ξένοντας: μοστίζοντας]
12. ξεστόν: ὀμαλισμένον, [γεγυλμμένον]
13. ξιφήρεις: ξιφηφοροῦντες, [ἐνοπλοί]

Codd.: BCFGHJKLMNORSTUVWZΓΔΘΞΠΣΦΩ; XY carent (Ba, Ka, Q, Va, A Φα, Φb omisi)

1. νησών (νησῶν Σ) v3
2. πυρροειδή v1 R S Z Ω, πυρροειδή v2 (T) U, πυρροειδή v31 Ε Φ
4. ξενωούντων L V W
5. ξεινοι v1 v2 R S T U οἱ ἀπὸ ξένοις v1 J, οἱ ἀπὸ ξεινᾶς V W
6. ξειαγόν Brown Π Σ Φ, ξειαγόν Γ Δ Θ
8. Gloss. om. codd. exc. v1 Z
9. Gloss. om. Ω
10. ξεινίζονας Γ II (Θ) ἀλλόφυλον v1, ἀλλόφυλον J (N) P W ἀηθῆ F H R Δ Θ Ε
11. Gloss. om. codd. exc. v1 v2
12. ξεστόν U ὀμαλισμένον (vel ὄμ.) nonnulli γεγυλμμένον om. v3 W Z Ω
13. ξιφήροι O Π ξιφηροφοροῦντες v1, ξιφηφοροῦντας v3 ἐνοπλοί om. v3 T U Z Ω
14. ξόνων: ἁγαλμα, εἰδωλον, ξώδιον, ἀνδριάς
15. ξούθος: ξανθός
16. ξούθα: ξανθά
17. ξύει: γράφει· οδεν καὶ ξύσματα τὰ γράμματα
18. ξυλοζομένη: ξύλα συλλέγουσα
19. ξύμμαχοι: σύμμαχοι
20. ξυνωρίς: συνωρίς, ξυγή
21. ξυμβαίνει: συμβαίνει
22. ξυνθήματος: σημείου
23. ξύνιον: ξύνιον
24. ξυνεχῶς: συνεχῶς
25. ξύστρα: χλανίς
26. ξυνέναι: συνέναι, νόσα
27. ξυνούσα: συνούσα, μίζις
28. ξυνεχῶς: συνεχῶς, δία παντός
29. ξυναρμόσας: συναρμόσας, συνάφας
30. ξυνορίδα: ἄρμα εκ δύο ἵππων συνεξηγμένων
31. ξυνορίδα: ξυγήν· κυρίως δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμίονων. ὀρεύς γὰρ ὁ ἡμίονος
32. ξύνορον: κοινωνόν

17. Gloss. om. T ξύει (Ξ) (Π) ΣΦ γράφη v1 K ac N Z Π ὡς παρ᾽ ὁμείρων post γράφει add. W ξύσματα γὰρ τὰ (γὰρ τὰ om. Γ) γράμματα v3
18. ξυλοζομένη v1
20. Gloss. om. v32 R T Ζ U Ω (cum 31 iunx. T U) ξυνωρίς v1 συνωρίς om. v31, συνωρίς v1 T συζυγή U
21. ξυμβαίνει v2 (exc. Ka O)
22. Gloss. om. V
23. ξύειν v1 v2. ξύειν V ξύειν v2
24. Gloss. om. codd. exc. v1
25. ξύστρα v1 Ω: ξύστρα cett. χλαμίς S (T) U leg. ξυστίδα: χλανίδα
27. Gloss. om. Ω συνούσα om. K, συνούσα B G
28. Gloss. om. Ω
30. ξυνωρίς Ω ἄρμα nonnulli συνεξηγμένων B C ac G, συνεξηγμένων v2 (exc. N) v3 (exc. Ξ) S
32. Gloss. om. codd. exc. v1 W m
33. ξυνών: συνών
34. ξυστίδας: περιβόλαια
35. ξυνάφορον: γαμετήν
36. ξυμπονήσαι: συμπονήσαι
37. ξύπνα: κοῦνα πράγματα [ἡ χρήματα]
38. ξύνε: σώνες, ἀκουσάν
39. ξυθήματος: συνθήματος· ἐστὶ δὲ σημεῖον ἢ πρόσφθεγμα διδόμενον ἐπὶ
γνωρισμῷ τῶν οἰκείων ἐν πολέμῳ ἢ ἐτέρᾳ τινὶ ἐπιβουλῇ
40. ξυπωδά: συνωδά
41. ξύθακος: συγκάθεδρος
42. ξυνοδόκος: ξενοδόχος
[43. ξύστρα: (χ)λαῖσ]
44. ξυστίδα: λεπτὸν ὑφασμα [ἡ περιβόλαιον]
45. ξυσμός: κυνημός
46. ξυστός· τότος ἀνεμένος ἀθλητῶν
47. ἔξωθεν: ἔξωθεν

33. Gloss. om. v22 ξυνών: συνών nonnulli κοῦνων pro συνών v3 κοῦνων add. W
35. ξυνάφορον S T
37. ξύπνα V W; leg. ξύπνα ἢ χρήματα om. v3 R Z Ω
38. Gloss. om. v3
39. σύνθημα antε σημεῖον add. v2 σημεῖα B C G διδόμενος Δ Θ ἐτέρα B G Z Π
40. τινι om. v2 ἐπιβουλή nonnulli, ἐπιβουλεί v1
42. Gloss. om. v22 συνκάθεδρος nonnulli
43. Gloss. om. W ξυνοδόκος v1 Κ ἡκ M, ξυνοδόκος V, ξυνοδόκος W= Ω
44. Gloss. om. codd. exc. v1 λαῖσ F H, λαῖσ B C G
45. Gloss. cum praec. conf. lemmate omissionis F H ἢ περιβόλαιον om. codd. exc. v1 v2
46. κυνημός v2 (exc. J L) R V W, κυνημός J ἔξωθεν add. Γ
47. ἀνεμένον v1 ἀφορομένος pro ἀνεμένον v3 ἀθλητῶν C G=0
48. ἔξωθεν v1 K N Z, ἔξωθεν (ξενωθέν Σ) v3 V W ἔξω v2 (exc. K) Ω

Αρχή τοῦ ἧ στοιχείου

[1. χάδεν: ἔχωρησεν ἡ μετέσχεν]
2. χάζετο: ἀνεχώρει

Codd.: BCFGHJKLMNOPRSTUVWΓΔΠΣΦ (Ba, Ka, Q, Va, A, Φα, Φb omisi; non habent XYZ(Ω)Ξ)
2. ἀναχωρίσειεν R
3. χαζεο: ἀναχώρει
4. χαίτην: τὴν κόμην τῶν τρικών
5. χαζεο τῆλε: ἀναχώρει μακρὰν
[6. Χαιρουβίμ: πλήθος γνώσεως ἡ σοφίας]
7. χαζομένω: ἀναχωροῦντι
8. χαίρειν φάσαστε: ἀποτασάμενοι, καταγνώντες
9. χαίρετε: θαρρεῖτε
10. χαλεπίναι: ἀγανακτήσας
[11. χαλεπώτερος: δυσκολώτερος]
12. χάλεσι: τοῖς ὄνυξι
13. χαλκεομήστωρ: ἵσχυρόφωνοι
14. χαλέπτει: κακίζει, [κατασπονεῖ]
15. χαλκίς: ἡ γλαυξ· εἴδος ὀρνέου
16. χαλλκοκοροστήν: χαλκῆς ὀπλιζόμενον ἡ κράνος ἔχοντα χαλκοῦν
17. χαλεπῶς: δυσκόλως, [δυσχερῶς, κακῶς]
18. χαμαιζήληλοι: [ταπεινόφρονες,] ταπεινοί· ἡ διόφροι κοιλόδειες [ἢ ὅ ἄ γήνα
φρονοῦντες]
[19. χαμεννά: ἡ ἔπι γῆς κατάκλισις· καὶ τὸ ταπεινὸν κλινόδιον χαμεννῆ, Σοφοκλῆς Δόλοψη]
20. χαμαιεύνης: χαμοκόκτος
21. χαμαιπτετε: ταπεινῶ ἡ χαμαί κειμένω

3. Gloss. om. T χαζετο U Σ ἀναχωρεῖ vii U
4. κόμην O P R S (T) U
5. χαζετῆλε N R S (T) (U), χαζετῆλαι vii τῆλε γὰρ τὰ μακρὰν add. W
7. Gloss. om. Σ χαζομένω C F H, χαζόμενος B G
8. καταγνώντες vii (J) (K) N R S T U, ἀπογνώντες V, ἀπογνώντες (ἀπογνώναι Φ) v3 W
9. χαίρεται vii T, χαίρεται v3 T, χαίρεται Αθαρρεῖται vii (N) S T
10. Gloss. om. T χαλασώνται vii R Γ Δ Σ
12. χαλάζων V W, χαλάζω M; leg. χαλάζαι τοὺς om. V W Π
13. Gloss. om. v22 χαλέπτεις Α κατασπονεῖ om. v3
15. χαλκῆς S T U, χαλκῆς vii γλαυξ nonnulli, γλαύξ F H, γλαύξ J K Γ εἴδος ὀρνέου
ante ἡ γλαύξ V W
16. χαλκοῦ Γ Δ, χαλεπῶ D50 J M, χαλεπῶς v22 K L ἐχοντα C F H Π, ἐχων v2 (exc. L)
17. χαλαιπᾶς R δυσχερῶς κακῶς om. v3
20. χαμαιεύνης Γ, χαμαιεύνης v3 (exc. Γ), χαμαιεύνης S T (U) χαμοκόκτος vii, χαμακίκτος
v3 (exc. Γ), χαμακίκτος V W Γ
21. ταπεινῶν T Γ Δ, ταπεινῶς L κειμένων K (Γ) Δ, κεῖται L
22. χαμαίτισσών: τῶν πολυκότων συνοισιῶν
23. χαματαιρίς: σόρη
24. χαμαίτιτη: σόρην ἄδοδος
25. χανδών: ἡνογιμένων, ἀπλήστως, ἄθρως, χωρητικῶς
26. χανδών πιείς: κεχρήστως καὶ ἄθρως πιείν
27. χαρακτηρίζει: διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν χαρακτήρων σημαίνει
28. χάρακες: ἀκανθαὶ καὶ κάλαμοι
29. χαράβδη: λύμη στὸν
30. χαράδρα: αἱ ὕδροφόραι· [χείμαρροι, διαρέσεις, σχίσματα, ῥήγματα γῆς·] οἱ μικροὶ ρύκαι

[31. χαίος: δ ὅπλοι τῆν ράβδον]
[32. χαράδραν: τῶν χειμάρρων]
33. χάρακα: χαράκωμα, περίφραγμα, [ὕποστήριγμα]
34. χαρωπὸς: ἐπιχαρής, εὐφθαλμός
35. Χάρυβδας: [ὑπνών ἀναρρόφους τῆν θάλασσαν· καὶ] ἡ ἀναπυρμένη θάλασσα περὶ τὰ Γάθειρα καὶ πάλιν ῥαγδαιστέρως ἐπαναστρέφουσα· εἰρηταὶ δὲ [καὶ χάσμα θαλάσσαιν ἄγχη] καὶ πάν τὸ εἰς χαίος καὶ ὀλεθρὸν καταστῶν

22. τῶν πολύ μετεχῶντων τῶν συνοισιῶν πρὸ τῶν πολυκ. συν. v3 R, πολυκότων T U, πολυκότων V W
23. χαμαίτης v22, χαμαίτης ST, χαμαίτης v1 v3 J R U= V ac W, χαμαίτης K L (M)
24. Gloss. om. v3 (exc. Γ Δ) χαμαίτεις C F G H, χαμαίτιτης (R) T Γ Δ, χαμαίτης S U, χαμαίτιτης V W ἣ ἀδοδος R
25. χάνδών v1 K M N S T U ἡνογιμένων om. v3, ἡνογιμένων v1 R S T U ἄθρως v1, ἄθλιος ἀντὶ ἄθρως v2 χαρακτικός J Ὁ ῬΤ, χαρακτικός B C G, χαρακτικός F H
26. χάνδων ποιεῖν nonnulli πόλεις ἀντὶ κεχρήστως add. v2 R S T U V W κεχρήστως F H, κεχρήστος B C G ποιεῖν v1 Γ Σ ὕπερ πρὸς πιεῖν v22 J, ὕπερ πιεῖν K L
27. αὐτῶν om. v22
28. ἀκάνθα v2 B Π: ἀκάνθα cett.
29. λοίμα v1 φθορὰ πρὸς λύμη R
30. χάραδρα v1 N ὑδροβία v1 J K M N, ὑδροβία (ι) v1 R S (T) U V (W), ὑδρορία v3 χείμαρροι ἀντὶ ύδρ. S καὶ τὰ κοιλώματα (κυλ.) τῷ χείμαρρῳ· γῆς v3 R W διαρέσεις· γῆs om. S, σχίσματα· γῆς om. T U V ῥήγματα v1 ἣ οἱ μικροὶ ρύκαι W, ἢ μικρὰ ῥάκια T
32. Gloss. hab. v1 v2 (exc. L): cett. om. χάραδραν v1
33. χαράκωμα v1 ἡνογιμένως om. v3
34. χαρτοί v1 T W ἐπιχαρής v1, περιχαρής (O) P
35. Χάρυβδης L O S U: Χάρυβδης v1, αὐτοῦ· θάλασσαν καὶ om. v3 ἀνάρ(ι)οφών L O P V W, ἀνάρ(ι)οφών CF H (J) (K) (M) N (T) (U), ἀνάρ(ι)οφών B G R (S) γάθηρα R, γαθήρα v1 ῥαγδαιστέρως (προν) v1, ῥαγδαιστέρως R S T U, ῥαγδαιστέρως V W ἐπιστρέφουσα R, καὶ χάσμα· ἄγχη om. v3 θαλάσσαιν ἄγχη om. R S ἄγχη scrpsi: ἄγχη V W, ἄγχη v1 v2, ἄγχη T U καὶ ὀλεθρὸν om. v3 καταστῶν K (M)
37. χάρια vi1, χαριά P V W
39. χαρίη v3 N, χαρίη T
40. ἐπινυκίοι v3 εὑριστεῖαν vi1 (J) (K) S W, εὑριστηρίαν v3
41. γοῦς pro χοῦν V W στόμα ανεφωμένον om. v3
42. χαυόνας (vel χαυόνας) v3 R ἀναφωμένας v3 λάχανα nonnulli
43. Gloss. om. V W Χειρουβίμι Δ Φ ἐπὶ ἐνικοῦ διδόγγυν, ἐπὶ δὲ πληθυντικοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἰ ἐστὶ δὲ αντε πλῆθος add. v32 ἡ χώσις σοφίας v3 R χάρις pro χώσιν v2
44. χειροθῆς Γ Ε Φ, χειροθῆς Δ, χειροθῆς Σ, χειροθῆς Π ἦμερον nonnulli
45. χειρότητα V W χειροποίητα om. v3 κατηγορισάμενα v3 N P W
46. χειροτονεῖα vi1 M ἐγκληγοί vi1 (exc. B) τοῦ δήμου R S καὶ—κύρωσις hab. vi1 v2: cett. om. κύριοις v1
47. χεία καὶ χεια v3 R ἢ κατάδυσις v1 καὶ om. v3 φωλαιοὶ S (T) U, φωλαιοὶ v1 v3 (exc. 2) M N, φωλαιοὶ R
48. χειρόμακτον vi1 T W δ ῥωμαῖοι μανδήλιον λέγουσιν v3 μανδήλιον R S T, μανδήλιον B C G V, μανδήλιον(s) U διὰ τὸ ἐκμάκασαν τὴν ὅλην add. W
49. συμβολέον vi1 T U γραμματεῖον v3 R V W, γραμματεῖον M
50. Gloss. om. L Π χεία v1, (N) T (Γ) Δ Ε χείας nonnulli
51. χειρώνας vel χειρώνας codd. χαλκεῖς add. v32
52. τῶ (τὸ v32) ἐν τῶ χειμῶν v3 v22 R γενόμενον v3 R ἤ ἐν om. O P τῶ ρωξ ἦν v1 v2 ῥωξ ἦν v1 Π τῶν δακτύλων om. v3 R τοῦ ποδός O P ἦ ἀποκαίματα post ἐλκος add. v3 R
54. χείριστα: δεινά, κάκιστα
55. χείριστον: χείρονα
56. χεδροπόν: ὀστρινον
57. χέλυν: κηθάρα
58. χελώνιδος: τοῦ ἄδου τῆς θύρας
59. χερμόδος: λιθοῦ πληρούστος τὴν χείρα
60. χερνητίν: πενεχράν, [χερνητίν ἐργαζόμενήν,] ἀπὸ χερνητῶν ζώσαν, [ἐριουργόν]
61. χειμαγροί: ρύσκες, ποταμοί
62. χερθονεία γῆ: ἥ ἐστὶ θάλασσαν ἐκκενόουσα, ἥ μὴτε χέρσος μὴτε θάλασσα, ἀλλὰ περικυλυζομένη καὶ μίαν ἔχουσα διέξοδον
63. χερσία: ἐφήμια
64. χεύμα: ῥεύμα
65. χέρας: γῆ
66. χεύματι: προχοῤή: ἥ ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἄριστερῶν ἔχουσα θάλασσαν
[67. χηλή: ὁ διηρημένος ὅνυξ τοῦ βοῶς]
68. χηλή: ὀπλή, ὅνυξ βοῶς καὶ προβάτου καὶ αἰγώς· λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὰ τῶν θαλασσίων κορκίνων στόματα χηλαί
69. χηλή: ὅνυξ κτήνους
70. χηραμοι: οι φωλεοι των θηριων, αι καταδύσεις των οφεων
71. χηρώσας: χῆραν έάσας
72. χηρώς: χηρεάν έάσας]
73. χθαμαλός: [χαμηλός,] ταπεινός, ὁμαλός, ἵσος
74. χθαμαλός: [ταπεινός,] χαμηλός
75. χθαμαλόν: ἀσθενές
76. χθιξῶν: χθεσινῶν
77. χθινόν: γῆς
78. χθινών: γηνών
79. χθιξόν: χθεσινός
80. χθύνας: γήνων
81. χθύρα: [τρίψημα, σίτος νέος φρυττόμενος,] στάχυς νεογενής: ἡ τὰ ἐξ ὀσπρίων ὀλέυρα [ἡ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ὀσπρια]
82. χθύρα ἐρικτά: ἐκ κριθῆς νέας ὡς σεμίδαλις
83. χθόλος: τροφὴ ἵππων
84. Χήμαρα: τὸ τρίμορφον θηρίων ἐνταῦθα δηλοὶ, ὀπερ ἐν τῇ Λυκίᾳ ὑπῆρχεν

70. χήραμος: οἱ φωλεοὶ τῶν ὀφεων (tantum!) ν3 φωλεοὶ ν1, φωλαιοὶ N R S T U V τῶν θηρίων, αἱ καταδύσεις om. R
71. Gloss. om. ν2 ν3 R χηράσας V W
73. χαμηλός hab. ν1 ν2; cett. om. χαμηλὸς νι ὁμαλός ante ταπεινός ΓΔ ἵσος om. νι ἡ ἀσθενής post ἵσος add. V W
74. Gloss. om. L O ταπεινός hab. νι ν2, cett. om. χαμηλός om. ν22 χαμηλός νι Δ
75. Gloss. om. V W χθαλαὶ πρὸ χθαμαλὸν νι
76. χθιξῶν T U V: χθινοὶ ν2 W, χθηνοὶ νι S, χθιξῶν ν3 R χθηνοὶ νι, χθινοὶ V W ἄργου ἄχρηντοι post χθινοὶ add. T U (W)
77. Gloss. om νι χθινός T U, χθινὸς S
78. Gloss. om. J χθινοὶ ν2 R S T U V, χθινοὶ νι
79. Gloss. om. ν3 R χθῆνος νι
80. χθῶνος S T U ἐπίγειος add. W
83. χθόνος Γ, χθόρος R, χθόρος S καὶ ἵππων χόρτα add. ν3 (exc. Γ)
84. Χήμαρα ν1 J K M N S (T) U, Χήμαραν V (W), Χημεραν ν3 τρόφιμον (R) (S) (T) U λυκία νι N Γ
85. χίμαροι: τράγοι
86. χιονωθέονται: λαμπρωνθέονται
87. χίμαιρα: άγα άγρια
88. χίδρον: νέον καρπόν
89. χεία: ἂ κατάδυσι τοῦ ὀφεως
[90. χιδάλεων: τυφλόν, ἄγαμον, πεθρικός]
91. χιτών: ἐσθής, ιμάτιον ἀνδρικόν
92. χλαίνα: χλαμῦς, χλανίς, χειμερινὸν ιμάτιον πορφυρόν
[93. χλεύ: χλευασμός, γέλος]
94. χλιδώσα: τραυμάσα, σπαταλώσα
95. χλιδή: τρυφή
96. χλιδώνα: κόσμον περὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἡ βραχίων, δ καλεῖται βραχίόλιον
97. χλιάζεσθαι: γαστρίζεσθαι
98. χλοάζει: βλαστάνει
99. χνοῦς: λεπτὸν κονιορτός
100. χοῖς: ἐναγύμαιτα ἐπὶ νεκροῖς [εἰς τοὺς τάφους χείμενα]
101. χόειον: παχὺ ἐντερον

85. Gloss. om. v22; cum gl. 61 conf. T U χίμαροι vi J K W, χείμαροι Γ, χείμαρροι S, χιμαρροί R χίμαρος: τράγος ν32
86. χιονωθεύονται vi (exc. B) ν3 Νο Rαυ S, χιονωθήσονται ΣΤ
87. χιμαίρα (χιμαίρα B) vi άγα (άγα B) vi O P R αἰὲ L, αἰγὶς ν3 άγριά B ἡ ἐν χειμώνι τεχθείσα post ἀγρία add. ν3 χίμερα: άγρια αἰὲ et χιμαίρα: αἰγὶς άγριά περαινοῦν V W
88. leg. χίδρον
89. Gloss. om. ν3 V W χεία Q P: χία Μ, χία cett.
90. Gloss. hab. vi; cett. om. πεθρικῶς codd.
91. Gloss. om. ν22 ν32 χιτῶν vi T Γ Δ, χιτῶν S ἐσθῆς vi T U ιμάτιον ΡΤ Γ
92. Gloss. om. ν3 χλάινα, χλαμὸς καὶ χλανίς: χλάνα μὲν λέγεται τὸ παχὺ καὶ χιμερίων (μέρισμ ρ) ιμάτιον χλαμῶς δὲ τὸ παρ’ ἡμῶν λεγόμενον κυμάτιον χλάνις (χλανίς B C G) δὲ τὸ ἀπαλὼν καὶ λεπτὸν (ιμάτιον add. F H) καὶ τρυφερὸν νι χλάνα Ν Ο U V χλανών R πορφύρα χαμερίων (καὶ χειμ. Ρ) ιμάτιον Ρ S
93. Gloss. hab. vi; cett. om. χλεύει codd. leg. γέλος
94. Gloss. om. vi χλιδώσας: τραυμάσας, σπαταλώσας Υ
95. Gloss. om. vi χλίδη R Γ
96. χλιάνα vi Ν, χλίδωνα (χλίδωνα Γ) ν3 τράχηλον ἡ om. Υ, sed supra lineam ἂ τὸν τράχηλον add. τὸν om. B βραχίόλιος Γ, βραχίόλην R S, βραχίονος Φ, βραχίονον L, βραχίονον καὶ βραχίόλιον W
97. χλιάζει vi
98. χρόος νι M V W
100. χοῖς ν22 L: χαῖς cett. ἐναγύμαιτα vi Ν νεκροῖς R εἰς—χείμενα om. ν3 R ἐν τοῖς τάφοις S
101. χνοῖν Ο P, leg. χόρον παχὺ Ο P, ταχὺ W
102. χονδρίτην: παχύ σεμιδαλις γυνομένη
103. χοικός: γγγενής, έκ χοός, πήλινος
104. χωάμενος: λυπούμενος, ὀργιζόμενος
105. χοιράδες: πετρών ὃθοι ἢ ἐξοχαί
106. χότ: χώματι
107. χοιρογράφιοις: [ἐρκόμους], ὰστριξ, εἴδεσ λαγωοῦ
108. χολέασαμί: ἀν: ὀργιεῖσθαι
109. χολέρεα: ἄνωθεν καὶ κάτωθεν ἔμετος, ἦτουν] ἐκκρίσις διὰ στόματος καὶ γαστρός
110. χολάδες: ἐντερα
111. χοιρὸι ἄλων: θρόμβοι ἄλατος, παχὺ ἄλας
112. χορτηγία: δόσις, παροχή
113. χοροστάτης: χορόν κατάρχων
114. χώριον: τὸ κάλυμμα τὸ συγγεννώμενον ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῖς βρέφεσι
115. χόρος: κύκλος, στέφανος
116. χοῦς: μέτρον ἐἱρήται δὲ καὶ τὸ χῶμα
117. χράνας: μιάνας, ῥυπώσας
118. χραισμεῖν: βοηθεῖν
119. χραισμήσαι: βοηθῆσαι

102. Gloss. om. Π χονδρίτης Σ: χονδρίτων ν3 R S (T) U, χονδρίτων V W χονδρίτων vel χονδρίτων ν1 ν2 σεμιδαλις ν1, σεμιδαλις R, γυνομένη R S U Σ Φ, γυνομένης T
103. γγγενής nonnulli πήλινος ὃν ν3
104. χωάμενος V W: χωάμενος cett. ἐργαζόμενος ν1
105. Gloss. om. Φ χοῖ F N T U χώματα ν W-V W
107. χολέασμεν R Ρ, χολέασμεν ν3 R νο ὀργιοθήσαμεν νι ἢ post ὄργ. add. O P
108. χολερά L T V W, χολερά R S U ἄνωθεν—ήτουν om. ν3 R S ἔμετος ν2 V W, αἵμετος ν1 T (U) εἴτου ν, ἢγουν W ἐκκρίσις J M N R, ἐκκρίσις νι
109. χόλαδες vel χολάδες νι θρόμβοι post ἐντερα add. νι
110. χονδριλάν S (T) U Γ Π, χονδριλάν R ἄλων nonnulli, ἄλος V W θρόμβοι om ν1 (cf. gloss. praec.) ἄλατος om. W, ἄλατος ... ἄλα nonnulli
111. δώσις S, δώσις R
112. χροκαταδάρχων νι
115. μέτροι—χῶμα (= gl. sequ.) add. ν3
116. Gloss. om. V
117. ρυπώσας K O R T Δ
118. χραισμεῖνα νι N S βοηθῆσαι nonnulli
120. χρημητίσαι: κράξαι ὡς ἵππος [ἡ ἀντὶ τοῦ λαλῆσαι εἰρηταί]
121. χρήμπτεται: [βῆσει, οἶνον] ἥχον τῷ στόματι ἀποτελεῖ, πτέρνεται
122. χρεώμενος: χράμενος
123. χρέων ἀποκοπαί: ὅταν τὰ ύπό τῶν πενήτων ἀφαιρεθέντα ἀφεὶς λάβωσιν
124. χρημετισμὸς: ἢ τῶν ἵππων φωνή
125. χρασιμό, ἕχρασιμον
126. χρὴμα: πράγμα, πλοῦτος, οὐσία, λῆμμα
127. χρηματίζει: ἀποκρίνεται, προλέγει, [προφητεύει ἢ πράσσει· χρὴμα γὰρ τὸ πράγμα]
128. χρησιμοδοτούμενα: [μαντεύομενα,] προλεγόμενα
129. χρησιμοί: προφητειαν, [κληρον, μαντείαν]
130. χρηστοῖ: ἑγαθοὶ
131. χρήσης: ὁ δανειζών καὶ δανειζόμενος
132. χρήσθαι: χράσθαι, προσφέρεσθαι
133. χρήμπτεται: [προσκνάται,] πελάζει, προσεγγίζει
134. χροὸς ἀσάμην: τοῦ σώματος ἐκορεσθῆν
135. χρυσότευκτος: ἐκ χρυσοῦ κατεσκευασμένος
136. χρυσηλακάτου: χρυσοτόξου
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137. χρυσόμωρον: χρυσόξυφον
138. χρυσομπυκας: χρυσοχαλίνος
139. χρυσοστόρευτα: χρυσόγυλφα
140. χρυσανγούντα: στιλβοντα, ἀστράπτοντα
141. χρός: σῶμα
142. χρωτός: σώματος, ἱδέας
143. χύδην: κεχυμένιος, [ὡς ἐτυχὲν]
144. χυδαιος: εὐτελής, [συρφετός]
145. χυδαιος: τὸ πλήθος δεδήλωκεν
146. χυλός: ἐκπασιμός
147. χυμός: σίελος ἡ πῆγαμα ύγρόν
148. χυμών: πεμμάτων ύγρών
149. χύμα: ὑψαμμά γῆς, ὅπερ οἱ πολέμιοι ἐν ταῖς πολιορκίαις εἰώθασι προσχοῦν τὰ τείχη
[150. χωρήσω: βαδίσω, ὑποστρέψω]
[151. χωρίον: τόπον]
152. χώρος: τόπος
153. χωρήσατε: προσδέξασθε
154. χωλωτοίσαι: ὑργύλοις
[155. χώμασι: τοὺς ἵπεσας τῶν ματαίων]

137. χρυσόμωρον v22 R S
138. χρυσομπυκας ν1 χρυσοχαλίνος S
139. χρυσοστόρευτα (B) F H χρυσόφορα post χρυσόγυλφα add. R S, pro χρυσόγλ. hab. V
140. στιλβοντα ν1 ἀστράπτοντα ante στιλβοντα W
141. χρός R S U V: χρῶς cett. εἰδέα add. L
143. χύδην R κεχυμένος B C G Π ὡς ἐτυχὲν om. v3 W, ἐτυχὸν V
144. χυδαιος nonnulli, χύδαιος (R) S (T) U εὐτελῆς ν1 N Τ Π Φ συρφετός om. v3, συρφετός ν1 πανθληθῆς pro συρφετός W
146. Gloss. om. P ὁ ἐκπασιμός v3
149. ὅπερ codd.; leg. ὅπερ πολέμικοι ν1 πολυορκίαις nonnulli προσχῶν F H, προσχοῦντα B G τείχει B C G S ἀλαχοῦ εἰώθαν προσχοῦν τὰ τείχη add. W
150, 151. om. v3 v4
152. χώρος ν1 N ὁ τόπος v3
153. Gloss. om. Σ χωρίσατε ν1 v21, χωρίσατε T, χωρίσασθαι Π Φ προσδέξασθαι ν1 v3 (exc. Δ) v22 R S T W
155. Gloss. om. v3 L W
[156. χῶτα: σῶμα]
156. Gloss. om. v3 L R S W χῶτα vel χῶτα codd.; leg. χῶτα
158. Gloss. hab. vi; cett. om. χώρος codd. καὶ κύπριοι F H χωρητικὸν F H,
χωρητικὸν B C G